1 LAND USE COMMISSION STATE OF HAWAI'I 2 Hearing held on April 28, 2021 Commencing at 9:40 a.m 3 Held via ZOOM by Interactive Conference Technology 4 Call to Order I. 5 II. Adoption of Minutes 6 Tentative Meeting Schedule III. 7 IV. ACTION A07-772 A&B PROPERTIES, INC. (Maui) Consider Motion for Order to Extend Time in 8 Docket No. A07-772 in which the Commission 9 granted the reclassification of approximately 94.352 acres of land from the Agricultural 10 District to the Urban District at Waiakoa, Maui, for single-and multi-family residential 11 units, and commercial services at TMK Nos. 3-8-04:por.2, por. 22 and por.30 12 13 V. ACTION CONFORMANCE OF C&C OF HONOLULU IMPORTANT 14 AGRICULTURAL LANDS (IAL) RECOMMENDATION TO APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND PROCEDURAL 15 REQUIREMENTS To consider whether the City and County of 16 Honolulu recommendations for the designation of Important Agricultural Lands on the Island of 17 Oahu complies with the requirements of Sections 205-47, 205-48, 205-49 Hawaii Revised Statutes 18 and whether the proper procedural, legal, statutory and public notice requirements were 19 met in developing the recommendations. lands recommended for designation are listed in 20 Appendix H of the C&C's IAL petition which, along with meeting materials are available for public review in advance of the meeting at 2.1 Https://luc.hawaii.gov/city-county-ial. 22 The Commission will not be considering or determining at the meeting the legal rights, 23 duties, or privileges of specific landowners or issues relating to particular properties. 24 VI. Recess 25 Before: Jean Marie McManus, Hawaii CSR #156

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
2
      JONATHAN LIKEKE SCHEUER, Chair (Oahu)
      NANCY CABRAL, Vice Chair (Big Island)
3
      EDMUND ACZON, Vice Chair (Oahu)
      GARY OKUDA (Oahu)
4
      LEE OHIGASHI (Maui)
      ARNOLD WONG (Oahu)
5
      DAWN CHANG (Oahu)
      DAN GIOVANNI (Kauai)
6
      STAFF:
7
      JULIE CHINA, ESQ.
      Deputy Attorneys General
8
      DANIEL ORODENKER, Executive Officer
9
      RILEY K. HAKODA, Chief Clerk
      SCOTT DERRICKSON, Chief Planner
10
      NATASHA A. QUINONES, Program Specialist
11
      BRYAN YEE, ESQ.
      Deputy Attorney General
12
      RODNEY FUNAKOSHI, Planning Program Administrator
      AARON SETOGAWA, Planner
13
      ALISON KATO, ESQ.
      Deputy Attorney General
14
      State Office of Planning
      State of Hawaii
15
      BENJAMIN MATSUBARA, ESQ.
16
      CURTIS TABATA, ESQ.
      Attorneys for A&B Properties
17
     MICHAEL HOPPER, ESQ.
18
      Deputy Corporation Counsel
      JORDAN HART, Planning Director
19
      KURT WOLLENHAUPT, Planning Consultant
      County of Maui, State of Hawaii
20
      DAWN TAKEUCHI-APUNA, ESQ.
