Urban and more dense development. And this -- and that this particular property does not have that or particular conservation values of note.

I say this, and I give this description to you because, again, you might ask why would the University of Nations filed a Motion to Voluntarily

Revert the Property? The answer is that while

through their period of recollection or --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may. I want to give you great latitude in presenting, but the presentation should be on the status report.

Should we, after the status report, move into an Order to Show Cause hearing, that would be the appropriate venue for discussions about when the appropriate reclassification might be if we went through that entire process.

THE WITNESS: In fact, it's a good note,
Chair, because we segue now to commitment statement
by the University of Nations COO Paul Childers with
respect to compliance with the LUC conditions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm also going to swear you in.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

PAUL CHILDERS

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the Petitioners, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ CHING: These next slides specifically speak to compliance with the LUC conditions and I'll quickly go through them.

Infrastructure, public program conditions.

Again, they relate to affordable housing, drainage,
public school facilities, water resources, wastewater
facilities, soil erosion, transportation, traffic,
civil defense and solid waste. And, again, they are
triggered particularly as development proceeds.

We have attached for you a much more specific and lengthy annual report narrative for you that details responses to date for those particular conditions.

And the statement at this point would be that the University of Nations Kona is committed to complying with all of these conditions and approval as the project progresses.

Technical conditions, again, are listed, and they relate to compliance which relate representations to the Commission, notice of change

of ownership interest, annual reports, release of conditions and recording of conditions.

Again, commitment is that we're obliged to observe these conditions, although we note the following exceptions:

With reference previously that they have -there have been changes to title, and we recognize
that they should be appropriately noticed and
recorded to the Commission. So we acknowledge a
greater diligence on our part is required with
respect to the submission of its annual reports.

I note for you that we have previously sought on March 1st, 2007, a release of conditions with a motion hearing, but that the LUC took no action. We look to proceed on this matter as directed by the Commission on this matter.

With respect to the archaeological condition, I note that the Petitioner is compliant with the Condition 6A through F, but I offer this following note for Site 23683, which happens to be a burial site.

On January 5th through 6 there was a fire that was reported in the area supposedly triggered to investigation by the firing of bottle rockets from a neighboring subdivision. It produced an intensive

fire that required fire department helicopter and four engine companies to respond. In the course of the response, it is believed that Site 23683 might have been overrun by a bulldozer from the HFD as they were seeking to carve out access to the fire for their equipment. That's despite the marking and the efforts by staff to ensure that there would be no -- or appropriate actions in the area.

I note for you that Hawai'i Burial Council on Big Island Burial Council was informed of it, and we seek to find further documentation and necessary next steps which we are obliged to take to, again, preserve and restore that particular site.

With respect to Condition No. 16 in terms of notice of change of ownership interest, I'll note for you again, I have described the particular changes in ownership, and we understand that we are obliged to conform to that standard in the future to let you know whatever changes are taken.

With respect to Condition No. 17 in terms of annual reports, you can see where annual reports have been submitted. We understand that we need to perform better with respect to that standard of annual reports being given without fail.

With respect to Finding of Fact 93(a),

which is not a condition but represents a commitment made by the Petitioner, I'm going to defer now to the COO to present the university's document.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If you would please state your name on the record again.

THE WITNESS: My name is Paul Childers.

PAUL CHILDERS

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for making the time today for us to come in and share.

As Tony was sharing, we have had a season of realignment. We were really getting back to our core values of who we are as a mission and a university.

And so moving forward, we do want to remain very diligent in making the commitment that were the spirit and the intent of the original commitment made for the reclassified area, even though back in 2007 we had mentioned that we will not be able to get the cultural center up and going.

We make a commitment to provide scholarship for University of Hilo's students at the College of Hawaiian language. And in the same spirit of that we also will be giving a free internship for a student from that college to be able to intern in our haleo

immersion Hawaiian studies that actually do occur on the University of the Nations campus at the moment.

