1	LAND USE COMMISSION STATE OF HAWAI'I
2	
3	Hearing held on November 5, 2020 Commencing at 9:00 a.m.
4	Held via ZOOM by Interactive Conference Technology
5	
6	VII. Call to Order
7	VIII. Action A99-729 Newton Family Limited Partnership (aka
8	Hawaiian Islands Land Trust) Consider Petitioner Hawaiian Islands Land
9	Trust's Motion for Order Amending the Findings Of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and
10	Order dated November 16, 2001
11	IX. Adjournment
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	BEFORE: Jean Marie McManus, CSR #156
23	
24	
25	

18 RON KIM, ESQ. For Hawaiian Islands Land Trust 19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

APPEARANCES:

STAFF:

GARY OKUDA (Oahu) LEE OHIGASHI (Maui)

ARNOLD WONG (Oahu) DAWN CHANG (Oahu)

DAN GIOVANNI (Kauai)

WILLIAM WYNHOFF, ESQ.

MELISSA GOLDMAN, ESQ.

DAWN T. APUNA, ESQ.

State of Hawaii

County of Maui

Deputy Attorney General

LAUREN CHUN, ESQ.

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I'd like to call the meeting to order, call the hearing to order.

Good morning. This is the November 5th,
2020, Land Use Commission meeting, and it is being
held using interactive conference technology linking
videoconference participants and other interested
individuals of the public via the ZOOM internet
conferencing program. This is being done to comply
with the State and County official operational
directives during the COVID-19 pandemic. Members of
the public are viewing the meeting via the ZOOM
webinar platform.

For all meeting participants, I would like to stress to everyone the importance of speaking slowly, clearly and directly into your microphone and that before you speak, that you please state your name and identify yourself for the record.

Also please be aware that all meeting participants are being recorded on the digital record of this ZOOM meeting. Your continued participation is your implied consent to be part of the public record of this event. If you do not wish to be part of the public record, please exit this meeting now.

This ZOOM conferencing technology allows the parties and each participating Commissioner

individual remote access to the meeting proceedings via their personal digital devices.

2.1

entirely outside of our control, occasional disruptions to connectivity may occur for one or more members of the meeting at any given time. If such disruptions occur please let us know, and be patient as we try to restore the audiovisual signals to effectively conduct business during the pandemic.

My name is Nancy Cabral, and I currently serve as LUC Vice Chair. With us today are Commissioners Aczon, Chang, Okuda and Wong on Oahu, along with LUC Executives Officer Daniel Orodenker, LUC Chief Planner, Scott Derrickson, Chief Clerk Riley Hakoda, the LUC Deputy Attorney Generals Lauren Chun and Bill Wynhoff and the Court Reporter, Jean McManus. They are on O'ahu. Commissioner Ohigashi is currently the eighth seated Commissioner of a possible nine and he is on Maui.

Oh, I'm sorry, Ohigashi is on Maui,

Commissioner Giovanni is on the Island of Kauai, and
I'm Nancy Cabral on the Big Island.

There are currently eight seated

Commissioners of a possible nine. Chair Scheuer has recused himself from the hearing on this matter.

Our next agenda item is an action meeting on Docket No. A99-729, also known as Hawaiian Islands Land Trust to consider the Petitioner Hawaiian Islands Land Trust Motion for Order Amending the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated November 16, 2020

Will the parties for Docket No. A99-729 please identify themselves for the record. You may need to enable your audio at this time. Please identify yourself.

MR. KIM: Good morning, Acting Chair, this is Ron Kim. I'm representing Hawaiian Islands Land Trust, and with me from the Trust is also Laura Kaakua. Not with me in person, but with me on the ZOOM call.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you.

Let me review things.

On June 25th, 2020, the Land Use Commission received status report on Docket No. A99-729.

From September 17, 2020, until yesterday,

November 4th, 2020, the Commission received the

Hawaiian Islands Land Trust Motion for Amending the

Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and

Order dated November 16, 2001.

The Office of Planning's Request for a Time

- 1 Extension to Respond to Petitioner's Motion.
- OP and County of Hawaii's Response to
- 3 | HILT's Motion.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 4 HILT's Notice of Appearance of Co-Counsel and HILT's Amended Motion.
- 6 County of Hawaii's Response to Hawaiian
 7 Islands Land Trust's Amended Motion.
 - We received the County of Hawaii's response to the Hawaiian Islands Land Trust's Amended Motion for filing with the LUC.
 - And we received the County of Hawaii's Errata to Certificate of Service to the County of Hawaii's Response to HILT's Amended Motion.
 - On October 28, 2020, the Commission held the November 4 and 5, 2020 agenda of notice of meeting out to the statewide, Maui regular and Big Island regular and email, mailing lists.
 - I'm unaware of any late filings at this time. If so, I would need to know from staff if there are any additional late filings.
 - None received.
- Let me briefly run over our hearing
 procedure for the day.
- First, I will recognize the written public testimony that has been submitted in this matter,

identifying the person or organization who has submitted the testimony.

Second, we will call for those individuals who have preregistered to provide public testimony for this docket. All such individuals will be called in turn by the Co-Chair. The Chief Clerk will then enable their audio and visual to our virtual witness box where they will then be sworn in. These individuals will have three minutes to provide their testimony and should standby after their testimony to respond to any questions by the parties or the Commissioners may have. When all questions have been completed, the Chair will then excuse that witness and they will be put back into the viewing audience and we will call for the next witness to enter the virtual witness box.

After all registered testifiers complete their testimonies, I will call for those individuals in the general audience who wish to provide public testimony for this docket to identify themselves by using the "raised-hand" technique in the webinar function of their device screens. The Chair will recognize all such individuals and will call on them in turn to our virtual witness box where they will be sworn in. These individuals will also have three

minutes to provide their testimony and they should standby after their testimony to respond to any questions the parties or Commissioners may have.

When all questions have been completed, the Chair will excuse that witness and they will return to the audience. The Chair will then call for the next witness to enter the virtual witness box until all witnesses have been heard.

Fourth, after completion of public testimony portion of this proceedings, I will give an opportunity for the parties to admit any additional documents into the record.

After the admission of additional documents to the record, the Petitioner will present its case.

Once the petitioner is completed with its presentation, it will be followed in turn by the County of Hawaii, the State Office of Planning.

The Chair would also note that the parties and public from time to time that I will be calling for short breaks. Are there any questions on our procedures for today?

I will now recognize the written public testimony submitted in this matter.

Mr. Orodenker, do we have any written testimony?

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Madam Chair, 2 we do not. 3 COMMISSIONER WONG: Excuse me, Chair. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, Commissioner 4 5 Wonq. 6 COMMISSIONER WONG: Commissioner Okuda is 7 raising his hand for something. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I'm sorry, 8 Commissioner Okuda. 9 10 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Ms. Chair. 11 Even though the County of Hawaii and Office of Planning orally said they were participating when 12 13 there was a call out just to do mic check, is it okay 14 if they do a formal appearance so the record shows 15 that they're present also? I'm not sure if they made 16 a formal appearance. Thank you. 17 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Can we ask at this 18 time for the County of Hawaii to become visual, I 19 guess this would be by becoming visual in our screen, 20 because right now we're showing April Suprenant, we 21 see her code, but we don't have her picture or 22 attendance with us. 23 Can you become an attendant person or show 24 who is attending on behalf of the County of Hawaii?

CHIEF CLERK: Chair, this is Riley. She is

25

1 in the lower right-hand corner. 2 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I'm seeing her name 3 but I don't see any -- there we go. Now we have a 4 picture and a person. April, is that you, and who else might be with you? 5 6 If you can unmute or is it Diana 7 Mellon-Lacey? 8 MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diana 9 Mellon-Lacey, County of Hawaii Corporation Counsel, 10 appearing with April Suprenant from the Planning 11 Department. 12 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much, 13 our Commissioners ask that you show your appearance 14 during this hearing. 15 Commissioner Okuda, is that satisfactory? 16 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Perhaps if the Office 17 of Planning can also make their appearance. Thank 18 you. 19 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I do see Dawn, 20 appearance from Office of Planning. 21 MS. APUNA: Good morning, Dawn Apuna on

is with me too.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. I

apologize for not calling for your acknowledgment

behalf of State Office of Planning. Rodney Funakoshi

22

23

24

25

1 sooner.

So onward. We have -- no public testimony has been submitted in this case, that we are aware of.

Thank you very much, all of you for that matter.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair?

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Yes

COMMISSIONER WONG: Do you want to ask any participants in the waiting room if they want to do any testimony?

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, that's correct. Do we have anyone else present from the public who might be in the waiting room that we are not visually seeing from the screen? Is there anybody else who might want to identify yourself, and our staff will bring you into our visual screen if you would like to make any comments or testimony in this matter?

 $\label{eq:executive officer: Madam Chair, we don't have anyone. \\$

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Good. We paused for that long enough, we'll move on.

