

STATE OF HAWAII  
LAND USE COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting

*Approved 3/28/69*

Land Use Commission Hearing Room  
Honolulu, Hawaii

January 10, 1969 - 1:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Wilbert Choi, Chairman Pro Tempore  
Shelley Mark  
Sunao Kido  
Leslie Wung  
Alexander Napier  
Shiro Nishimura  
Goro Inaba

Commissioners Absent: C. E. S. Burns, Jr.  
Keigo Murakami

Staff Present: Ramon Duran, Executive Officer  
Ah Sung Leong, Planner  
George Pai, Legal Counsel  
Jack Morse, Deputy Attorney General  
Jean Soma, Stenographer

All those wishing to testify before the Commission were sworn in by Chairman Choi.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the November 15, 1968, and November 29, 1968, meetings were approved as circulated to the Commissioners.

HEARINGS

PETITION BY THE TRUSTEES OF THE BERNICE P. BISHOP ESTATE  
(A68-201) TO REZONE 615 ACRES FROM AGRICULTURAL TO URBAN AT  
WAI'IAU, EWA, OAHU

Staff recommendation for denial of subject petition was based on the following reasons:

1. purpose and intent of the Land Use Law is to "prevent the shifting of prime agricultural land into non-revenue producing residential

January 10, 1969

uses when other lands are available that could serve adequately the urban need",

2. Land Use Law states "no change shall be approved unless the petitioner has submitted proof that the area is needed for a use other than that for which the district in which it is situated is classified," and
3. petitioners have not submitted any significant additional evidence to warrant the reversal of the Commission's decision.

Mr. Duran oriented the Commission with the district map of the petitioned area. He also pointed out the land uses to the extent of vacant and partially developed land, nearby and immediately surrounding areas (Honolulu, Halawa, Aiea, and Pearl City), and military lands.

Replying to Commissioner Kido's inquiry on suitability of petitioned land, Mr. Duran responded that 346 acres of land are undevelopable because of the steep topography. Mr. Duran further informed Commissioner Kido that areas indicated orange on the district map total approximately 4,000 acres of vacant land in the nearby Urban District. This vacant land is located at about an 8-10 minute drive beyond the property in question.

Although the staff stated in their report that no major boundary amendment should be enacted until the Commission has the benefit of the consultants' study and recommendations, Commissioner Kido recalled that the Deputy Attorney General has previously been confronted with a similar matter and at that time advised the Commission that it is mandated to consider or act on any petition that is filed. Mr. Duran was in full agreement with Commissioner Kido and added that every petition filed with the Commission must be acted on but that every one does not have to be approved. Since the Land Use Commission's District and Regulation Review Program is currently underway and because public hearings will soon be held in the respective counties, it is suggested that proposed boundary amendments which have been denied may be considered at one time during the boundary review. Commissioner Kido then reasoned that favorable action should not be given on major land areas.

January 10, 1969

At the request of Commissioner Inaba, Mr. Duran pointed out on the map the difference in location of the petitioners' and County General Plan's urban boundary line.

Mr. Duran advised Commissioner Mark that although the City and County Planning Commission has recommended approval of the entire area over and above their General Plan, such recommendation would not amend the County General Plan. In order to amend the Plan, the County Planning Commission would be required to duly advertise the amendment, conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment, and make recommendations to the City Council until it is adopted after three readings. Such action by the City Planning Commission must transpire before any actual development may occur because the property would have to be rezoned. On the average, it takes approximately six months to amend the County General Plan. Basically, the City Planning Commission has recommended urbanizing areas that are not so indicated on their General Plan.

Regarding Mr. Francis H. I. Brown's development, Commissioner Napier wondered whether any actual development was underway. Mr. Duran advised that no physical ground development has occurred. However, subdivision plans may have been filed with the City and County. Chairman Choi disclosed that model homes have been constructed on the subdivision site; and, therefore, some development has resulted.

Mr. Duran notified Commissioner Inaba that the County General Plan for the petitioned area encompasses approximately 300 acres.

Concerning Chairman Choi's inquiry of the due date of our consultants' report, Mr. Duran imparted that the final report will not be submitted until after the Commission has completed all of its work. Our consultants will be submitting phase reports leading up to the public hearings and will contain recommendations for boundary and regulation amendments. The sequence is set up so that the timetable will permit the Commission to conduct public hearings throughout the State, allow for the proper waiting period as specified by law, final action, remapping of the boundaries and finalizing the regulations.

