

From: [Hakoda, Riley K](#)
To: [Quinones, Natasha A](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] IAL Comments/Questions
Date: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 2:31:49 PM

IAL

From: Justin Smith <altafoods@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 9:38 AM
To: Hakoda, Riley K <riley.k.hakoda@hawaii.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] IAL Comments/Questions

I am writing to express some concerns regarding the Important Agricultural Lands (IAL).

Although I may not be entirely up to speed on the absolute implications of this bill, it seems that there has developed a gap in the overall intention of the bill and the potential outcome with its passing.

I greatly appreciate a goal for a cohesive plan... BUT I find it selective to allow thousands of acres of farm land in Eva to be cemented over for a shopping mall and a rail all the while choosing small plots to be dedicated for highly specific and restrictive use. For me, there is a large disconnect here.

Below are just a few of my quickly articulate thoughts after reading over the bill.

1. How the land was selected seems to be rather arbitrary. Solely base on the map, I see that some areas (the one in which I live) have been elected for designation, while other areas directly adjacent of higher caliber usability have been omitted. What was the process for selection for these designations? Maybe since this process started so long ago, it is no longer applicable with existing qualifications? The material shows that the selected was based on having one or two of a possible group of qualifying components, but doesn't take into consideration things that disqualify it from being selected.
2. Although I understand a need to preserve land and create a food security for the islands, it seem targeting and imposing use mandate will not do the trick especially upon smaller parcels. If the concern was for such food security, the thousands upon

thousands of acres that lie fallow year after year are the source for a viable and productive farming areas.

3. With regards to residency, I'm a bit taken aback as to how it can be regulated with specifics of who can live on a certain property under what circumstance. If I have a legal residence having complied with the layers upon layers of existing regulations, how can it be dictated as to whom can actually live in my house? Not sure how the overall law of the land would allow for such selective discrimination.

4. Regarding income amounts and income percentages: would it even be constitutionally legal for a 2/3 total income minimum to be imposed upon someone to be made as farm generated proceeds? If I can eek out \$10-\$15K of sales for the year... am I then limited to only generating \$22.5K annually as a total income?

5. How was it selected? How was it deemed important? I purchased land from someone who bought land off a larger land holder years ago because the land was not productive for them as farm land. I did/do hope to produce something viable here someday, but it turns out that this space had been so abused by the existing tenants and land owners that its very difficult to even manage. There were piles and pile of boulders rolled off the adjacent slop to clear way. Dead animals and countless cars and equipment have been buried in the soil, not to mention a great deal on the soil is on a rocky slope. Metal garbage, rolls of plastic irrigation shredded all over the place, barbed wire fencing tilled into the soil... the list goes on and on, sadly.

6. Speaking of land stewardship... if the true concern for the quality of the land is there and the interest of additional regulations are there... we may want to look into existing systems of farming. The current large scale fruit production on the north shore alone does more ecological harm than I could possibly imagine. Each crop has miles and miles of plastic irrigation piping as well as plastic weed barriers that are tilled into the soil as shredded (not-so) micro plastics each and every time a crop is harvested and replanted (1.5-2 year cycle). There is nothing good coming from this practice. I only notice this, because the land I'm living on has experienced the same type of abuse.

7. The time frame seems short to notify the public of such a potentially significant and enduring decision.

Thank you for your time and any further explanation of this observations and questions would be greatly appreciated.

Justin Smith

North Shore Resident.