Mr. Ron Kim, we will ask him to go ahead and see if he has any further documentation. At this

point in time I don't know when I should have said 1 2 this, I do know Mr. Kim. I first met him as a member 3 of the Land Use Commission over the years but I 4 understand he has recently gone into private practice 5 and he has a wonderful landlord, me. So he is now a 6 partner with another attorney who is a tenant of 7 mine, so Mr. Kim is now my tenant. I can assure you it will not influence my 8 9 vote in any way, shape or form. Anyone have any 10 objection or concern on that matter? I should ask 11 each party. 12 Mr. Kim, do you have any concern in that 13 matter as Petitioner 14 MR. KIM: No, Chair. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Office of Planning, 15 16 do you have any concern? 17 MS. APUNA: No concern, no objection. 18 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: And County of Hawaii, 19 do you have any concern or objection in that manner? 20 MS. MELLON-LACEY: No concerns.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much. Then, Mr. Kim, do you have any further documents which you would wish to have admitted to the record at this time?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KIM: No, thank you, Chair, we didn't

1 have further documents.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Okay. And then, Ms. Mellon-Lacey, do you have any further documents you wish to submit at this time?

MS. MELLON-LACEY: No, we have none.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Ms. Apuna, do you have any further documents from Office of Planning you would like to submit?

MS. APUNA: No, Chair, no further documents.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Mr. Kim, would you please make your presentation at this time?

MR. KIM: Well, first of all, thanks to all of the Commissioners for taking time to be here and wrangle with the technical difficulties. And, of course, our thanks to the staff too for bringing this all together.

So actually as far as this project goes, it sounds like a great project to me, definitely support it. And I was actually going to turn it over to Laura Kaakua to briefly present on the project, just to give you an overview of HILT and what it does and also what it's plans are for the Petition Area, and let you know what the plans are, let you know why we're asking for the changed condition that we are.

1 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Ms. Kaakua, before 2 you testify, may I swear you in? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: You're microphone, 4 5 you're not easy to hear for me. If you can double 6 check your --7 THE WITNESS: Okay. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Much better. 8 9 Can you raise your right hand, please? 10 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 11 that you are about to give is the truth? 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. 13 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. Go ahead 14 and proceed. 15 LAURA KAAKKUA 16 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 17 Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 18 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 20 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Acting Chair. 21 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I apologize, Ms. 22 Kaakua, your microphone again. But also I would ask 23 for your full name and your address for the record 24 before you proceed with your testimony. 25 THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you hear me all

1 right?

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, I'm hearing other people speaking in the background. This is the Court Reporter.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Jean.

I will even silence myself during this time so I'm not part of that.

Okay, Ms. Kaakua, go ahead and proceed and we will just all be careful to not have background noise. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Sorry about that, and please do interrupt me if you hear background noise again, still at home, working from home. It's a full house here.

My full name is Laura Kaakua and I am the CEO of Hawaiian Islands Land Trust, and in our presentation today, if I'm able to share screen, I do have a short PowerPoint. Would that be allowable?

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, please go ahead and proceed to share your screen.

THE WITNESS: Please interrupt me at any time if you can't hear me okay. So this is just a short PowerPoint presentation to give a little background on Hawaiian Islands Land Trust, our mission to protect and steward the land of the State

of Hawaii. We are a 501(C)(3) Hawai'i non-profit that works on all islands.

We have a mission to protect and steward the land that sustains Hawaii. We have seven preserves that we own and care for in partnership with the communities in which they sit. We hold 44 conservation easements which are legal restrictions on privately held lands. We have facilitated five transactions, including one adjacent to this Kukuau forest preserve that we'll be talking about today. And in total we protected over 21,000 acres.

In a nutshell what we do is we protect land, we steward lands of great importance, and most importantly we be connect people to those lands.

Our vision is Hawaii's land thrive and nourish its people; and our mission is seen in our daily work to protect and steward the lands that sustain Hawaii.

In terms of our land protection work, our priorities are coastlines, Hawaiian cultural landscapes and lands that grow healthy food for Hawaii's people. The Kukuau forest falls into the category of wahi kupuna, and in the research that we have done about Kukuau, it was a place used by Kamehameha for gathering of koa, specifically for

wa'a or canoes.

This is our stewardship goals for the next five years so there are many that, but I don't expect you to read them all, but I did highlight a few that pertain to this Kukuau forest property here.

We have big goals about fencing portions of the property to prevent the spread, especially of strawberry guava and invasive grass and clydemia which grow at alarming rates in really -- in places such as Kukuau. We do hope also to be working with the surrounding Hilo community to establish a Hilo program, which is basically Hawaiian science of observation, and something that kids from preschoolers to adults can really help us do in terms of just observing the flora and fauna on the Kukuau property in the different seasons throughout the year and observing how our stewardship actions impact the native species and invasive species.

We do hope within these five years to be able to restore to a primarily native habitat, ideally it would be 100 percent native, four acres at Kukuau forest, and we also expect to create a resiliency plan for a forest stewardship plan focused on resilience of the lands and community within that time.

One of our other needs is this last bullet here, which is to make sure that we have on-site stewardship and education staff in place at all of our preserves including Kukuau.

And just in terms of our stewardship work, there's really three things we focus on. The best way to care for a place is to make sure that there's a community in that place that really is a big part of the stewardship work. And so a lot of our work when we first protect the place is focused on sustaining and strengthening relationships with neighbors, area schools, church groups, civic clubs.

And then we look at engaging our scientist and resilience planning for that specific place, and continuing, or starting the ongoing ecological restoration work. And our goal, and really our specialty is restoration to native habitat or native species.

The third part of our work is in connecting people to the land, and these are the goals that we're looking at for the next five years. We've been able to really engage a number of schools around the places that we own and care for, and have also opened them up to the public.

And so every year at our preserves we do

have thousands of people actually that come through in total for Kukuau in particular. We expect to start small and maybe work with a few schools to engage that Hilo community in particular.

And the connection work in terms of community volunteering, student education, making sure that kids understand where they are, the names of the places, the species that surround them, and have a real identity connected to the place that they're in.

And then our third part of our work to connect people to land is to support Hawaiian cultural practitioners to be able to not only help care for the land, but also utilize the natural resources found on the land to sustain their particular cultural practices.

And that brings us here to Kukuau forest.

And so Kukuau forest is in the foreground, and you can see how close it is to Hilo Town. And so that is really one of the -- proximity to people and community is one of the things that has us very excited about this Kukuau forest property. We are very focused on that connection part. And so when we think about stewarding the land, we imagine that it is very much a community effort.

On this image here (indicating), we see the separation between the Agricultural designation on the makai end of the Kukuau forest property, and the Conservation designation on the mauka end of the property.

This image here shows that on the makai end there is a mix of ohia koa with quite a lot of ohia being the dominant native tree species. And in the mauka region there is a mix of Hawaiian ohia with koa being the dominant native tree species.

The concerning about this map is the non-native forest, and so this map was done a few years back, you know, at the rapid rate with which strawberry guava spreads that these pink areas now would have expanded more than it shows here.

And so we also notice that there is strawberry guava that has already crept in from the most mauka side of the property, and so this is really our greatest concern is that we have a non-pristine native forest. And with the intensity of the invasive species, especially strawberry guava, over time inevitably without active management, the property will all succumb to strawberry guava and Clydemia and non-native grasses.

And so in taking on the property management

planning, we know that if we are to retain the property and keep it as a forest, with a strong focus on education and community connection, we need to actively manage the forest, eventually set certain areas and clearing basis and replant natives.

And as a non-profit organization, our struggle is really that we understand the right steps to manage the forest, but we are limited on funds to actually execute those plans.

And so our proposal and request would be that the continuation of the Agricultural designation in the makai section of the property to allow us to actively manage the forest, including selective harvesting of koa trees which would then allow us to --

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Laura, someone else is talking in the background on another screen.

THE WITNESS: So that selective harvest of koa trees would allow us to have staff on hand to have that regular presence and welcome in school groups. It would also allow us to actually afford the pretty intensive invasive species clearing and management and fencing.

And we see keeping the property in native forest is a real benefit, not only just to the

ecological systems and native birds and bat and insect species in the area, but also as a really big sponge. We know that native forests are incredibly effective in absorbing water and also in absorbing carbon from the atmosphere.

This is a very high rainfall area. And so as an alternative to development, we think that just for Hilo's water management, that this is a really critical property to keep in forest.

And so it might be the end of my presentation, and welcome any questions that you may have.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much.

Mr. Kim, do you have any other part of your

presentation you would like to make at this time?

MR. KIM: No, I think that was a very good

job of giving an overview of what the plans are for the property.

The only thing I would want to point out is, you know, we're asking now for the conditions that were imposed about 20 years ago to be changed, because the current lands have changed pretty significantly compared to what was initially proposed to this Commission.