PETITION BY BISHOP TRUST COMPANY, LIMITED AND AUSTIN ESTATE  
(A68-202) TO REZONE 1,025 ACRES FROM AGRICULTURAL TO URBAN  
AT WAIIAU, EWA, OAHU

Mr. Duran then presented the proposed plan of the applicants for that portion of the staff report which differed with the A68-201 report.

TESTIMONY BY MR. MORIO OMORI:

Mr. Morio Omori, attorney representing the petitioners (both the Trustees of the Bernice P. Bishop Estate - A68-201 and Bishop Trust Company, Limited and Austin Estate - A68-202) suggested that for hearing and discussion purposes only the legal and factual issues of the two petitions be consolidated. Legal Counsel, George Pai, declared that since Mr. Omori was the attorney for the applicants of both petitions, it was legally possible to proceed as suggested.

Mr. Omori continued with his presentation which was based on the following:

1. The two parcels of land under consideration are the only remaining lands in the totally urbanized complex between Halawa and Pearl City. Moreover, staff has admitted that such lands meet all of the standards established for Section 2.7 which require urban-like characteristics such as proximity to trading and employment facilities; proximity to basic services such as sewers, water, schools, playgrounds, police and fire protection; satisfactory topography and drainage; and prevention of scatterization of urban developments.
2. Irrefutable evidence which the federal, state, and local governments recognize as urban growth in the area are the construction of the H-1 Highway, Waiiau and Waiawa Interchange, and the realignment and widening of Moanalua Road.
3. City Planning Commission recommended approval for Urban Districting both parcels of land when the original petitions for the same land area were filed (A67-161 - Trustees of the Bernice P. Bishop Estate; A67-162 - Bishop Trust Company, Limited and Austin Estate). Therefore, the

Land Use Commission should consider the City Planning Commission's recommendation for approving said petitions in making its decision.

4. Petitioners believe that "urban needs" must be determined not only on the bases of available urban lands and the number of units which can be built to accommodate anticipated population growth; but, the character of the proposed development, the type and quality of the proposed units, the lot sizes proposed, the cost of land (lease) and building, the market for each development is designed for and the state of readiness for utilizing the lands which are already urbanized must be considered.
5. Parcels under petition are located in Census Tract 78 which include Kalauao, Waimalu, and Waiiau and were pointed out by Mr. George Houghtailing, planning consultant and engineer, Community Planning, Inc.
6. As shown on Exhibit A which was submitted with the petition, there are three areas which are presently zoned urban and two areas sought to be zoned urban:
  - (a) Lewers and Cooke development - presently zoned urban,
  - (b) Waiiau--Bernice P. Bishop Estate land - subject area under petition (A68-201),
  - (c) Waimalu--Austin Estate land - subject area under petition (A68-202),
  - (d) Waimalu--Marks land or McCandless Estate land - presently zoned urban, and
  - (e) Kaonohi development--Bishop Estate land - presently zoned urban.
7. The Kaonohi development is a golf course development designed to meet the needs of a higher-income bracket, although it is situated

in Census Tract 78. Densities and comparable densities for this development are as follows:

- (a) Designed for low-density apartments (58.6 acres) - 13 units per acre as compared to an allowable density of 25.
  - (b) Designed for medium-density apartments (41.9 acres) - 20 units per acre as compared to an allowable density of 50.
  - (c) Designed for high-density apartments (13.6 acres) - 30 units per acre as compared to an allowable density of 100.
  - (d) Designed for single family residential lots (70.0 acres) - 2.36 units as compared to an allowable density of 4.3.
8. The Oahu Transportation Study, other population forecasts, and staff anticipate a population growth of approximately 12,000 people by 1975 in Census Tract 78. In order to accommodate this population growth, staff concluded at the March 23, 1968, public hearing that at 3.5 persons per unit, 3,387 (3,428.6) units would be needed. Using the maximum density and maximum available urban acreage of 444 acres, staff arrived at a total of 6,830 units that can be developed on Census Tract 78.
9. The chart submitted by petitioners as part of Exhibit C is based on the assumption that the specific zoning for the land will be approved by the City Planning Department after the Land Use Commission deems these lands should be included within the Urban District. The number of units actually developable could be decreased if the proposal for specific zoning is amended by the City Planning Department. In addition, a decrease may result if more public facilities such as schools, parks, etc., are designated for the area, an eventuality that is not too remote.
10. Since the last public hearing on these two petitions, a new compelling factor is the

definite decision to upgrade Moanalua Road to the status of a major 80-foot thoroughfare with joint participation by the City and State in the cost of the roadway portion, exclusive of the Waiiau Interchange portion.