Moving along, we also will continue with our haleo course that Mr. Ching has already mentioned that 397 students have gone through that. And we will be able to continue that and no tuition will be required from the Big Island Native Hawaiians in that regard.

Moving forward to our commitment, the archaeological sites that are on the reclassified area, we will establish and record the permanent easements around those sites for each one of the five sites that have been recognized as needing to be protected, and the development around that.

We will also utilize our best efforts to maintain the area within these preservation easements with our students and kokua crew making it -- getting any vegetation out of the place as well as being able to really take care of these archaeological sites.

In regards to LUC Condition No. 7, we also will be moving towards forming the KWC, which is the Ka Ohana Waiaha Committee, that will also give counsel as well as oversight over these archaeological areas and will be moving towards formally establishing the KWC.

There are several issues that have happened over the last several years that definitely have absorbed a lot of our effort and energy within the University of Nations. One was a fraud perpetrated on us over the last year by Palo Rivera, who was a volunteer with us. We're a full voluntary staff, and so he joined with us. And in January 2017 we discovered that he was perpetrating fraud on us. He was tried. He plead guilty. He was sentenced to 115 months in federal penitentiary.

Also during this season had litigation against us in connection with an accident on the mainland, and the court ultimately found that University of the Nations Kona was in no control over that place, and they found in favor for us. And that was also upheld on the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.

So these are a couple of issues that have taken a lot of our energy and time as well as resources.

So as we have come through this relatively challenging season, we believe that reestablishing, reaffirming our faith-based model, which is walking forward, really, walking with the lord in the issues of development, we really believe that we will be able to develop this campus as an educational

facility for the local Hawaiians, training missionaries to go around the world, and we will be able to do it in a way that accords with Kona, our town here, as well as being able to fulfill our mission mandate.

So, thank you, Mr. Chair, for your time this morning.

MS. ANJO: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and the Commission. This concludes our annual report. We do look forward to working with you and keeping you apprised of this project as we develop forward, and await any directive that you have for us, and we thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioners, do you have questions for the Petitioner? Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair.

So from your status report, Mr. Ching stated that from 2003 to now there's been a lot of, can I say, difficulties? And lot of issues that happened with your corporation and changing and all that. And that these conditions, a lot of them have not been met, or you're going to try to meet them from now on; is that correct?

MS. ANJO: Yes. The conditions, yes, we

have been facing a lot of difficulties since 2003 and realignment, and a lot of the conditions although have not been expressed on the reclassified area. In heart, we've met a lot of the conditions on the broader scale, what they were trying to convey.

For example, affordable housing, commitment to the community, Hawaiian culture. So we have actually been really moving forward, creating a strong foundation to make these conditions met with the heart of what they were for.

And that's -- and then some of them, the archaeological sites, and the reports really trying to make sure those were done well.

However, I'm concerned because, you know, the conditions were set for the parcel we're talking about now, not of the surrounding areas. So I'm concerned that the affordable housing piece is not done on the parcel, it's done maybe on the surrounding areas as you stated.

So that to me is not our kuleana. The parcel itself is our issue right now. And I'm very concerned right now, because has there even been plans on the affordable housing that's been set?

Do you want me to stop, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No, please proceed.

COMMISSIONER WONG: I'm just concerned.

Has there even been plans set up for affordable housing on the parcel at this time?

MS. ANJO: We came with a realignment of the mission, trying to return the faith-based value. We came before the Commission in 2007 and requested in that motion if we could -- to amend kind of the condition and the housing vision. So to shift the housing vision at that time.

COMMISSIONER WONG: But there was no -- sorry, I wasn't here in 2007. So it's kind of new to me in terms of that portion.

But at this point in time, it seemed like there's no commencement or plan in front of us right now but the affordable housing for that parcel; is that correct?

MS. ANJO: Correct. The housing is, instead of it being put for the sell of condos, it was -- the current revision is to have it for staff housing and for student housing on the property, instead of -- and so the affordable housing original vision which was to make condos and sell them off.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So shouldn't you have

come -- if that was a change, shouldn't you have come
to amend that condition? A request for the
amendment?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ CHING: If I could respond to the question.