21
      Deputy Director
      RAYMOND YOUNG, Planner
22
      DINA WONG, Planner
      Department of Permitting and Planning
23
      For IAL, C&C of Honolulu
24
25
```

		3
1	INDEX	
2	PROCEEDINGS:	PAGE
3	A&B PROPERTIES, INC.:	12
4	PUBLIC WITNESSES:	
5	Grant Chun Direct Examination	1.0
6		19
7	PETITIONER WITNESSES:	
8	Natalie Kiehm Direct Examination	25
9	Michael Hamasu Direct Examination	31
10	COUNTY WITNESSES:	31
11		
12	Michele McLean Direct Examination	50
13	CITY & COUNTY OF HONOLULU - IAL PUBLIC WITNESSES:	75
14	Wendy Hee	
15	Direct Examination	8 9
16	Bronson Azama Direct Examination	95
17	Sylvia Chiappetta	
18	Direct Examination	103
19	Mieko Yamamoto Direct Examination	110
20	Michael Lenz	
21	Direct Examination	113
22	Linda Baptiste Direct Examination	116
23	Yvonne Watari	T T O
24	Direct Examination	122
25		

			4
1	INDEX CONTINUED		
2	PUBLIC WITNESSES:	PAGE	
3	John Foti	100	
4	Direct Examination	127	
5	Diana Young Direct Examination	133	
6	Robert Cherry Direct Examination	138	
7		138	
8	Michelle Correia Direct Examination	142	
9	Caridad Levia Direct Examination	145	
10	Nodie Namba	145	
11	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	148 149	
12	Alexander Garber	149	
13	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	152 154	
14	Joann Robello	101	
15	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	159 162	
16	Nicholas Ernst		
17	Direct Examination	164	
18	Jennifer Ballera Direct Examination	169	
19	Cross-Examination/County	170	
20	Michael G. Wright Direct Examination	172	
21	Cross-Examination/County	174	
22	Shirley Simao Direct Examination	175	
23	Cross-Examination/County	178	
24	Randall Sakumoto Direct Examination	180	
25			

			5
1	INDEX CONTINUED		
2	PUBLIC WITNESSES:	PAGE	
3	Anna Murray	106	
4	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	186 187	
5	Gene Dumaran	1.0.0	
6	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	189 190	
7	Racquel Achiu Direct Examination	191	
8	Cross-Examination/County	194	
9	Mary Tubbs Direct Examination	199	
10	Cross-Examination/County	201	
11	Tameria Kelley Colbin Direct Examination	203	
12	Sharlette Poe	203	
13	Direct Examination	205	
14	Mahelani Cyper Direct Examination	210	
15	Jeff Bloom	210	
16	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	213 215	
17	Samuel Campbell	210	
18	Direct Examination	219	
19	Michael Pietsch Direct Examination	221	
20	Melissa Ginella	221	
21	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	225 226	
22	Sean Anderson	220	
23	Direct Examination	227 230	
24	Cross-Examination/County	230	
25	Ken Church Direct Examination	233	

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha mai kakou; good morning.

This is the April 28, 2021 Land Use

Commission meeting, which is being held using

recently upgraded interactive conference technology

linking video conference participants and other

interested individuals of the public via the ZOOM

internet conferencing platform to comply with the

State and County official operational directives

during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Members of the public are able to view the meeting via the ZOOM webinar platform. I will depart from my script briefly to say, if this is your first time, that means if you are attending, you only see us, you cannot be seen or heard at this time. But when it's time for public testimony on the matter that you are interested in, which is for most people in this audience primarily our second major agenda item, the City and County of Honolulu's proposal regarding Important Agricultural Lands.

One by one you'll be admitted into the meeting to testify. At that time you can be seen and heard by all the panelist.

So for you who might come in later, and for everybody who is in the panelist now, I'd like to

emphasize the importance of speaking slowly, clearly and directly into your microphone. Before speaking, please state your name and identify yourself for the record.

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

The ZOOM conferencing technology, again, recently upgraded to allow many more participants, allows each of the parties and each individual Commissioner individual remote access to this meeting via our own individual personal digital devices.

Because of that, please note that due to matters entirely outside of our control, occasional disruptions may occur for one or more members of the meeting at any given time. If such disruptions occur, please be patient and let us know as we try to restore audio/visual signals so we can conduct business.

For members of the public who wish to publicly testify during the appropriate agenda item, the way that you signify your desire to testify, if

you're accessing this via smart phone or desktop ZOOM software, you press the "raise-hand" button. If you are calling in by phone, you press *9 to raise your hand, and *9 to lower your hand; and *6 to request to be unmuted. And, again, I will repeat these directions when it comes time for testimony on Important Agricultural Lands and other agenda items.

I will share for participants, we will take breaks from time too time. The LUC conducts quasi-judicial meetings. In addition, we have a court reporter, and among other things we need to give a period of rest to our court reporter once every hour or so.

