STATE OF HAWAII LAND USE COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting

Kahului Library Kahului, Maui

August 9, 1978 - 9:30 a.m.

approved 9/27/18

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Charles Duke, Chairman

Shinichi Nakagawa, Vice-Chairman

James Carras Colette Machado Shinsei Miyasato

Mitsuo Oura George Pascua Carol Whitesell Edward Yanai

STAFF PRESENT

PUBLIC WITNESSES

Gordan Furutani, Executive Officer

Daniel Yasui, Planner

Allan Kawada, Deputy Attorney General

Dora Horikawa, Chief Clerk

Ray Russell, Court Reporter

CONTINUATION OF HEARING

A78-437 - ROLPH B. FUHRMAN AND ULUPALAKUA RANCH, INC.

Chairman Duke called the meeting to order and requested the Executive Officer to identify the lands under petition on the maps.

	ges	
William Maschal, President, Kihei Community Association (Represented by Mr. Jim Wagner)		
Read letter prepared by Mr. Maschal180	to	182
Examination by Commissioner Whitesell and Vice Chairman Nakagawa183	to	184
<u>John Bose</u> - Representing Sierra Club, Maui Group		
Oral testimony185	to	189

Cross examination by Mr. McCarthy-----189 to 190

John Bose (cont.)

Mr. Takeyama offered into evidence, additional exhibit marked "Q" delineating the 3,494 square feet cemetery site which petitioner was proposing to delete from the petition. Since there were no objections from the parties, Exhibit "Q" was admitted into evidence.

Cross examination by Mr. McCarthy-----210 to 213

Edward Y. Chang

Oral testimony-----215 to 218
Examination by Commssioner Yanai----218 to 219

During her presentation, Mrs. Chang had produced a single page of an application to the Land Court by Ulupalakua Ranch which included, among other things, the granting of public beach access, deletion of the "cemetery area", etc.

For the record, it was noted by Mr. Takeyama that the document alluded to by Mrs. Chang was a stipulation which was not executed.

Mr. Allan Kawada, Deputy Attorney General, advised that the records reflect that the subject stipulation was an unsigned document.

Mr. McCarthy made a motion to dismiss the disputed property from the petition based on Rule 6-1 (4) and 6-2 (1) (e) of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, since petitioner had failed to demonstrate that he has standing to request amendment for that particular piece of property.

In response to clarification by the Chairman, Mr. Furutani advised that it was standard procedure for staff to investigate the property ownership with the State Tax Office.

Mr. Takeyama submitted that petitioner relied primarily on the fact that the ownership was recorded with the Bureau of Conveyances.

Vice Chairman Nakagawa moved to go into executive session to consult with counsel on this matter. It was seconded by Commissioner Carras and unanimously passed.

The Commission was in executive session from 10:48 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

11:00 a.m.

Chairman Duke announced that the Commission had received counsel regarding the legality of the motion made by Life of the Land.

Vice Chairman Nakagawa moved to deny the motion made by Life of the Land to dismiss the disputed property from the petition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carras and unanimously carried.

Mr. Kawada elaborated that in verifying ownership of the property, staff had relied on the records at the Tax Office, which records must be taken as being true and correct since they are public records.

Mr. McCarthy stated that he intended to renew his motion at such time when the Changs submit a duly executed document to the Commission.

PETITIONER (cont.)

Rolph B. Fuhrman - Petitioner

Direct examination by Mr. Takeyama227 to	238
Cross examination by Mr. Kato238 to	247
Cross examination by Mr. McCarthy247 to	256
Redirect examination by Mr. Takeyama256 to	257
Cross examination by Mr. Yempuku257 to	258
Examination by Commissioner Carras258 to	261
Examination by Commissioner Machado261 to	266

Rolph B. Fuhrman (cont.)				
*** The state of t				
Examination by Commissioner Whitesell266 to 268				
Examination by Vice Chairman Nakagawa268 to 269				
Reexamination by Commissioner Machado269 to 270				
Recross examination by Mr. Yempuku270 to 272				
The meeting was recessed for lunch from 12:30 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.				
1:15 p.m.				
PETITIONER (cont.)				
Howard Nakamura - Planner				
Direct examination by Mr. Takeyama273 to 282				
Cross examination by Mr. Kato282 to 287				
Cross examination by Mr. McCarthy288 to 298				
Douglas R. Sodetani - Realtor				
Direct examination by Mr. Takeyama303 to 306				
Cross examination by Mr. McCarthy306 to 309				
Leslie Kuloloio - Employee of Maui News				
Direct examination by Mr. Takeyama310 to 313				
Cross examination by Mr. Kato313 to 315				
Cross examination by Mr. McCarthy315 to 316				
COUNTY OF MAUI				
At Mr. Yempuku's request, an addendum to County's Exhibit 1 was moved into evidence. The reading of the County's prepared testimony was also waived.				
Toshi Ishikawa - Planning Director, Maui Planning Department				

Cross examination by Mr. Kato-----319 to 321

Cross examination by Mr. McCarthy-----322 to 325

Toshi Ishikawa (cont.)

Examination by Commissioner Whitesell325	to	329
Examination by Chairman Duke329	to	330
Reexamination by Commissioner Whitesell330	to	331
Recross examination by Mr. Kato331	to	332

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Tatsuo Fujimoto - Head, Land Use Division

Oral Testimony334	to	338
Cross examination by Mr. Takeyama338	to	340
Examination by Commissioner Yanai340	to	341
Examination by Commissioner Whitesell341	to	342

LIFE OF THE LAND

Exhibits

The exhibits attached to Life of the Land's motion were admitted into the record.

David McMullen

Oral testimony----- 344 to 345

Mr. Takeyama advised that he will submit evidence showing the actual ownership of the property as registered with the Bureau of Conveyances to be made a part of the reocrd. No objections were raised by any of the party to the admission of this document to the record.

CLOSING ARGUMENTS

Both the petitioner and the County of Maui elected to waive their closing arguments.

Mr. Kato emphasized that those concerns which had been addressed in DPED's testimony be adequately considered and provided for, should the Commission rule in favor of the petition.

Mr. McCarthy reiterated that even if an EIS in not filed, the Commission's Rules require that the environmental assessment be considered. It was his opinion that none of the

petitioner's witnesses seemed to be qualified to provide information regarding the environmental factors surrounding the shoreline. Mr. McCarthy also argued that petitioner had not made any allowances for tsunami inundation. He recommended that the Commission ask the petitioner to provide this information.

Chairman Duke instructed all parties to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, making appropriate reference to the page and line number of the transcript, when applicable. It was also requested that proper identification of the exhibits be made in the proposed findings. All parties were given 30 days following the completion of the transcript to submit the proposed findings, and two weeks in which to comment on each other's proposed findings.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.