The affordable housing condition on the reclassified area would be triggered by the development of housing, which then on that area, which then triggers a commiserate response. In this particular case, as no housing has been developed to date, we're compliant in the sense that, well, we haven't done -- we haven't produced that trigger for housing from activity on the reclassified area.

And Mr. Childers has indicated, and a commitment as housing is developed on the reclassified area, and at this point it's going to be the student dorms, staff housing. If that triggers an affordable housing requirement, they must produce and they must comply.

What Julie has mentioned is simply that in advance of that, and in good faith, they have provided and rehabbed and brought to the market 128 units of very qualified affordable rentals that is needed in the community.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you for taking a

drug infested area, as you stated, to do something 1 2 for the public. 3 Because I'm still concerned, because right now I think if you are planning to do housing, even 4 for students or faculty, wouldn't you need some sort 5 6 of drainage and water issue? I mean the 7 infrastructure for that. Has that started? 8 MS. ANJO: Yes, we've been working on water 9 on the 62 acres. 10 COMMISSIONER WONG: Is that with the county 11 or how is it set up? 12 MS. ANJO: Currently we are working on

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wells.

COMMISSIONER WONG: And wastewater also, you're working on what type of plan? Just infrastructure?

MS. ANJO: A lot of things are still under the development. The plan with the wastewater is to -- to follow the same with the county.

COMMISSIONER WONG: It's just that I'm just concerned in terms of it's been, what, 2003 to now, and it appears, even though it's not your fault, there's been changes, that there's been nothing done until now. I mean outside, yes, you did some things, but from the inside of that parcel there's nothing to

1 | it, pretty much fallow.

So it's just a concern of myself that nothing has been done. Because I know you're trying to do good but, you know, I haven't seen the good right now in what is in front of us. So I'm just concerned about that.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Good morning. Kind of slow this morning. Like Commissioner Wong, I wasn't here from the beginning, and I just want to understand the whole process.

Annual report was good. A lot of information. But fast forward to today, we are here to hear about the Petitioner's request to revert back the property to the original condition. Is that the case?

MS. ANJO: We withdrew the motion for reversion and said, upon further wisdom and advice from very knowledgeable people, that the appropriate action is to give the annual report and to show you what we've been doing, and that was what we needed to do. So we're through the motion.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: So we are here now

just for annual report?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: To clarify why,

Commissioner Aczon, why we are here today, we're here
to receive the annual report.

And after having asked questions of the Petitioner, hearing any presentation from Hawaii County and from Office of Planning on this, the Commission may deliberate on this matter, can take no action, or can take other actions including a motion for an order to show cause if there is a belief among the Commissioners that there may be a reason that we believe that the Petitioner is not in compliance with the Decision and Order on this matter.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner

Ohigashi.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: You have to excuse} \\ \mbox{me, I'm in the junior chair today.}$

I'm intrigued by your comment, Mr. Ching.

You made a comment about that the affordable housing or affordable housing component would only be triggered by a -- if the development went through or went forward on the main property.

Is that your -- that was essentially -- MR. CHING: In broad strokes there is

affordable housing requirement condition imposed on any activity developed in the reclassified area.

So my statement was that as the project progresses and housing is developed, then there will be in -- and the Petitioner understands and realizes that they will have to appropriately comply with the requirement, however it turns out.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So the existing plans for that parcel, does that include any housing that has been approved by the Commission? In other words, was there a housing component in the original presentation?

MR. CHING: In 2003 the Petitioner indicated that they would be selling 297 market housing units. And they've represented today as well as in 2007, that they will not be developing any market housing units.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And based upon that representation, is there -- that that part of the motion to amend that was in 2007?

MR. CHING: I believe in 2007 that particular -- there were no exhibits or motion made to relieve the Petitioner of an affordable housing condition.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So technically

then, the plan before us is, there's no amendment to the plan, that you will provide those affordable or those housing units for sale; is that correct?