So everyone, my name is Jonathan Likeke

Scheuer. I currently have the honor and pleasure of serving as LUC Chair. Along with me, Commissioners

Ed Aczon, Dawn Chang, Gary Okuda, Arnold Wong, our

LUC Executive Officer Daniel Orodenker, our Chief

Planner Scott Derrickson, our Chief Clerk, Riley

Hakoda, Deputy Attorney General Julie China, our

Program Specialist Natasha Quinones, and our Court

Reporter, Jean McManus are all on the Island of Oahu.

Commissioner Nancy Cabral is on Hawaii Island,

Commissioner Lee Ohigashi is on Maui, and

Commissioner Dan Giovanni is on Kauai. I'm not sure

if he's reentered the meeting yet. I don't see him.

Because we are eight Commissioners of a possible nine, I will also note at this time for members of the public who perhaps never even heard of the LUC until you received a notice from us recently, that all eight Commissioners, we serve as volunteers. We are not paid to do this job. We volunteer for it. We have been appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate. Should you not like any of our performance, and any of us are up for reconfirmation, these are public hearings at the State Senate. You can comment whether you like or dislike, and feel whether or not we need to be reappointed.

But we are volunteers, so we especially feel for most of you taking time off from paid work.

I will note today Commission Edmund Aczon needs to leave today at 1:45 with the possibility of rejoining us at $2:45~\mathrm{p.m.}$

Our intention will be to go to approximately 4:30 given the extensive amount of public testimony that's participating.

Our first order of business is adoption of the April 14th and 15th minutes. I will note that they are not ready for approval yet. Our staff has been fielding a huge number of inquiries regarding

the Important Agricultural matter, so we will defer
the approval of the minutes.

Our next agenda item is the tentative meeting schedule. Mr. Orodenker, please go over the tentative meeting schedule.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Tentatively we're having a meeting today. We anticipate this meeting to be continued until tomorrow on the Important Agricultural Land matter, that's the 29th.

May 12th we are having a hearing on HoKua Place matter as well May 13th.

May 26th and 27, once again holding the hearing on Oahu IAL matter.

On June 9th we will be taking up SP06-400 Pohakea Maui matter.

On June 10th we will be taking up the 21-411 AES West Oahu Solar matter, and if time allows the HoKua Place matter.

On June 23rd we will be taking up the Kula Ridge matter; and once again, if necessary, HoKua Place. June 24th is also set aside for that matter.

Mr. Chair, that is as far as we want to take our schedule at this point because right now it is in flux. We request that the Commissioners keep

the tentative dates open in anticipation of
(indecipherable).

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Orodenker.

Commissioners, any questions on our tentative meeting schedule? I note the presence of Commissioner Giovanni as well.

So folks who are waiting and have been already very patient, we have one other agenda item to consider prior to taking up the City and County regarding Important Agricultural Land designation.

A&B PROPERTIES, INC., (Maui)

And that is the next agenda item. Docket A07-772 Alexander & Baldwin Properties, Inc. (Maui) their Petition To Consider Petitioner's Motion for Order to Extend Time in Docket No. A07-772 in which the Commission granted the reclassification of approximately 94.352 acres of land from the Agricultural District to the Urban District at Waiakoa, Maui, for single-and multi-family residential units, and commercial services at TMK Nos. 3-8-04: Por.2, por.22 and por.30.

Will the parties please identify yourself for the record.

MR. MATSUBARA: Good morning,

Commissioners. Benjamin Matsubara and Curtis Tabata on behalf of A&B Properties Hawaii LLC, Series T.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have any of your clients with you, or do they need to be admitted?

MR. MATSUBARA: I have two witnesses in the audience, and I believe there's a public witness also on this Petition.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County of Maui.

MR. HOPPER: Thank you, Chair. Michael
Hopper, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Maui County
Corporation Counsel Office representing Maui County
Department of Planning. With me is Planning Director
Jordan Hart. At 11:00 o'clock I believe Michele
McLean will be joining us for the department, should
the meeting go that long.