Initially, looking at doing an eight lot

```
semi-agricultural type subdivision, and at this
1
2
     point, you know, HILT has no plans to subdivide the
 3
     property. And it's going to do very minimal types of
 4
      improvement, such as fencing and possibly the types
 5
     of structures we had discussed in our moving papers
 6
     but, of course, the structures would have to be
7
     either allowed under HRS 205 or permitted.
                ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Anything else, Mr.
8
9
     Kim, at this tine?
10
                MR. KIM: No, thank you, Chair.
                ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much.
11
      Then let's go ahead to any questions of the
12
13
     Petitioner or the witness.
14
                County of Hawaii, do you have any questions
     of the Petitioner at this time?
15
16
                Ms. Mellon-Lacey, if are you there, can you
17
     unmute or come forward if you have any questions or
18
     not?
19
                MS. MELLON-LACEY: Can you hear me?
20
                No, we have no questions, thank you.
21
                ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Office of Planning,
22
     do you have any questions at this time?
23
                MS. APUNA: Yes, Chair, I do. Thank you.
24
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
25
     BY MS. APUNA:
```

Q Thank you, Ms. Kaakua, for your testimony.

I just have a few questions.

So will HILT, will they create a conservation easement or any other additional restrictions on the property to ensure the certain uses of the property?

We've actually started that conversation with DLNR as to whether we could work with them to do some sort of forest legacy, conservation easement. I think what the forestry staff has shared is that they might be willing to do that, but they're working on a lot of just great projects that are really at risk right now. And so because HILT owns the property, they're kind of falling down on the priority list, because there's no immediate threat.

And so we would like to do a conservation easement, but, you know, in that conservation easement scenario the holder of the conservation easement has to be a different entity of the landowner. They kind of act as big brother to make sure that their property is used as intended.

And so we're hoping that when we work through the forest stewardship plan with DLNR, that that might kind of reopen the door to a possible conservation easement with the State.

1 MS. APUNA: Thank you.

And then did HILT consider reverting the land to Conservation? And you're shaking your head "yes".

And why did you decide not to revert the land to Conservation? I think --

THE WITNESS: Yeah, so my first thought was to revert it to Conservation because the plan and practices that we envision are conservation practices, and we removing invasive specious, but actually to actively manage the forest and pretty aggressively remove invasive species and to finance the conservation operations with selective harvesting.

It would be really difficult to do that if it was in the Conservation District. And so it surprised me, actually, in looking into the different restrictions on the -- between the two land use districts, but the Agricultural District actually makes conservation more feasible for us.

Q And did you consult with DLNR as far as what would be a more appropriate land use classification?

A Yeah. When I originally asked if we could work with DLNR on a forest legacy application, I did

have the chance to share our plans, and I think they're pretty understanding about our need to really actively manage the forest, and that it needs to be in Agriculture to really let us get started in carrying for the forest.

But we are really looking forward to working with DLNR and the forest division plan, and that is quite a process. It's a set of requirements that we will have to meet, and will actually have to get approval on that forest stewardship plan.

And one of the great things about the forest stewardship plan is we know that we are hitting a certain standard of forest management, and then it also opens the door for us in terms of matching funding programs.

So if we can raise half of the funds for a fence, for example, then it kind of opens the doors to these different conservation programs that would possibly match things like fencing or tools and equipment.

MS. APUNA: Thank you.

And then -- and so will HILT continue to be the landowner indefinitely? Or do you think that at some point there will be a transfer of the land to a different property owner?

A I can share that when we were first donated the property, actually the property just mauka of this Kukuau forest property is property that many years ago before I was with HILT, HILT's predecessor actually helped to purchase that property and then make sure that it was conveyed to the State. And so the mauka property is now part of the State Forest Reserve System.

And so when we were first donated the property, I had reached out to DLNR just to talk about all these different options: Can we do conservation easement? Is the State actually interested in owning the property? And really just thinking and talking through what would be best for the land in terms of capacity.

And so I think at this time the answer that I have is the State has pretty similar funding to what they had many years ago with now a lot more land, and so I don't think they're too interested in taking on ownership and management responsibility for the property, but do want to work with us on the forest stewardship plan.

So that's I think a long answer to say if we can get approval to retain the Agricultural designation and actively manage the forest, we would

imagine ourselves as the perpetual owner. And I think we are -- the question that we just keep coming back to is what is best for the land and the surrounding community.

And so if we got to a point where for some reason the State was really interested in taking over management, I think we would always be open to that as well.

Q Thank you. Just one last question.

As far as the selective koa harvesting, so that would be perpetual too as long as there's a need for funding the different activities that are required of the forest management project; is that correct?

A Yeah. I guess I don't know that it would

-- I guess it could be perpetual, the projection of

really the end goal is that we can restore the entire

property to a fully native forest.

And so I'm not sure what the -- kind of what the battle will be like, like 200 years from now, or whatnot, in terms of if we've conquered clydemia, strawberry guava, or if there really is just that constant pressure, and a lot of it would have to do on what's happening on the surrounding lands.

So if we have a lot of pressure from the adjacent lands, then I think we would still be actively managing and would probably need to continue regular harvesting to pay for that.

But if the surrounding lands are in native forest too, or without invasive species, then we can back off on the harvesting and just maintain.

I guess we'll just have to be flexible.

And I imagine that our forest stewardship plan would account for that flexibility.

Q So then hypothetically if the forest comes back to a more pristine condition and you don't have to necessarily do harvesting, do you think HILT would consider reclassifying it to Conservation if that would provide some benefit, and you wouldn't necessarily need the Ag District that allows you to harvest? It's just a hypothetical.

A I think if there was no need, or if the Ag designation to actually manage the conservation, then I would look at Conservation District.

Q Thank you, Ms. Kaakua.

No further questions, Chair.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Ms. Apuna and Office of Planning.

Commissioners, do you have any questions of

- 1 Mr. Kim or Ms. Kaakua at this time? Mr. Okuda.
- COMMISSION1ER OKUDA: Thank you very much,
- 3 Ms. Chair.
- 4 Ms. Kaakua, you are also a licensed
- 5 | attorney; is that correct?
- 6 THE WITNESS: That is correct, but I'm
- 7 inactive.
- 8 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: But do you have a law
- 9 background, because you seem very knowledgeable about
- 10 things that we lawyers might view as esoteric kind of
- 11 | theoretical kind of things?
- 12 Let me just ask you a non-legal question,
- 13 and just to confirm or given put with respect to
- 14 | harvesting of koa, I once had a forestry client. Is
- 15 | it true that sometimes harvesting koa actually helps
- 16 | with the rejuvenation of the koa native forest,
- meaning that when you harvest a koa tree, just by
- 18 | physical interaction, it causes seeds to fall, allows
- 19 the seeds to grow, and as long as you protect, for
- 20 example, the growing seedlings from pigs or other
- 21 invasive species, taking out one koa tree might
- 22 | actually help contribute to the restoration of the
- 23 forest.
- Is that a semi accurate statement by me?
- THE WITNESS: Yeah, yes, that is accurate.

The koa tree is known as kind of a native weed tree.

It grows like a weed, given the right environment to do so. And so I have seen in many cases where there's been harvesting of koa or clearing around remaining koa trees, that there are koa that sprout up.

We've also seen where strawberry guava have been cleared within a forest that has koa. Koa will voluntarily grow in their place as long as that strawberry guava is kept low enough to give sunlight to the koa seeds.

And so it's our hope that in a forest that has been historically in native trees, that the seed bed is still there, and that in clearing certain areas, that will be removing an invasive species that will get the benefit of volunteer koa seeds that are just underground and have been just shaded out by that really thick strawberry guava canopy so that they couldn't grow.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So in other words, sometimes and in an appropriate situation, active forestry or active managed forestry can actually push forward conservation types goals in restoring a native forest such as a native koa forest; is that correct?

potential drawbacks, just to be totally up front, in that when you -- if you have to clear uluhe. Uluhe is a really thick native fern, also acts as a weed mat, because it's so incredibly thick that it keeps pigs out, and it also prevents spread of invasive species.

So the downside of clearing is that you have to be really careful not to get rid of too much of that uluhe mat, because if that uluhe mat is taken away, it's kind of a gamble as to whether koa will naturally volunteer themselves in that cleared space or whether invasive species will creep in, so it's a constant management balance.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And if I can ask a question about management balance and management activity.

Is it true or not true that if the property -- or if a property is designated in the Conservation zone, it frankly leads to a lot more permitting, and for back lack of a better term, red tape that even if an entity like yourself has the best of intentions, you have to jump through a lot more permitting hoops, do a lot more things with the Department of Land and Natural Resources to

accomplish a goal which you could do a lot more simply and at a lower cost if the property was designated Agriculture. Is that a fair statement?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's a fair statement.

It's actually our hope to actively manage the mauka side of the property that is in Conservation designation right now.

And so we do expect a lot of cost to go through the appropriate channels, which we understand why they're there, and as an environmental organization, actually support them being there, but we would not be able -- we just don't have the funds to actually do a full archaeological inventory study and do an entire environmental study. That would be prohibitive for us to get started in managing the forest.