MR. CHING: I think it's -- it would be accurate to say that Petitioner has made a representation that they would like to change the tenor of the development, and that they would be advised by the Commission as to what action needs to be taken.

In 2007 a motion hearing was convened by the LUC, exhibits were offered by the Petitioner, but, again, no action was taken.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And I think you testified that that motion to amend did not include the changing of the sale of the condominium units, it dealt with something else?

MR. CHING: I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. I do believe in 2007 the documents offered clearly indicated a deletion of removal of any intent to develop for sale real estate condo units.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So we don't know what happened to that? So is it your intent to file a motion to amend to delete that portion or renew that motion to amend; is that your intent?

MR. CHING: Well, actually, again, the

specific purpose here is to provide the report and to take direction as appropriate from the Commission.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's not} \\ \mbox{answering my question.}$

My question is, that assuming that we -- we have -- we have two courses today. Well, we can do nothing, or we can file an OSC, or say let's move to OSC and have a big hearing on this matter; or we can say we understand that the Petitioner, you guys, are going to file a motion to clear up what they're going to be doing on that property, and defer an OSC hearing.

So my question is very simple. Is it your intent to file a motion to amend to identify what changes in the project is necessary that you're seeking, and to show us the necessary financing ability?

Because I'm assuming that the development of the condominium was meant to finance some of the development on this property, and absent that financial component.

So I'm just asking a simple question. Is it your intent to file a motion to amend?

MR. CHING: If allowed by the Commission, I believe that would be an appropriate action.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I think the rules allow you to do it no matter what. I'm just asking your intent.

MR. CHING: Again, I believe that would be the logical step. It's just that there was the unresolved issue of the previous filing and no action

being taken, and that's why we defer to the

Commission to give us direction in that matter.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Are you asking us to bring up that motion again?

MR. CHING: Again, if, given the opportunity, I think we would offer a new motion that would be up-to-date and would be consistent with any instructions that we have received from the Commission, as well as in compliance with the vision moving forward for the Petitioner.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
Ohigashi, can you take a break? And we will go back
to you, Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I'm still just trying to follow up on Commissioner Ohigashi's questioning.

I'm just trying to kind of see where the end gate is. I'm pretty sure you guys have some idea where you guys want to go.

I'm just curious. You folks filed a Motion

1 to Revert the property to its original designation, and then all of a sudden you guys pulled out. Why do 2 3 you -- did you file a Motion to Revert the property 4 to begin with? 5 MS. ANJO: We filed a Motion to Revert 6 because we were trying to figure out how to move forward. And that had been some advice that had been 7 8 given to us, revert the property. 9 And so then I had the privilege of being with Ms. Apuna and she asked me some questions. 10 then we sought some broader -- some broader counsel, 11 and that's when they said, you know, this is a good 12 classification for what you want to do, so it would 13 14 be better to, you know, go -- go back to the 15 Commission and give them an update and see how they 16 want you to move forward. 17 For us we weren't sure how you wanted us to 18 move forward. What could we do to do this? We tried 19 to come before, and they didn't --20 COMMISSIONER ACZON: As if --21 MS. ANJO: Then we pulled the motion and 22 then --

COMMISSIONER ACZON: The question now is:

When you decided to file or to revert

original designation, your plan is when you get the

23

24

25

reversion, then file again for reclassification?

MS. ANJO: If that's what we needed to do. We felt like that -- that we needed -- we wanted to move with the land. We wanted to make things right that -- where there has been a lot of silence. We were trying to fix it. We were just operating on

what we were advised to do on how to move forward.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I just wanted to get some idea on where the end game is. I don't want to go through all those, then we're back to square one. I just kind of wanted to get some ideas.

Mr. Ching, I appreciate your background information about your relationship with ethnic studies program. I don't know whether I have to disclose or not. Right before I went to law school, I was the convenor of the dean's advisory committee on ethnic studies at UH Manoa, which ended up hiring Dr. Franklin Oda as permanent director, so I understand the concepts and framework that you're trying to present.

My question is basically this: Because we