I do believe Kurt Wollenhaupt will be joining us as an attendee, but I haven't checked for his name, but he maybe available as well.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning.

MR. YEE: Good morning, Deputy Attorney

General, Bryan Yee on behalf of Office of Planning.

With me is Alison Kato, the new OP Deputy Attorney

General who will be representing the Office of

Planning in all new matters. We welcome her for this

1 hearing today.

With me as well is Rodney Funakoshi from the Office of Planning.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Now, let me update record on this docket.

On February 20th, 2019, the Land Use

Commission approved the reclassification of

approximately 94.352 acres, the Petition Area,

situated at Waiakoa, Island of Maui, identified as

Tax Map Key No. 3-8-004, portion of 22 and portion of

30, and shown on attached map to this item on our

website from Exhibit A, from the State Agricultural

District into the State Urban District.

On February 27, 2009 the Commission received Notice of Imposition of Conditions by the Land Use Commission from Petitioner.

On April 6, 2009, the Commission received the Declaration of Conditions.

On November 17, 2020, the Commission received Petitioner's Motion for Order Granting Time Extension and Exhibits 1 through 8.

On November 24th, 2020, the Commission received OP's Request for Extension of Time to Respond to Petitioner's Motion.

On November 30, 2020, the Land Use

1 | Commission responded to OP's request.

On December 3rd, 2020, the Commission received OP's second Request for Extension of Time to Respond to Petitioner's Motion.

On December 8, 2020, the LUC responded to the Office of Planning's second request.

On January 11th, the Petitioner filed a Request for Hearing date.

On January 21st, the Petitioner filed its First Amendment to Motion for Order Granting Time Extension and Exhibit 9.

On April 13, the Commission received the Petitioner's witness list, Exhibit List, Exhibit 10 and Certificate of Service.

April 15th, the Commission received Office of Planning's Response to Petitioner's Motion.

On April 20, the Commission received County of Maui's Department of Planning's Position Statement on Motion for Order Granting Time Extension.

And on the same day, the Commission mailed out the meeting Agenda for April 28 to 29th meeting to the parties in this docket and to the Statewide and County mailing lists.

I will first give the opportunity for Petitioner to comment on Commission's Polity

governing reimbursement of hearing expenses. 1

Then I will recognize any written testimony on this docket item, which is not the County IAL item, but a separate docket on Maui.

I will then call for any individuals who want to provide public testimony for this docket to identify themselves using the "raise-hand" function. I will call them in, offer them two minutes to testify, then they will be available for questions by the Petitioner, County, Office of Planning and the Commission.

Following that, the Petitioner will make their presentation. After the Petitioner's presentation, there will be questions from the Commissioners. Following that the same procedure for County of Maui and Office of Planning.

Petitioner will be given any chance for rebuttal. After all the parties represented arguments, the Commission will conduct deliberations, and again, from time to time, approximately every 50 minutes, I will call for a ten-minute break.

Any questions for our procedures today?

MR. MATSUBARA: No questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOPPER: No, Chair.

MR. YEE: No questions.

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Hakoda, is there 2 anybody who wishes to provide public testimony --3 first, actually, Petitioner, you're familiar with the 4 Commission's policy and rulings regarding 5 reimbursement of hearing expenses? 6 MR. MATSUBARA: Yes, we are familiar and we 7 agree. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: With that, Mr. 8 9 Hakoda, any written public testimony on this agenda 10 item? 11 CHIEF CLERK: Chair, this is Riley. 12 have not received any written testimony on this 13 docket matter. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So I'm going to ask 15 folks in the audience now who are attendees in this 16 webinar platform to use your "raise-your-hand" 17 function if you wish to testify on this matter, which 18 is extension of time regarding reclassification of 19 lands on Maui. If you could lower your hand, 20 otherwise I'm going to think that you're going to 21 testify on this item. 22 Thank you very much, super helpful.