But in the future, we may decide that we have -- that we're ready to go through the right legal protocols to get the appropriate permits to start managing in the Conservation District later down the road.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So in other words, it's possible that income or money generated from activities in the Agricultural zone, which might also promote restoration of a native forest, one of the

benefits of that would also be providing funds which you could use for purposes in the Conservation zone which might not be as income generating.

Is that a fair statement?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

2.1

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I had heard somewhere in some previous hearing that the Hawaii Islands Land Trust is an accredited land trust.

Can you explain to us on the Commission, number one, who you are accredited by, if your accredited? And what does the accreditation mean?

A Yes, we're accredited by a land trust which is a special kind of non-profit that koa plans really entrusts for people and the environment. And so we're part of the National Lands Trust Community, and there is this Land Trust Alliance that brings all of these land trusts from everywhere together, and tries to share and instill best practices.

And some land trusts are accredited, which is a really lengthy and intensive process. We were just reaccredited this past year, which is the second time that we've been reaccredited, but there is an entire manual of standards and practices that we must follow in order to be accredited.

And it's a five-year -- we have to go

through accreditation every five years, and it's basically an audit at land trust standards.

So they're looking at when we purchase a property or accept a donation of a property, have we done all of our paperwork correctly.

And then what are our stewardship practices. And then what are our practices in community relationships even, so it's really best practices across-the-board.

And I really appreciate, even though it's a lot of work to go through accreditation, I really appreciate it, because I think it's kind of a risk management tool for us to know that we're hitting a certain standard and don't have large unforeseen gaps in our non-profit structure.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And I don't mean to belabor some of these points.

Just so that we have a full record, the

Chair Jonathan Scheuer has recused himself because of

his relationship with the Hawaiian Islands Land

Trust. So just so that -- and I'm only being

facetious and joking by saying so -- that his

relationship with you is not held against your

Petition.

You have a board of directors, is that

correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we do. We have a board of directors with representation from all islands, and I believe we have 15 directors on our board at this time.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And you have members on the board who at first blush people in the community might not think of as -- and I put these in quotes "radical environmentalist", but in fact are well-known business people from just the regular capitalist industry; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct. We have a very diverse board from Hawaiian cultural practitioners to real estate agents, to folks that have been involved in development and business leaders. Makes for really robust board discussions. Folks coming from all perspectives when we take on a project.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Okay. And can I ask you, or Mr. Kim can chime in, and I apologize if the next question might be a little bit tedious, but since these are requests for amendments of certain conditions and there have been these memorandum today's going back and forth, if I can ask you or Mr. Kim to comment on what is now the final position of

the Hawaiian Islands Land Trust for some of these conditions. And if I can ask, and this is probably the longest one, Condition No. 1, if I can read what I think is the agreed modification to Condition No. 1, between Hawaiian Islands Land Trust and the Office of Planning as modified by the Planning Department, if I can read to you this provision. Then after I read it, if you can tell me whether Hawaiian Islands Land Trust agrees with this provision, disagrees, or requests further modification; and I'll try to read it slowly so everyone can hear.

The Petition Area shall not be subdivided. Any structures that HILT, H-I-L-T, erect or construct in the Petition Area must be permitted under HRS Section 205-2(d) or HILT shall seek appropriate permits and/or special permits to erect or construct such structures. Petitioner shall work cooperatively with the County Planning Department to rezone the Petition Area to a zoning density that will prevent subdivision.

Is that provision acceptable to HILT, or do you request further modification? And either you or Mr. Kim can comment.

MR. KIM: I believe that's acceptable the way it is now, that provision. Yeah, that's fine.

The one caveat on the rezoning or zoning to a more appropriate designation would be, you know, there have previously been I believe request in the County's response that zoning take place within a year, and we actually asked for a longer time frame than that, because just getting the stewardship plan in place itself will take about an estimated two years.

So there's still a number of variables that have to be put in place, fall in place for HILT plans for the property to come to fruition.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: But what I read doesn't have any time restriction, so as I read the words actually, as I read the words, the words are acceptable?

MR. KIM: Yeah, I think so.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Okay. And HILT agrees that Condition No. 2 and 7 be modified as agreed between HILT and the Office of Planning. Is that my understanding that there's not only an agreed modification but it's acceptable?

MR. KIM: Yeah, that is correct, yeah.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And then Conditions 4, 5, 8 and 9, there's an agreement for modification as agreed by the parties. Is that correct?

MR. KIM: Yes, that's my understanding too, yeah.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And the Planning

Department wanted Condition 10 to be modified based on, you know, language that they submitted which is that the 80-foot right-of-way in the City of Hilo zoning map, which they had attached as Exhibit A, that HILT be required to preserve and dedicate 80-foot right-of-way.

What is HILT's position on the County's position regarding Condition No. 10?

MR. KIM: HILT actually is not in agreement with the County on that position. HILT wouldn't object to reserving the right-of-way because it is shown on the zoning map. However, at this point requiring dedication, you know, just based on this request to amend the conditions, doesn't seem really proportionate to HILT.

The reason being the initial condition required dedication as tied in with the subdivision. But currently it would just be a dedication without it being tied into any subdivision. If we are talking about modified conditions here, you know, it seems pretty evident that the impact on use, density, traffic use and the community is much less with

HILT's proposal than it was with the original proposal, and the original proposal did tie in dedication with the subdivision.

- COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So what does HILT want us to do? Or what is HILT requesting the Land Use Commission to do regarding Condition No. 10?
 - MR. KIM: HILT would be okay with it remaining as written, because it was tied in with a subdivision. So in connection with subdivision shall if necessary dedicate, if we want to take out the reference to subdivision, HILT wouldn't object to reserving that right-of-way.
 - Obviously we are not really planning much structure building, but any structure they are planning on building, they're not going to put them right in the middle of the right-of-way.
 - COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I will be asking, or somebody I'm sure will be asking the County of Hawaii about what their position is regarding Condition No. 10.
- Is it HILT's position that Conditions No.
- 22 | 3, 12 through 15, 17 and 20 be deleted?
- MR. KIM: Yeah.
- COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Let me repeat it.
- 25 It's to delete Conditions No. 3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17

and 20. 1 2 MR. KIM: Three, yes. 12, yes. 3 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So 12 through 13, 14? 4 MR. KIM: 13, 14, yeah. 5 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And 17 and 20 also 6 would be deleted? 7 MR. KIM: 20 I think HILT actually had proposed some revised language rather than deleting 8 9 it. 10 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm sorry about that 11 then. Can you tell me what HILT wants regarding No. 12 20? 13 MR. KIM: With No. 20 HILT actually 14 proposed, you know, it's saying that we will develop 15 and implement a forest management plan within two years from the day of the Decision and Order, and 16 17 HILT will provide that management plan to the Commission. 18 19 And it also says HILT will provide report 20 to the Commission every five years on native forest 21 restoration progress per plan, that's their 22 projection. 23 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Mr. Okuda, can the Chair ask about how much further? We are probably in

24

25

```
1
     need of a break, one plus hours.
2
               Do you have a lot more to your questions,
 3
     or should we take a break now, or should you finish
 4
     up at this point?
5
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: My last question which
     is just for HILT to confirm that Conditions No. 6,
 6
     11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 23 shall be retained in
7
8
     their original form?
               MR. KIM: Yes.
9
10
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm sorry?
11
               MR. KIM: Yes to 6; yes to 11.
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: 16?
12
13
               MR. KIM: 16, yes. Yes.
14
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: 18?
15
               MR. KIM: 18, yes.
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: 19?
16
17
               MR. KIM: 19, correct.
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: 21?
18
19
               MR. KIM: 21, yeah.
20
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: 22?
21
               MR. KIM: 22, yeah.
22
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And 23?
23
               MR. KIM: And 23, yes.
24
               COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Madam
25
     Chair.
             Thank you, Mr. Kim. I have no further
```

1 questions.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you,

Commissioner Okuda, for your always excellent

questions to help us all put it into the right box.

At this point in time, we will be taking a ten-minute break and come back at 12:15 for me, but that would be 10:15 for you folks in Hawaii.

(Recess taken.)

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: It is 10:15. Call the meeting back to order.

We've got Commissioner Okuda, Commissioner Aczon, Commissioner Ohigashi, Commissioner Giovanni, Commissioner Chang, and Commissioner Wong in the group. All of our Commissioners are present, and Petitioner's representative Ron Kim is present, and our witness for the Petitioner with Hawaiian Islands Land Trust Laura Kaakua, who is also showing, I don't see her though yet.

So if, Ron, if Laura is still here, I was going to open up just if any other Commissioners had questions at this time of you, the Petitioner or of your witness.

I would like to have any other

Commissioners ask any other questions at this time.

Laura is there. Thank you.

I saw Commissioner Aczon's hand first and then Mr. Commissioner Giovanni after that.

2.1

Mr. Aczon, if could you unmute yourself.

CHAIR VICE ACZON: Most of my questions were answered by the questions from Commissioner Okuda today, and this is why it's really good if Commissioner Okuda go first, because he asks all those questions.