11. Mr. Houghtailing revealed that an engineering study has been conducted and takes up the improvement of Moanalua Road from the point of termination at the Kaonohi-Waimalu boundary all the way up to Waimano Home Road. The improvements for streets and utilities are being undertaken so there is no question that the developers are accepting to service the demand for urbanization.
12. Another further development which indicates the urbanization of the two parcels is the finalization of plans by the Department of Transportation, Division of Highways, for a major access road with a minimum 80 foot right-of-way at the boundary of the Bishop Estate and Austin Estate lands to provide adequate access for urban development of these two parcels.
13. At a recent court hearing involving the H-1 Highway, the Deputy Attorney General had lodged a complaint regarding the construction of the 80 foot right-of-way. However, he has since amended his complaint. Nevertheless, Mr. Omori commented that as of this date, he has not received the Deputy Attorney General's amended complaint and was therefore unable to state whether the actual size of the thoroughfare would be altered.
14. The City and County Department of Public Works is cognizant of the urban nature of the two parcels in question and has embarked on a flood control drainage system study under urban conditions. This program is planned in conjunction with the U.S. Soil Conservation Department to provide for the urban nature of this area. In addition, the City Planning Department and the Department of Education are in the process of reviewing school sites

in the area to accommodate the anticipated urban expansion.

15. It is proposed that the Waiau and Waimalu areas will be serviced by the Waiau Interchange and the H-1 Highway by 1970. Subsequently, urbanization is necessary to embark on the development in line with the governmental developments presently being undertaken.
16. The construction of the H-1 Highway, upgrading of Moanalua Road, and other governmental activities have made the retention of agricultural pursuits in this pocket of agricultural land more difficult and economically unfeasible. Any agricultural pursuit will be in direct conflict with the total urbanization that is occurring in the subject areas.
17. As evidenced by Karl H. Berg's, President, Oahu Sugar Company, letter to the Trustees, Bernice P. Bishop Estate (copy of which was submitted with petition), every effort has been and is being made in cooperation with the Department of Transportation to coordinate sugar cane cultivation with the plans for the H-1 Highway, Waiau Interchange, and the extension of Moanalua Road on the present cane haul road between Waiau and Waimano Home Road.
18. As a vital part of the State land use philosophy, staff has emphatically stressed the preservation of agricultural land against unnecessary urban encroachment. However, it should be noted that in this situation, urban encroachment has already taken place as the lands sought to be zoned urban are located in the only pocket of agriculture remaining in a totally-urban area.
19. From an economic point of view, it is to the advantage of the petitioners to coordinate their urban development of the area with Oahu Sugar Company. Satisfactory arrangements are being made to phase out these areas without jeopardizing either the pursuits here



brought about by the urbanization of the whole area.

20. Petitioners feel that delay in considering this boundary amendment (staff has suggested that petitioners confront LUC with proposed boundary amendment when public hearings are held throughout the counties during the boundary review program) is unnecessary since the construction plans for a project of this magnitude will take a considerable amount of time and that the delay would prevent or jeopardize the plans that have been submitted. From studies conducted and from the experience of developers in subject area, there is a great urgency for the development of medium- and moderate-income units.
  
21. Since the City Planning Commission has on two occasions recommended urbanization of subject areas, petitioners requested favorable recommendation as urbanization is clearly within the standards established in Section 2.7, Part II, State Land Use District Regulations.

---

Commissioner Mark tended to agree with Mr. Omori that certain zoning conditions are matters more appropriately taken care of by the City Planning Commission and may not be entirely relevant to the deliberations. Mr. Omori continued that the Land Use Commission is mandated under Section 2.7 to consider the type and quality of the proposed units, the lot sizes proposed, the cost of land and building, etc., in interpreting the term "urban needs" as stated in the Land Use Regulations. Furthermore, the zoning for developments is granted by the City Planning Commission. However, the Land Use Commission, in considering "urban needs" as defined in Section 2.7, should consider aforementioned factors.