23

24

25

I'm going to first admit -- this is regarding this docket item. I'm going to first admit Sylvia Chiappetta, promote you to be a panelist.

1 Pay attention everyone, this is how we go 2 through with public witnesses when you're allowed in. 3 Please enable your audio and video which you will be able to do when you're allowed in. 4 5 Ms. Chiappetta, you've been admitted. You 6 should see at the bottom of your screen to enable audio and video. If not, I'm going to briefly, at 7 8 least, move you back to being an attendee. If you 9 really want to testify on this agenda item, I would 10 encourage you to keep your hand raised. 11 At this time, I'm going to call on Mr. 12 Grant Chun and promote him to be a panelist whose 13 hand is raised on this matter. 14 Mr. Chun, as you're admitted to the 15 meeting, please enable your audio and video. Can you 16 say something so we can hear you? 17 THE WITNESS: Can you hear me? 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, we can. I'm 19 confirming you wish to testify on this Maui docket. 20 You need to speak up more clearly. You have to hold 2.1 your microphone like this (indicating). 22 THE WITNESS: This better? 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Far better.

I'm going to swear you in and ask you to

state your name and address for the record.

24

1 Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're 2 about to give is the truth? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your 4 name and address for the record and proceed. 5 6 GRANT CHUN 7 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 8 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 9 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 THE WITNESS: Grant Chun, 200 Hina Avenue, 12 Kahului, Hawaii. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 14 THE WITNESS: Good morning, Mr. Chair, 15 Members. My name is Grant Chun and I'm the Executive Director of Hale Mahaolu, a nonprofit providing 16 17 affordable rental housing, especially focused on senior citizens based on Maui. 18 19 We have 17 different properties comprised 20 of approximately 1200 units on Maui, Molokai and 21 Lanai. 22 Just by way of background, prior to joining Hale Mahaolu in 2017, I was the Vice President of A&B 23 24 Properties Maui from 2003 to 2017. 25 Prior to that I served as Managing Director of the County of Maui and also worked for 12 years as an attorney in private practice.

I'm here today to ensure that the record reflects the acute need we have on Maui for housing for our residents.

Aside from making my career here, I also grew up on Maui, so I've seen how our real estate market has evolved. It would not be an exaggeration when I say that I have never seen our housing market in such desperate need of inventory.

Prices are at an all time high driven by natural and steady demand, short supply, and very low interest rates.

Maui needs both rental housing as well as opportunities for homeownership at all levels in the market, entry level as well as senior citizen housing.

This housing is needed in both the affordable as well as in market realm. Without increased inventory in all categories of housing, it is not possible for families in existing housing to move to other homes as their needs evolve, without the natural ability for families to move to larger homes as their families grow, or downsize as their needs change later in life.

We have a market place that makes it much more difficult for a young family to get started on the path to homeownership. That's why it was so satisfying for me when I was involved with the team that brought Kamalani to market a few year ago.

We worked with Hale Mahaolu to provide home buyer education to over 200 families. And as a result, families that had never previously owned their homes were able to experience the pride of owning a new home in a planned community, with planned bikeways and future community center.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Two minutes. If I can ask you to summarize, please.

THE WITNESS: Each of the units has a private yard, and the prices started at below 300,000. I hope that you will look favorable upon Kamalani's request, which will allow more than 460 new families to experience the same pride and stability in their lives.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chun.

Since you are well familiar with our proceedings, I would like to make you available for questions, if any, from Petitioner, the County,

```
Office of Planing and the Commissioners.
1
2
               Any questions for the witness?
 3
               MR. MATSUBARA: No questions from
 4
      Petitioner. Thank you, Grant.
5
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Hopper?
 6
               MR. HOPPER: No questions, Chair.
7
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Yee?
               MR. YEE: No questions. Thank you.
8
9
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner's, any
10
     questions?
                Commissioner Cabral.