Anyway, I have a question about HILT's governance, decision-makers and other accreditation, but I think your mission is great, and you have a great plan, but and I really do appreciate you working with the other parties, Office of Planning and County, County of Hawaii, to not all in agreement, but you know, most of the items the conditions in agreement, that makes our job easy. And then the rest we can work it out during this hearing.

But I apologize for my ignorance, but can you give us a back history on how this Petition changed hands from Newton Family to Hawaiian Islands Land Trust?

THE WITNESS: Sure.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Okay, Laura, go ahead and proceed.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Chair.

So I will say I joined Hawaiian Islands

Land Trust as CEO just after the transfer of land

from Newton Family Partnership to HILT, and so I

wasn't privy to those initial conversations between

the Newton Family Partnership and HILT, but my

understanding is that the Newton Family, previous

landowner Newton Family had envisioned this kind of a

family development on the property, and for whatever

reason came together, made sort of a family legacy

donation to not pursue their plans of subdivision,

and to donate the land to Hawaiian Islands Land

Trust.

And so in receiving the land, the challenge before myself and our board was how do we achieve our mission with this particular piece of property, and how do we sustain the operation.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: It's a complete donation without HILT putting up some money on it?

THE WITNESS: That's right. It was a complete donation of land.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: How you get your funding -- what are your funding sources?

THE WITNESS: Sure. Our funds are split between three primary categories, so before this year

we were pretty event, heavy event organization. We have fund raising event annually on each island. And that has all gone away for this year, but typically that makes up maybe a third of our budget.

And then another -- the other you could say roughly a third of our budget would be for maybe a little bit more, would be grants from foundations.

So there's a lot of grant support either environmental work or support our educational programs that happen on the preserves that we own and steward.

And then the remaining funding comes from individual donations. And so we do have a lot of people that contribute to the land trust anywhere from like \$5 annual donation to larger gifts.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: So your funding sources come from public and private entities?

THE WITNESS: Yes, they do. Yep. We received, I would say, primarily private entities, so in our fund raising events, our individual donation and most of the grants that we receive are from private foundations.

We do occasionally receive County or State grants in aid, but not consistently.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: The bulk is coming from

1 private, is that what you said?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Looking at your plans and missions, it's very ambitious. So do you think -- are you confident that you're going to receive sufficient funding to do most of it, if not all?

THE WITNESS: Yes. So we are confident with the combination of the State Forest Stewardship Plan. We know that will take awhile, but once we have that in place, as I had mentioned earlier, that opens the door for kind of incentive programs for private landowners, so matching funds. And then with the ability to do selective harvest, that will support our efforts.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Thank you, Ms. Kaakua, that really brought in my knowledge about your organization, also about this Petition. Again, I really appreciate you're working together with other entities to make our job little bit easier.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you Commissioner Aczon.

Commissioner Giovanni, you had some questions?

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes, I do have very simple questions because following in the foot steps of Commissioner Okuda and Commissioner Aczon, there's not much left to ask.

My question has to do pretty specifically, are you experiencing rapid ohia death on the property?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's actually one of the first things that we will need to do is to do a survey to understand if there is rapid ohia death, what the extent of it is from our initial surveys, we do believe that there are individual trees that look to have rapid ohia death. And that's a very large concern in terms of management, and will absolutely affect every aspect of how we manage the property.

So when we go into the forest now, which is pretty infrequently as we wait to understand this process, we are following all rapid ohia death protocols. And even if we don't have rapid ohia death, we will still be following all of those protocols with our contractor, with volunteers with students very religiously.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Is it your view

that districting as Agricultural will facilitate your management practices to deal with rapid ohia death as compared to staying in Conservation?

THE WITNESS: I think it gives us better flexibility, so, yes. I will say though, that rapid -- if we do find rapid ohia death, it could just put a pause on certain management practices, like we might just have to leave a whole section alone, if that's the recommended practice.

So our potential partner in doing this forest management, you know, we will be working with them. We always would be working with DLNR as well, since we will be working on the Forest Stewardship Plan together.

I think the Agricultural zoning can only help with -- not zoning, but District, can only help in our flexibility, but rapid ohia death could actually put a pause in our management plan, just because if it's there, we want to do everything we can to not spread it, including just not touching it COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Ms.

Kaakua. I have no further questions, thank you.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Fellow Commissioners, do any of the other Commissioners have questions of Mr. Kim or Ms. Kaakua at this time?

1 Commissioner Chang.

2 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Chair 3 Cabral.

And good to see you, Ms. Kaakua, and thank you so much for Zooming in with us.

I just -- I too, like the other

Commissioners, want to applaud Hawaiian Islands Land

Trust for taking this stewardship on.

You know, what I found sitting on the Land Use Commission is too often a Petitioner comes in to seek an amendment and modification of a land use condition, which has community concerns.

So in this case, have you met with the community and is there -- what's the temperament of the community with respect to Hawaiian Islands Land Trust taking over this property, if you have reached out to them?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, thank you, Commissioner Chang, for that question.

So community outreach is a big part of our work. And in this case, we've done some community outreach just to get a sense of what the hopes for the property are; and it's pretty overwhelming in terms of just, yeah, keep it as forest, and invite the community in.

So that's been pretty consistent, but we haven't done the type of community outreach that we would typically do, because we haven't been sure where this process would lead to, and so we were concerned about building up positive expectation and then not being able to fulfill them.

So if we're allowed to proceed with the amendment, then we have sort of two tracks, one is assessing the rapid ohia death, assessing the native and invasive species status of the property; and then we have another track which is this whole community outreach track where we kind of work in concentric circles out from the property.

We know where the nearest schools are, and there's a neighbor outreach strategy, and we will have to really develop that. And that's one of the reasons why we need staff on the ground to be that presence. We do have Shae Kamakaala in Hilo who is our Director of Aina Protection, but she has a lot on her plate, and so we would like to hire someone to be that community organizer.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And your approach makes a lot of sense, manage community's expectation.

So getting this amendment, this modification is really critical to your next steps;

is that correct? 1 2 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 3 COMMISSIONER CHANG: As you were describing the Newton's donation, Commissioner Aczon's 4 5 questions, were there any restriction or covenants 6 that the Newton's placed on this donation? 7 THE WITNESS: No. COMMISSIONER CHANG: And the surrounding 8 9 landowners, again, it sounds as if they will be your 10 next step, because I'm assuming for purposes of 11 managing both controlling invasive species within 12 your property and externally, that collaboration is 13 important. 14 So that would be part of your next steps? 15 THE WITNESS: That's right. 16 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Can you just confirm, 17 is it my understanding that your primary source of revenue to do the stewardship, including hiring of 18 19 staff, will be through the sale or the harvesting of 20 the ohia? 21 THE WITNESS: That's rights. 22 COMMISSIONER CHANG: And do you have a 23 partner that you're working with for the harvesting

THE WITNESS: We do. So we haven't

24

and the sale?

contracted with them yet, but we do expect to partner with Forest Solution, which is a large forestry company that worked with a lot of landowners, institutions that we have good relationships with, such as Kamehameha Schools and the State.

So kind of based on recommendation, we were brought to them. And they seem very flexible to working with us and, yeah, we see that partnership moving forward.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much.

Those are the only questions that I have, Madam,

Chair, so I have no further questions. Thank you,

Laura.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Commissioner Chang.

Commissioners, anyone else with questions of this witness at this time? Seeing none.

Mr. Kim, do you have any other witnesses that you would like to bring forward at this time?

MR. KIM: No, thank you.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Then I would like to go ahead at this point in time and ask the County of Hawaii and, Ms. Mellon-Lacey, if you would like to go ahead and make comments or present anything in

regards to the County's position at this time?

MS. MELLON-LACEY: Can you hear me?

3 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Yes. I can,

4 especially if you are wearing your mask, speak

5 clearly. Thank you.

MS. MELLON-LACEY: I'm going to take it off, because April isn't here.

So we thank the Hawaiian Islands Land Trust for their presentation. It was very comprehensive and helpful, and we are in support of what they plan to do, and view it as a noble undertaking.

I'm going to put my mask back on.

Okay, I think, you know, there's been -Mr. Okuda pointed out various iterations going back
and forth of this document to amend the conditions,
and Commissioner Okuda did an excellent job, but I
got a little lost.

So there's three that are important to us, I guess, and the first is number one, and I wasn't sure where he was reading from, because it seemed like he sort of combined two, but the part that is really important to us would be that the Petition Area will not be subdivided, and that the Petitioner shall work cooperatively with the County Planning Department to rezone the Petition Area to a zoning

density that will prevent subdivision.

And we also concur with OP's constructive language in there. So that's the first one.

The next condition that we are concerned about is preserving the native forest, which is Condition 5. And we concur with the request for the change made by Hawaiian Islands Land Trust, but the County requests the opportunity to comment on the Forest Management Plan.

I know I spoke with Mr. Kim yesterday on this issue, and he told me that Hawaiian Islands Land Trust would be working with DOFAW to come up with this plan, but that's not stated in the condition as it's been revised.