At the request of Commissioner Mark to comment on whether or not the Commission is restricted to what exists on the map, George Pai, Legal Counsel, reported that the Commission is not bound to what is on the County General Plan. Mr. Pai was of the opinion that Mr. Omori believed the Commission should consider the City's recommendation for

January 10, 1969

approval of subject petitions, and this is a relevant consideration.

Commissioner Mark was concerned about Mr. Omori's statement about whether some of the government facilities (highways, schools, utilities, etc.) were made necessary by poor urban development in the past. Mr. Omori then submitted that since urbanization has occurred in surrounding lands and to retain subject parcels as a pocket of agriculture which is located in the midst of a totally-urban area would be compounding the problem of planning.

Mr. George Houghtailing reported that the Waiau Interchange is being constructed due to the fact that urbanization has gone beyond instead of concentrating in one area. Because urban sprawl has created problems, government is spending money to try and resolve these problems.

In view of the fact that the Land Use Commission is presently in the process of reviewing the Land Use Law, Commissioner Mark questioned Mr. Houghtailing as to whether he would welcome an amendment to the Land Use Law whereby the Commission should regard the agricultural provision established in said law for all islands except Oahu, Mr. Houghtailing stated that "everything has to be considered on its own merits and that it would be rather difficult to take a standpoint if agriculture is ruled out altogether".

Mr. Houghtailing informed Commissioner Nishimura that the Department of Education is reviewing the need for additional school sites and facilities in conjunction with the development that is contemplated. Additionally, Mr. Houghtailing was unable to say whether the Trustees of Bishop Estate are planning to donate a parcel of land for a school site.

Assuming that 4,000 acres of vacant land surrounding the immediate vicinity of the petitioners' lands and if the lands in Makakilo abutting Halawa Valley are omitted, a net area of 2,500 acres of developable land would be the end result.

Mr. Duran informed Chairman Choi that the Kaonohi Ridge development is at a standstill. There are no buildings of any kind on the property. It could take as long as five years from now to fill up this land, and by that time the

Land Use Commission will have conducted two boundary review programs.

Mr. Houghtailing disclosed that in the two areas under petition moderate-income homes beginning at \$25,000 are proposed. Nevertheless, what is considered a moderate-priced home today will not be considered as such a year from now. Improvement costs range from 50 cents to almost \$1 per square foot, and \$25,000 will include the improvement costs.

In response to Commissioner Kido's inquiry regarding the delineation of an area in compliance with the mandate that the Land Use Commission include sufficient reserve areas for urban growth, Mr. Duran reported that it is done by population forecasts for specific areas arriving at what the future density might be within that area for a ten-year period. The next step would be to determine whether or not there would be enough land area to accommodate this growth, then to establish the Urban District boundaries in appropriate locations to accommodate this growth. This was the procedure undertaken in the establishment of the last permanent district boundaries. As a matter of fact, the Commission multiplied the ten year growth factor by three to permit flexibility and selectivity. Consequently, there are still vacant lands available today. Densities (high, medium, or low) for an area are fixed on the County General Plan, DLUM, and then implemented by County zoning.

Mr. Omori announced that Oahu Sugar Company has no long-term lease for their land. They are presently operating on a crop-to-crop basis.

Mr. Duran disputed Mr. Omori's statement that the petitioners are mandated to confront the Land Use Commission before any general planning can be done at the County level. The Commission should not be led to believe that the Counties cannot do any general planning unless subject lands are within the Urban District. Mr. Duran was of the consensus that master planning or county general planning is the most vital part of the procedure as actual designation for County long-range development for an area is based on a General Plan, projected for a 20-year period. The final step is the implementation of the plan through State zoning and then zoning at the County level. Therefore, the three steps

January 10, 1969

involved before actual development of a particular project can occur are:

1. County general planning,
2. State zoning, and
3. County zoning.

In refuting Mr. Duran's comment, Mr. Omori stated that petitioners are following the proper procedure by appearing before the Land Use Commission with their proposed boundary amendment because without the urban designation, no amount of general planning or zoning will be effectuated. Petitioners cannot implement any type of developmental plan as long as subject parcels are in the Agricultural District. Mr. Omori then informed Commissioner Napier that although the Commission approves this urbanization request, the actual development for subject areas could be entirely different and not as proposed.