11
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I would like to
12
13
     basically thank Mr. Chun for coming forward, actually
14
      thank you for apparently giving your life to help
15
     with housing. I'm here on the Big Island. And
16
     housing is kind of my thing. And your presentation
17
      (indecipherable) -- and get on my own soapbox,
     because I see it. We need to do so many more things
18
19
     to allow for more housing (indecipherable) -- once we
     have supply and demand.
20
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral,
22
     your audio is not particularly clear today.
23
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'm sorry for that. I
24
     wanted to thank Mr. Chun. Thank you very much for
```

your presentation and dedicating your life and years

- 1 for dedicating housing.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further,
- 3 Commissioners?
- If not, thank you very much for your
- 5 testimony and being here today and your patience.
- 6 I'm going to move you back to being an attendee, and
- 7 I'm going to admit Michael Hamasu.
- 8 MR. MATSUBARA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mike
- 9 Hamasu is one of the witnesses I was going to call,
- 10 | so I will be calling him later in the presentation
- 11 after my first witness testifies.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You can turn your
- 13 video off and just hang out while we wait for you.
- 14 Mahalo.
- Any other members of the public who wish to
- 16 testify on this item regarding extension of time
- 17 request on a project on Maui? Seeing none.
- That will be the close of public testimony
- 19 on this docket item, and Mr. Matsubara, you can begin
- 20 | with your presentation.
- MR. MATSUBARA: Thank you.
- Chairman Scheuer, Commission members, Ben
- 23 Matsubara and Curtis Tabata on behalf of A&B
- 24 Properties Hawaii, LLC, Series T.
- We're asking for two things in this motion

we filed. One is to represent A&B Properties Hawaii,

LLC, Series T as successor Petitioner to A&B

Properties, Inc.

And secondly, to allow us an extension of time on the Conditions 22 and 23 of the D&O you issued in 2009.

We got to our first request. The

Petitioner at that time we filed this District

Boundary Amendment was A&B Properties. Since that

time, in 2016 it was converted to A&B Hawaii, LLC,

Series T, who would like at this time to be

considered as successor Petitioner.

Our second request relates to the time extension we're requesting. Originally in 2009, ten years was granted from the date of your Decision and Order to provide all the backbone infrastructure needed for the project.

After we left you in 2009 we proceeded with the entitlement requirements of Maui County, and that took us five-and-a-half years of the ten years you gave us. So as a result we will be needing additional time to complete the project.

We have just finished Increment 1, and have 170 homes sold that satisfy the affordable housing provision attached to our Petition.

My request relating to Condition 23 and the 1 2 language thereon, I'll address after my witnesses 3 regarding the extension of time as have testified. 4 The first witness I will call will be 5 Natalie Kiehm, the Vice President of A&B Properties 6 Hawaii, LLP, Series T to provide background on the 7 entitlement process undertaken with Maui County to 8 satisfy the County entitlement requirements. My second witness Michael Hamasu who will 9 10 testify on the economic impact of COVID-19 on the 11 Kamalani project. 12 The first witness will be Natalie Kiehm. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 14 affirm the testimony you're about to give is the 15 truth? 16 THE WITNESS: I do 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Your witness. NATALIE KIEHM 18 19 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 20 Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined 21 and testified as follows: 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. MATSUBARA: 24 Good, morning, Natalie. Q 25 Good morning. Α

Q State your name and business address for the record, please.

- A My name is Natalie Kiehm, and my address is 822 Bishop Street in Honolulu, Hawaii.
 - Q Where are you employed, Natalie?
- A I'm employed by A&B Properties Hawaii, LLC, Series T.
- Q What are your responsibilities in regard to this particular project, Kamalani?
- A So I have been the project team leader for Kamalani, and I have oversight responsibilities for the planning, design, construction, sales and marketing and finance activities for the project.
- Q After A&B -- I'll just say A&B received approval for this District Boundary Amendment from the LUC -- the Maui entitlement process began.
- Could you give the Commission a brief summary of the steps undertaken and the time period it took?