So I think we would like that to be added, but -- and we would still like the opportunity at the County to review it, but we would like to know in the condition that DOFAW will be consulted on the development of the plan.

And the third condition of concern to the County also was raised by Mr. Kim, Condition 10, relating to the 80-foot right-of-way. And we're fine with striking "dedicate", and just leaving "reserve" as long as it's clear that there wouldn't be any structures erected in that right-of-way.

Other than that, I think, you know, that the position of Office of Planning and HILT are good on the proposed conditions.

So I don't think we have really anything more to add other than to thank everyone for their work on this, and getting the documents back and forth for us all to kind of look at them and get closer. And I don't think there's any impediment to going forward with this. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much. Petitioner Kim, would you like to comment or ask any questions of the County of Hawaii and Ms.

Mellon-Lacey?

MR. KIM: I had to unmute.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: It's a process.

Mr. Kim, do you have any questions of the County?

MR. KIM: Not so much questions, I guess just a comment.

It sounds like we're on the same page, I think, on Condition 1 and 10. Condition 5, I guess the one comment HILT would have is very willing to, you know, share copies of the plan with the County, but it sounds like the forest -- it's actually the stewardship plan really with DOFAW that we would be

doing, and that's so specialized and so

particularised, and understanding that DOFAW really

are the experts in the area, and they really are the

sort of agency with jurisdiction over these types of

issues. We just don't understand what the County's

jurisdiction would be or what the expertise would be,

the capability to comment on the plan beyond what

DOFAW would do.

And we wouldn't want it to be delayed necessarily, so, you know, opportunity to comment wouldn't really mind, but it wouldn't be something that would be needed for us to go forward with the process, that it wouldn't delay our process if we're waiting for the County to comment.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Okay, thank you for that comment.

Office of Planning, do you have any questions or comments regarding the information provided by the County of Hawaii?

MS. APUNA: No questions, Chair.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Commissioners, do you have any questions or comments regarding the comments from the County of Hawaii?

Commissioner Chang, was that you raising your hand or brushing back your long hair?

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Madam Chair.

Commissioner Okuda and Ohigashi each have their hands raised.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I don't have that portion up.

Okay, Commissioner Ohigashi, let me have you come in first and ask your questions. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: My questions deal with Condition No. 10, and I'm just curious, it says Petitioner shall, if necessary, dedicate to the County of Hawaii 80-foot right-of-way located near the Ola'a flume system to accommodate the County's plan secondary arterial.

I was just wondering from the County, how does that work? How do you know when it's necessary? And how do you know when the dedication is required? Is a dedication required? Not required? Tell me how this condition works.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Ms. Mellon-Lacey, can you comment on that how that -- I think it's the difference is between whether there would be dedication or a reservation was the other word I heard. Can you comment on that?

MS. MELLON-LACEY: Right, and what we agreed to do is strike the "dedication" because the

dedication was tied to the specific subdivision as the property is now zoned.

But with the zone changing, then we would just want the reservation, because with is part of the County's plan of arterial road development, which is reflected in the map that was Exhibit A to our original amended filing.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: What bothered me was that the words "if necessary". I'm just not sure how that would work. What does "if necessary" mean? I'm just curious about this.

MS. MELLON-LACEY: That's the original language, not the proposed language. That's the original language, and it's not the proposed language that we are asking for now.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Not being a part of the original language, that's not quite an answer to my question.

I'm wondering how this provision works and what does "if necessary" mean? Does that mean somebody has to determine it to be necessary and who does the County determine it to be necessary? Does Mr. Kim's client's determine it to be necessary?

Maybe it should be "shall dedicate an 80-foot located to accommodate -- just asking if that

1 | should be -- how it works.

2 MS. SURPRENANT: Aloha, Deputy Planner
3 Director for the County.

And so that language would be if the County deemed it necessary, if the County went ahead with that arterial connection through this property. And so I would have to go back and look at the reason or mention other things in order to answer it more thoroughly. But, again, it's not part my understanding of what is the proposed language that we're looking at, and yes, it would be determined by the County based on the need of that arterial road going through.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Commissioner Ohigashi, any more comments?

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes, I just wonder -- it just confuses the whole provision in my mind. It says "if necessary", so it does not say who does it, contrary to what the County is saying. I'm just saying it would be more clear if you just delete that.

MS. SURPRENANT: If necessary, I don't think it's part of what is currently being proposed in the language. It depends on where you're reading from in the original language, which included the

subdivision, and there would be higher density
potentially going into that property.

At this point that we're asking that it not be subdivided, and so we're now just asking that they reserve that right-of-way. Again, if the County chooses to build that road at some point in the future, then the right-of-way is still available and reserved for further negotiation.

MS. CHUN: I'm wondering if the Planning Director has been sworn in.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I apologize. Yes, I have not sworn her in and she is not an attorney.

Thank you very much for picking up on my mistake.

Ms. Suprenant, can I swear you in at this time?

THE WITNESS: Yes, please.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Raise your hand, please.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, go ahead and proceed then.

APRIL SUPRENANT

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the

County of Hawaii, was sworn to tell the truth, was 1 2 examined and testified as follows: EXAMINATION 3 4 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I think, 5 Commissioner Ohigashi, are you clear on this or do 6 you think that we should create language that would 7 make that provision? 8 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not clear, but 9 if the parties want to remain unclear about it and 10 fight it out later on to say it's not necessary, 11 that's up to them. I'm just reading the language. 12 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: At this point, it's 13 not an issue, 100 years from now it may become 14 important. 15 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I don't know how 16 long --17 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Commissioners? 18 Commissioner Okuda, you have a question, I 19 believe? 20 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes, thank you, Madam 21 Chair. 22 Following up on Commissioner Ohigashi's 23 question, but, Ms. Suprenant, can I ask a preliminary 24 question. All the testimony that you gave before you 25 were sworn in, you also verify that that testimony

1 was are considered made under oath. Is that correct?

MS. SURPRENANT: That is correct, thank you for asking that question.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Let me follow up on what Commissioner Ohigashi was asking about the Condition No. 10. Let me read what I think Condition No. 10 presently states, and then I will ask you whether or not that's what Condition No. 10 presently states. And I quote.

"In connection with the subdivision of the Petition Area, Petitioner shall, if necessary, dedicate to the County of Hawaii an 80-foot right-of-way located near the Ola'a flume system to accommodate the County's planned secondary arterial.

Is what I read an accurate statement word for word about what Condition No. 10 presently reads or states?

MS. SUPRENANT: That is my understanding, yes.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So in other words, this condition does not take effect until there is a subdivision of the Petition Area, correct?

MS. SUPRENANT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Okay, so Hawaiian

Islands Land Trust is requesting that Condition No.

1 | 10 remain unchanged.

Would the County have an objection to just leaving Condition No. 10 unchanged?

4 MS. SUPRENANT: We would not object to 5 that, no.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And that --

MS. SUPRENANT: Well, I guess the objection is -- I take that back. The objection is that we would want it to be reserved, which is why we proposed language, and it's our understanding that HILT was okay with this language based on what Mr. Kim has said today with taking out the two words of "and dedicate".

And so we understand that the two parties would agree to this language if we take out the "to dedicate".

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yeah. And I understand that presentation and what Mr. Kim has said. This is my concern without having done extensive legal research.

A question about whether or not even a reservation where there is no concurrent or presently represented intent to subdivide or develop, whether we start coming into the area of whether or not such reservation might be constitutional or not

constitutional.

your comment, is, you know, if the dog is sleeping right now, and it was in the original Decision and Order, and we could argue that that was already vetted or evaluated based on the law at that time, if we don't fool with it right now, we can basically defer a potential constitutional issue about unlawful taking or taking without proper due process or just compensation to some later date.

I mean, in other words, let's not decide something which we don't really have to decide right now. I mean, would that be a little bit acceptable by the County?

MS. SURPRENANT: If you don't mind, hold on one second, please.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: We're not ready for a break yet, but pretty soon.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, let's take a five-minute break until the County is ready.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Ms. Suprenant, about how much time do you think you need?

MS. SURPRENANT: I think five minutes is great. I just want to confer with somebody else.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Because there's

about -- I guess we will take a 5 to 7-minute break, 1 2 so at 11:00 o'clock we will come back. That will be 3 our break for the hour. 4 (Recess taken.) ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: It's 11:00 o'clock. 5 6 Let's gather back together and continue. At the time 7 we took our break -- the screen rearranges itself. County of Hawaii, April Suprenant, looking 8 9 for information to make a response to questions 10 regarding No. 10, the difference between dedicate and 11 reserve, and what to do with that roadway usage. MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diana 12 13 Mellon-Lacey. I see, and I believe after looking at 14 this -- can you hear me? 15 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, we can. 16 MS. MELLON-LACEY: -- that we are fine with 17 leaving Condition 10 as it is presently. ACTING COMMISSIONER CABRAL: So, 18 19 Commissioner Okuda, your comment on that? COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Okay, thank you very 20 21 much for that response. 22

And then my final question, just so that the record is clear, deals with Condition No. 1. And if you can tell me whether or not the condition, as I read it, is acceptable so that we're clear on this?