Mrs. Harriet Fukunaga, resident of Waiiau area, spoke in behalf of the Waiiau residents residing below the Waiiau Interchange. She commented that they have no objection to the proposed development with the exception that developers provide adequate storm drainage facilities as subject parcels are situated in a high-elevation area. Residents of Waiiau are living in a low-lying area. Small streams in the area (Pearl City and Waimalu Streams) are inadequate to handle the additional flood conditions created by the conversion of sugar cane lands to housing. The Waiiau residents have lived in the area for approximately 20 years. They urged that the Land Use Commission and the city be responsible for seeing that adequate storm drainage facilities are provided so as to protect the welfare of the Waiiau residents. They desire to continue living there without fear of danger to lives and damage to their homes due to flood waters as a result of the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Omori was in complete agreement with Mrs. Fukunaga's standpoint and added that if the proposed development is accomplished on a piece-meal basis, i.e., providing utilities as each subdivision is developed, flooding problems will result. Therefore, Mr. Omori implicitly urged the Commission to consider the urbanization of lands under petition.

Regarding Mrs. Fukunaga's inquiry as to assuring the Waiiau residents that storm drainage facilities will be provided

subject to approval of boundary change, Mr. Houghtailing revealed that a complete study has been made of the Moanalua Road area and the developers have recommended that 8 or 9 foot drainage "boxes" be constructed to drain the rain or storm water.

Commissioner Mark was of the opinion that the developers will not eliminate the danger of flooding in the lower area (Waiiau) but rather would lessen the impact and hazards from a flood.

Chairman Choi then advised Mrs. Fukunaga that the Land Use Commission is only empowered to amend a district boundary. It is within the County's jurisdiction to specify the actual use of the land. Subsequently, Mr. Duran suggested that Mrs. Fukunaga write to the City Planning Department and request that in the event the County General Plan is proposed for amendment she be so notified of such public hearing.

There being no other discussion, the public hearing was closed.

ACTION

PETITION BY HISAHARU AND KIMIKO IKEDA (A68-198) TO RECLASSIFY 2.95 ACRES FROM AGRICULTURAL TO URBAN AT KAINALIU, KONA, HAWAII

Mr. Leong delivered the staff recommendation for Urban Districting only the mauka portion of the subject parcel comprising approximately one acre.

The chair then entertained a motion at which time Commissioner Inaba moved that the Commission approve the rezoning request as recommended by staff for one acre only. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Wung and was unanimously carried.

PETITION BY LUI KALANI STONE (A68-200) TO RECLASSIFY 284.5 ACRES FROM CONSERVATION TO AGRICULTURAL AT KALAUALEA, PUNA, HAWAII

Recommendation for approval of this petition on the bases that there is no need for the retention of these lands in the Conservation District as they are no longer in the National Park and have no significant historical or cultural value and because subject land is indicated as agricultural on the County's General Plan was presented by Mr. Leong.

January 10, 1969

Commissioner Wung moved that the Commission accept staff recommendation, which was seconded by Commissioner Inaba and unanimously carried.

RECONSIDERATION OF PETITION - JOSEPH S. BRUN (A68-199)

Executive Officer, Mr. Duran, informed the Commission that staff was in receipt of a letter from Mr. Brun dated December 24, 1968, regarding the denial of his boundary amendment. (See copy of letter on file.) There were only six Commissioners present at the action meeting, and the petitioner was advised to request a deferment until more Commissioners are present. Frances Suelto representing Mr. Brun at the action meeting on December 20, 1968, Lihue, Kauai, urged the Commission to reach a decision immediately. Consequently, action was taken and subject petition was denied by a 5 to 1 vote; and, Mr. Brun was so notified. Upon receipt of Mr. Brun's letter, staff forwarded a copy to the Attorney General's office. Subsequently, on January 9, 1969, Mr. Jack Morse, Deputy Attorney General, submitted a legal opinion on the reconsideration of the Commission's action. (Copy of legal opinion was sent to each Commissioner.) In essence, the Deputy Attorney General advised that the Commission could reconsider the request if it felt there was sufficient evidence to warrant a reconsideration. Therefore, the Commission could vote to reconsider this request, then, vote on the reconsideration issue.