- A So after the State Land Use Commission approved the project in February 2, 2009, we were planning to file for a Community Plan Amendment as well as change in zoning, but we were unable to because at that time the County of Maui's Planning Department had a policy of not supporting any

Community Plan Amendments, because the Maui Island
Plan was in its update phase. And subsequent to
that, at the end of 2009, they reversed that policy.
And we applied for the change in zoning and community
plan amendment in April of 2010; received Planning
Commission approval for the project. And it was
referred to the Maui County Council at the end of
2010.

At that juncture, the council was still reviewing and deliberating on the Maui Island Plan, and that plan was not approved until December 2012.

So thereafter, our change in zoning and community plan amendment started through the process at the County Council, and we started public hearings.

By then that was 2013. So in August of 2014 we received County Council -- well, we received full approval at that point in time. The mayor signed off in August of 2014. So that in total took five-and-a-half years.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Matsubara, if I may. I don't at all -- so do not misunderstand my comments -- want to deprive you or your client of your ability to thoroughly present a case today. But I'm also painfully cognizant of the 176 people

waiting in the attendee function for the next agenda

item.

MR. MATSUBARA: Let me just say this. We have attached exhibits to our motion, which

Exhibit 3, for example, is our status report to you that explains in detail the entitlement process we went to Maui County and the dates and the times, and we indicate the current status of the project.

We built 170 affordable homes in the first increment, and are working on Increment 2 and 3. And that, because of COVID, we've been severely impacted in terms of sales and proceeding with construction and so on.

And all of those exhibits are attached to our motion, and have been verified by this witness, Natalie Kiehm.

So unless there's specific questions, that basically, in a nutshell, would cover what I wanted to illicit from Natalie.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I very much appreciate it, Mr. Matsubara. If you're done, I'm going to offer questioning of the witness to the other parties.

Any questions for the witness, Maui County, Mr. Hopper?

1 MR. HOPPER: No questions, Chair. 2 you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Yee? 3 MR. YEE: No questions, thank you. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 6 Commissioner Okuda. 7 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm cognizant of the time constraints here. 8 9 Mr. Matsubara, can you answer this question 10 if it is more efficient, and I would take his answer 11 as also an offer of proof. 12 Is there any danger to the community by 13 allowing the substitution of parties, that somehow 14 the successor or the present entity, the Series T A&B entity is somehow less financially solvent to carry 15 16 out its promises, because as you know, one concern 17 the LUC always has, we want to make sure that when 18 promises are made to the community, those promises 19 are kept. 20 Is there any solvency issue, or is the 21 solvency of both the original Petitioner and the 22 successor in interest the same? 23 And, Mr. Matsubara, you can present an 24 offer of proof on that.

MR. MATSUBARA: Regard to that question,

there's nothing I've seen in regard to the transfer 1 2 that would affect the solvency between the original 3 Petitioner and the Petitioner we're asking to substitute at this time. It would still be basically 4 A&B that stands behind all the projects they have 5 6 committed to. 7 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much, and I do agree, Chair, that Mr. Matsubara's 8 9 documentation, if I may say, as usual is very 10 complete, very thoughtful and pursuant to the law. 11 Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. 13 Any other questions for Ms. Kiehm from the 14 Commissioners? If not, any redirect, Mr. Matsubara? 15 MR. MATSUBARA: No redirect, Mr. Chair. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much 17 as well. Sorry to cut you short. I know you'll 18 appreciate the reasons. 19 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Chair. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You're ready for your 21 second witness, Mr. Matsubara? 22 MR. MATSUBARA: Michael Hamasu. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 24 affirm the testimony you're about to give is the

25

truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 1 2 MICHAEL HAMASU 3 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 4 Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined 5 and testified as follows: 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MATSUBARA: 7 8 Would you state your name and address, 9 please? 10 Michael Brian Hamasu, 220 S. King Street, Suite 1800, Honolulu, Hawaii. 11 We have asked you to prepare a study on the 12 13 impact COVID-19 has had on the Kamalani project, and 14 especially in view of us proceeding with Increment 2 15 and 3. And you provided a report which we filed and included as Exhibit 10. 16 17 Could you basically summarize your findings 18 and conclusions in regard to that issue that we asked 19 you to testify? 20 But before you proceed, you've been 21 qualified as an expert by LUC in terms of market 22 analysis absorption and economics, have you not? 23 Yes, I have. Α 24 Q Thank you. 25 I would like to have Mr. Hamasu qualified

1 as an expert, Mr. Chair. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any objections, Maui 3 County? 4 MR. HOPPER: No objections, Chair. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 5 6 MR. YEE: No objection. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 7 Seeing none, so qualified. Please proceed. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioners and 10 Chairman. 11 Basically what I was brought in to do was evaluate Maui's residential marketplace as well as 12 13 its impact from an economics perspective due to 14 COVID. 15 So I realize you have a shortage of time, 16 so I'm going to quickly summarize. 17 Based on the data that we compiled from both DBED and from UHERO both forecast anticipated 18 19 recovery to Maui and Hawaii's economy will not occur until well after 2023. 20 21 Job growth (indecipherable) -- they are

What has also been impacted is Maui home sales. At the end of 2020, when we compare the data to 2019, there was a 12.4 percent decline in a number

very familiar with what has occurred.