23

24

25

```
"The Petition Area shall not be subdivided.
1
2
     Any structures that HILT erects or constructs in the
 3
      Petition Area must be permitted under HRS 205-2(d) or
 4
     HILT shall seek appropriate permits and/or special
 5
     permits to erect or construct such structures.
 6
      Petitioner shall work cooperatively with the County
7
      Planning Department to rezone the Petition Area to a
8
      zoning density that would prevent subdivision."
 9
                Is that language acceptable with respect to
10
     Condition No. 1?
11
                MS. MELLON-LACEY: Yes, Commissioner, it's
12
     acceptable. Thank you.
13
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA:
                                     Thank you very much
14
      for answering my questions. I have no further
15
     questions.
16
                Thank you, Madam Chair.
17
                ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you.
18
                Commissioners, do you have any other
19
     questions of the County of Hawaii at this time?
20
                Let me check back, County of Hawaii, Ms.
21
     Mellon-Lacey or Ms. Suprenant, any other items you
22
      wanted to present at this time?
23
                MS. MELLON-LACEY: Not at this time.
24
     you.
25
                ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much.
```

May I now go, I think in the order -- Ms.

Apuna, the Office of Planning, do you have any

3 statements at this time?

MS. APUNA: Yes, I would like to present OP's position.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you.

MS. APUNA: Thank you, Chair.

OP has reviewed Motion to Amend to allow successor Petitioner Hawaiian Islands Land Trust to develop a native forest management project in place of the originally proposed eight-lot agricultural subdivision on the Petition Area.

There is good cause to amend the D&O because with the change in ownership of the Petition Area to HILT, the Petition Area will be used to fulfill Petitioner's primary mission to protect and steward lands in Hawaii through its proposed Kukuau Forest Management Project.

The proposed use to establish a native

Forest Management Project is reasonable and

consistent with the permitted uses of the

Agricultural District as well as the Conservation

District. HRS Section 205-2(d)(1) permits within the

State Agricultural District activities or uses as

characterized by the cultivation of crops, crops for

bioenergy, orchards, forage, and forestry.

HRS Section 205-2(d)(1) states that the Conservation District shall include areas necessary for conserving indigenous or endemic plants, wildlife, including those which are threatened or endangered, forestry.

However, Petitioner has stated that it needs to harvest koa from the area to fund the forest management project. As a commercial use, harvesting of koa in the Conservation District would require BLNR permitting and other approvals, whereas the harvesting of koa in the Agricultural District would not require any further permitting and associated costs.

OP points out that while Petitioner proposes to erect a shelter for community volunteers, students, and Hawaiian cultural practitioners, such a structure is not a permitted use in Agricultural District and would require a special permit pursuant to HRS Section 205-6.

OP received comments from DLNR Engineering,
DOFAW, SHPD, US Fish and Wildlife Service, OHA, and
DOT. Most notably, SHPD indicated that an
Archaeological Inventory Survey was not conducted for
the proposed project area, and therefore, asks for

the opportunity to review any future proposed projects within the project area that involves ground-disturbing activities. Similarly, OHA states that "while reforestation is typically less impactful than a subdivision, there is still a potential to impact cultural resources. As such, if archaeological and/or cultural resources are encountered, OHA recommends that appropriate management and preservation protocols be in place."

Also, the USFWS states that their data indicate that a variety of federally listed species may occur or transmit through the vicinity of the Petition Area and offers applicable mitigation measures.

Through consultation with Petitioner, both parties have agreed upon various modifications to and/or retention of the 23 D&O conditions as provided in OP's last filing of November 2nd, 2020, which provide restrictions and protections in the development of Kukuau Forest Management Project, and incorporate pertinent state and federal agency comments.

OP therefore recommends approval of the Motion, subject to these conditions.

I think we would just like to just note when Commissioner Okuda had read Condition 1, I think

- it refers to HILT throughout, rather than Petitioner, 1 2 so OP would suggest that the conditions refer to 3 Petitioner generally rather than to HILT. Other than that, I'm available for 4 5 questions. Thank you. 6 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Ms. Apuna, 7 for your always good detailed information. Petitioner, do you have any questions of 8 9 the Office of Planning and Ms. Apuna at this time? 10 MR. KIM: No, we didn't have any questions. 11 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: County of Hawaii, Ms. 12 Mellon-Lacey or Ms. Suprenant, do you have any 13 questions of Ms. Apuna at this time? 14 MS. MELLON-LACEY: We have no questions at 15 this time. Thank you. 16 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Commissioners, do you 17 have any questions of Ms. Apuna at this time and her recommendations? 18 19 Let me see if I can find -- I don't see any 20 hands up. Okay. Thank you very much. Moving 21 forward. 22 Okay. Mr. Kim and Ms. Kaakua, do you have
 - any final comments at this time that you would like to make?
- MR. KIM: Thank you for the opportunity to

23

24

make some final comments.

You know, I think just to kind of clarify a little bit on that language in Condition 10, about the dedication, if necessary.

Our understanding, if necessary, was that it was tied to the subdivision, and then that would comply with the County code where, you know, the County can't just ask for exaction from a landowner carte blanche, just because they're going for a subdivision. If you're asking for something, money or land, you know, needs to be reasonably tied to the development.

So I believe that's what the term "if necessary" meant, was if necessary, in conjunction with the subdivision. If the subdivision impact is going to create the necessity, then the Petitioner would have been required to dedicate. So that's sort of "if necessary".

So hopefully that can help clarify that issue. If not, no, I would say it really has been a very good experience working with, you know, the County and Office of Planning on this.

You know, there was a very, I felt, like a collaborative approach to it. You know, we weren't necessarily oppositional or antagonistic with each

other, so that was good to work with.

And then it's just a good project to be behind, from where I'm sitting, where this is something that works out. I would be happy to tell my kids or even one day grand kids that this is something that we helped put together for the community here.

So it seems like a good project. I think there is good cause to amend the conditions from what the conditions initially were because, as I stated earlier, the two projects are pretty significantly different with their use and impact, and also the benefits to the community.

So I just appreciate everyone's questions and thoughtful commentary. I do, again, thank you all for your time and taking a good look at these issues, and really thinking about what you're doing with them. So thank you.

And I just would ask that the Commission, you know, would approve the amendments as we have agreed to with Office of Planning and the County.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Mr. Kim.

Let me give -- make sure I didn't miss anything.

Hawaii County, do you have any additional

1 comments you would like to make at this time? 2 MS. MELLON-LACEY: No, we have no 3 additional comment. Thank you. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: And, Office of 4 5 Planning, Ms. Apuna, do you have any final comments? 6 MS. APUNA: No final comments. Thank you, 7 Chair. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Commissioners, do you 8 9 have any final comments, or could I look to a 10 Commissioner to entertain a motion of the LUC to 11 either grant or deny the Hawaiian Islands Land Trust Motion to Amend the Land Use Commission's Findings of 12 13 Facts, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order as 14 filed November 16, 2001. 15 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: I think Commissioner 16 Okuda has his hand raised. 17 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Okay, yes, 18 Commissioner Okuda. Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: With the Chair's 20 permission, I would like to make a motion. 21 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, please 22 proceed. 23 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: In this motion, if I 24 refer to Hawaiian Islands Land Trust, I also mean

Petitioner, and if I state Petitioner, I also mean

1 | Hawaiian Islands Land Trust.

I would like to make a motion as follows, and if the parties and the Commission would bear with me so that I can state the substance of the motion.

The motion is basically this. The Land Use Commission recognizes Petitioner Hawaiian Islands

Land Trust's standing to seek and obtain the relief requested in its Amended Motion.

No. 2. The Decision and Order filed

November 16, 2001, shall be amended to reflect the

appropriate Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and

conditions that are applicable to Petitioner's Forest

Management Project, and as stated in this motion.

Specifically, these are the specific modifications and statements of non-modification.

First, Condition No. 1 shall be modified to state as follows, and I quote:

"The Petition Area shall not be subdivided.

Any structures that Petitioner Hawaiian Islands Land

Trust erects or constructs in the Petition Area must

be permitted under HRS Section 205-2(d) or Petitioner

HILT shall seek appropriate permits and/or special

permits to erect or construct such structures.

Petitioner shall work cooperatively with the County

Planning Department to rezone the Petition Area to a

zoning density that would prevent subdivision. 1 2 Second condition, Nos. 2 and 7 shall be 3 modified as agreed to by the Petitioner and the 4 Office of Planning. 5 No. 3. Conditions No. 4, 5, 8 and 9 shall 6 be modified as agreed by the parties. 7 Next, Conditions No. 3, 12 through 15, 17 and 20 shall be deleted. 8 9 And finally, Conditions No. 6, 10, 11, 16, 10 18, 19, 21, 22 and 23 shall be retained in their 11 original form or language. And, Madam Chair, that is the substance of 12 13 my motion. 14 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I second. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you for the 15 16 motion, Commissioner Okuda; and thank you, 17 Commissioner Ohigashi for seconding that motion. At this point, I would like to have 18 19 additional comments from our Commissioners on -- or 20 any questions in this regard. 21 Commissioners, any questions or comments, 22 then I'm going to proceed? 23 Commissioner Ohigashi, your comment, I see.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm going to

support this motion based upon the comments and the

24

documents provided to us. I want to congratulate the parties for making a lot of decisions and agreement to all the modifications and the changes that they'd like to make.