In reply to Commissioner Kido's inquiry as to whether or not the reconsideration would be within the time limitation, Mr. Duran responded in the affirmative that the expiration date for action on subject petition was January 16, 1969. Moreover, the Deputy Attorney General recommended "that the Commission adopt comprehensive procedural rules" so that similar incidents do not recur in the future.

Chairman Choi explained that Mr. Duran advised petitioner it was not imperative for him to be present at the action meeting. However, petitioner could have been notified to safeguard himself.

The Commission has previously been confronted with similar situations, and rehearings have always been denied if petitioner did not submit protest within 24 hours of the Commission's decision--Mr. Brun did not submit protest within a 24-hour period.

January 10, 1969

Mr. Morse reported that under the statute, Chapter 98H, the Commission has the power to keep its procedural rules very flexible. Furthermore, the Commission has not adopted any parliamentary procedure such as "Robert's Rules of Order" or "Cushing's Manual of Parliamentary Practice" as an established guideline. Therefore, the Commission is not bound to these or any other rules of practice and procedure. The Commission has the preogative to add clauses to its Rules and Regulations if it deems that such statements are desirable and necessary.

Concerning the 24-hour period, Chairman Choi recollected that at a meeting held in Kona, it was determined that if the 24-hour period to protest the Commission's decision fell within the specified time limit not exceeding 90 days, the Commission could reconsider the petition.

Mr. Hyman Greenstein, attorney representing the petitioner, submitted that at certain times the Commission may suspend its Rules and Regulations. To this effect, Mr. Morse quoted Part I, Rules of Practice and Procedure, Sub-Part B, Proceeding before the Commission, 1.6 General: "Also, any rule in Part I, Rules of Practice and Procedure, may be suspended or waived by the Commission or the presiding officer to prevent undue hardship in any particular instance."

In response to Commissioner Mark's inquiry, Mr. Morse replied that no Commissioner should vote on the substitute matter, i.e., the reconsideration of a petition, unless he has had the opportunity to review the facts, staff report, etc., in the event he was not in attendance at the public hearing or action meeting.

Mr. Morse clarified the situation by stating that if a reconsideration vote is taken, the petition will stand as if no vote had been taken. On the other hand, if the Commission denies reconsideration of this petition, the December 20th action stands as is. In the past, in compliance with petitioner's request, action has been extended beyond the 90-day period primarily in the absence of a full Commission.

It was brought up by Chairman Choi that Mr. Brun has not specifically stated he will discontinue the operation of his slaughterhouse as this matter would determine his vote in the reconsideration issue. Mr. Greenstein retorted that Mr. Brun will raze his slaughterhouse at such time as he begins actual construction on his property for a proposed subdivision.

January 10, 1969

Mr. Duran then proceeded to read Mr. Brun's correspondence wherein he stated: "I will terminate the operation of the slaughterhouse as soon as construction is begun near it so as to make its operation objectionable. I would like to continue its operation for the time being." (See copy of letter on file.)

Commissioner Nishimura moved that the Commission reconsider its previous action on Mr. Brun's petition, seconded by Commissioner Wung.

Motion to reconsider was defeated by the following votes:

Ayes: Commissioners - Wung, Nishimura, and Kido.

Nays: Commissioners - Inaba, Napier, Mark, and Chairman Choi.

CONSULTANTS' REPORT - ECKBO, DEAN, AUSTIN AND WILLIAMS

Mr. Edward Williams submitted a "Progress Report to Land Use Commission on Boundary Review Program" to the Commission. (See copy on file.) Answers to the questionnaires have been compiled by computer and were distributed to Commissioners. Mr. Williams asked Commissioners to look over the findings and present any questions and comments at the January 17th meeting. By mid-February consultants propose to have the final summary and analysis.

Meetings have been arranged with the County Planning Commissions and interested legislators to keep them abreast of consultants' plans, proposals, etc., and also to receive any comments and recommendations from aforementioned bodies. In addition, consultants are continuing to meet with land-owners and anyone concerned or interested in the boundary review project.

Mr. Myron Thompson, Administrative Assistant to the Governor, commented that the development of some lands located in the Conservation District for a multiple-concept use should be urged. Therefore, how can the State encourage companies to become interested in investing in such lands? Mr. Williams answered that the Public Development Corporations Plan has been utilized in some states. In regard to the California State General Plan, it was suggested that a method for augmenting the economy in the Redwood area where lumbering