I just have a comment, it seems to me that Condition 10 is superfluous because the County, or the emphasis that the County of Hawaii seems to be is that there shall be no subdivision. Absent the subdivision, there is no dedication. So that was my only concern during this whole proceedings. Other than that, I'm supporting the motion.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi.

Commissioner Chang, did I see your hand up? Do you want to comment?

MS. APUNA: Actually, Chair, I know you're in deliberation. If I can just make a point of clarification.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Please, go ahead.

MS. APUNA: So I mentioned that OP, when looking at Condition 1, or any of the conditions that is referring to Petitioner in general, not to HILT, and not Petitioner HILT, that it be generally just "Petitioner" in case that, say, HILT transfers the property and they are no longer the responsible

property owner, that whoever will be the Petitioner at that time, the successor would still be responsible under the condition.

 $\label{eq:continuous} I \text{ would just like to add that and I}$ apologize for interjecting. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Commissioner Okuda, would you agree that that is an understood portion of your motion?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Madam, Chair, that is correct. And I did not intend to create any type of confusion or ambiguity. I do believe that these conditions, as we say, run with the land, so a successor would be bound.

But to avoid any confusion or possibly any possible ambiguity, I would modify my motion to state that I'm just using the word "Petitioner" and I would delete any specific reference to Hawaiian Islands Land Trust.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you.

Commissioner Ohigashi, is that acceptable as you're the party who seconded that motion?

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's acceptable, but I always thought the staff would make the necessary corrections --

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: I think we are all on

- 1 | the same page here.
- 2 Commissioners, any other comments on the
- 3 motion at this time? Moving right along.
- 4 A motion --
- 5 CHIEF CLERK: Chair, this is Riley. We 6 have Commissioner Aczon with his hand raised.
- 7 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Oh, okay. Well, see,
- 8 I'm trying to look at the -- it's a hard job Jonathan does.
- 10 Commissioner Aczon, please proceed with
 11 your comments.
- VICE CHAIR ACZON: I just want to clarify

 before I make my comment, if Condition No. 10 was

 addressed by Commissioner Okuda's motion? I probably

 didn't hear it, I just want to make sure.
 - ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Commissioner Okuda, would you comment on how you're dealing with No. 10 in regards to your motion?
 - COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes, thank you, Commissioner Aczon for the question.
- I stated that Condition No. 10 would remain in original form. In other words, with no change.
- 23 And this is the reason why.

16

17

18

19

20

The way I read Condition No. 10 it starts
with saying that it's in connection with the

subdivision of the Petition Area. And then the condition continues on.

2.1

So the way I read the plain language of the condition, it's applicable only if there is a subdivision of the Petition Area.

If there is no subdivision of the Petition Area, then the requirement for dedication of a right-of-way is not applicable because, again, the triggering event under Condition No. 10 is subdivision of the Petition Area.

The specific reason why I'm asking that the condition just be left in its original form without any modification is basically to deal with the potential unconstitutional taking of private property issue, and also the issue raised by Commissioner Ohigashi, which is if there's no subdivision then, you know, the condition is sort of not applicable or superfluous.

I don't mean to put words in Commissioner
Ohigashi's mouth, even though I'm doing it. So using
the word that came out of my mouth, my intention is
simply to avoid dealing with this issue, because it's
really not something we're facing now. And it's to
punt it to some future event if that event were to
occur.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Thank you, Commissioner Okuda, for the clarification.

Madam chair, it's like what I said before, this is a good project. Hopefully better than the originally proposed project. So I will fully support the motion, and I just want to thank all the parties for working together. Like what Mr. Kim said, they're working collaboratively on all this without any, you know -- what you call that? Trying to find a word that what we had before, so I'm very, very impressed with the way they conducted their statements. And, again, I'm wishing Hawaiian Islands Land Trust the best in the future.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Commissioner Aczon.

I see Commissioner Giovanni's hand is raised, I believe. Do you have any comments Commissioner Giovanni?

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, I do.

I will be supporting the motion. I am also very encouraged to see this land going in a refreshing direction away from development and subdivision and into forest management.

My only additional comment is I'm really glad to see, in one part, because I think it will have incremental and positive benefit in terms of climate change if we do forest management of this type as opposed to clearing and development.

So thank you, and I really appreciate the work of HILT; and I appreciate work of the County and the State to work cooperatively with them.

Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Commissioner Giovanni.

I see that Lauren Chun with the Attorney

General's Office, I believe her hand is up. Did you
have a comment?

MS. CHUN: Yes, I have a question for clarification.

Does Commissioner Okuda's motion include authorizing the staff to make those non-substantive changes that were mentioned, and to offer for the Chair to sign the order?

ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. I have that in my language here that it should include modification to ensure consistency, and to authorize the Chair to sign the order in this matter on behalf of the Commission.

1 Thank you for reminding us of that. 2 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Madam Chair, if I may 3 state. I assumed that that would be -- I don't want 4 to call it standard boiler plate, but -- and an 5 assumed or a portion of whatever motion that we pass. 6 So I'm sorry for not stating it, but that was my 7 intention that the standard boiler plate authorization delegation provisions would also be 8 included. Thank you. 9 10 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Commissioner Okuda. 11 12 And, Commissioner Ohigashi, do you accept 13 that additional standard language to be in the 14 motion? 15 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I do. But I want 16 to make one additional comment. 17 I wanted to note, I'm glad to see that Mr. 18 Kim has joined the rest of us in private practice. 19 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: And he has such a 20 good landlord. Thank you. Couldn't not put that ad 2.1 in there. 22 Commissioners, any other comments from any 23 Commissioners before we look to hopefully finalizing

A motion has been made by Commissioner

this and taking a vote? Nobody's hands are up.

24

```
Okuda and seconded by Commissioner Ohigashi.
1
2
                I'm supposed to state the motion?
 3
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: I can restate the
 4
     motion for you. Thank you.
5
                ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Okay, thank you.
 6
                Mr. Orodenker please restate the motion and
7
     poll the Commission. Thank you.
8
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
                The Motion is for the Commission to
9
10
     recognize Petitioner's standing that the Decision and
     Order be amended as follows:
11
                Condition 1 as stated by Commissioner Okuda
12
      shall be amended.
13
14
                Conditions 2 and 7 to be modified as OP and
15
     Petitioner have agreed.
                Condition Nos. 4, 5, 8 and 9 be modified as
16
17
     agreed to by the parties.
                Conditions No. 3, 10 through 15 -- 12
18
19
     through 15 and 17 and 20 be deleted.
20
                Condition Nos. 6, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21,
      22 and 23 be retained.
21
22
                Commissioner Okuda?
23
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
24
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Ohigashi?
25
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI:
                                        Aye.
```

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Giovanni? 1 2 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye. 3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Chang? COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aye. 4 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon? 5 6 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Yes. 7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong? COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye. 8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer is 9 10 excused. Vice Chair Cabral? 11 12 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Yes. 13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Madam Chair, 14 the motion passes unanimously with seven votes. 15 ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. I too would like to comment that I think 16 17 this is -- it's very nice having -- as the Co-Chair, 18 and having to be the Chair today, I'm so grateful 19 that this was such a wonderful group of people all 20 agreeing and absolutely looking for the best language 21 to make this a good motion and a good activity into 22 the future and to preserve our land. 23 I'm so glad it was not controversial for me 24 and everyone. So I look at it, and from the overview I lease land from DLNR and it's very close to this 25

property by way of the crow flies as they say. At this point, do we have any further comments from any of the parties at this time? Thank you very much. And I would like now to ask Mr. Orodenker if there is any other business that we are to take up at this time? EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Madam Chair, this is all we have on the agenda, and there is no further business. ACTING CHAIR CABRAL: Being that there is no further business, I will declare this meeting adjourned. Thank you to everyone for your patience in my efforts. Thank you. (The proceedings adjourned at 11:30 p.m.)

1	CERTIFICATE STATE OF HAWAII)
2) SS. COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
3	COUNTI OF HONOHOLD
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on November 5, 2020, at 9:00 a.m.,
6	the proceedings contained herein was taken down by me
7	in machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
8	typewriting under my supervision; that the foregoing
9	represents, to the best of my ability, a true and
10	correct copy of the proceedings had in the foregoing
11	matter.
12	I further certify that I am not of counsel for
13	any of the parties hereto, nor in any way interested
14	in the outcome of the cause named in this caption.
15	Dated this 5th day of November, 2020, in
16	Honolulu, Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	<u>/s/ Jean Marie McManus</u> JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
20	JEAN MARIE MCMANOS, CSR #130
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	