22

23

24

of home transactions that occurred on Maui, despite median home prices rising by 17 percent to buy (indecipherable) at the end of the year.

We also evaluated data for the Kihei and Wailea area where the Kamalani project is located, and similarly that submarket of Maui was adversely affected by the 21.6 percent drop in home sales over the past year.

The reason why we brought up evaluation of the economy is because of the way the Kamalani buyer pool, so out of 170 units that were sold at Kamalani to workforce homes, basically 69 percent of those were owner users, and about 136 out of 170 were sold to Maui residents.

We took a quick analysis of where these buyers were employed at, and 27 percent were employed by the hospitality industry, 18 percent employed by education, 15 percent by construction, and 15 percent by health care. So you can see it's a broad brush of the Maui employment scene.

As a result of the pandemic, jobs were lost in that year end 2020, there was about 22,000 jobs total lost, majority of these sectors that I just mentioned where the buyers were located had been adversely affected as well.

So what we're trying to present here is a case that the recovery of the economy doesn't occur until well after 2023, and a lot of the jobs that had been impacted such as hospitality, retail, construction and education will not be replaced in that time period.

The Kamalani Increment 2 and 3 would be adversely affected by the fact that a lot of these people that were employed by these sectors would not likely jump out and buy a new house right away because as a result they are probably very conservative. If they lost their jobs, they're not going to be spending a lot of money on buying a new home.

So realizing this, that was the second point, other than the fact that the economy will not recover until 2023, '24 at the soonest, that the Kamalani buyer profile is adversely affected by the economy, will not buy homes right away.

We all know that residential real estate is cyclical, and despite all that's happened, low interest rates and the boom in buying on Maui, a lot of those home sales were attributed to offshore buyers. Those offshore buyers were the primary reasons that median home prices shot up dramatically

just in the last quarter alone.

And the last point I wanted to raise in conclusion is that the first increment of Kamalani roughly sold about seven units per month. And if we were given the authority to move forward on 460 units, that would take five-and-a-half years to sell out. Not to mention this extension is asking for ten years, we're already about two-and-a-half years past the 2019 deadline.

So if we add two-and-a-half years, plus five-and-a-half years, plus probably two years required for design and continued infrastructure development, we're looking at close to ten years in the most optimistic of scenarios to move forward on the project.

So those are the four or five major points I wanted to raise in the study that was conducted.

Q Thank you, Mike.

So basically the buyers we were designing this project for, which are Maui residents, because of COVID, have been more severely impacted based on the characteristics of the buyer pool for our first increments where so many of them employed in the hospitality industry?

A That is correct.

And the inability to market or sell these 1 2 homes would affect the volume and speed by which the 3 rest of the project could be developed and sold; 4 correct? 5 Α That is correct. Thank you. 6 0 7 MR. MATSUBARA: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 10 Mr. Matsubara. 11 Are there questions for the witness from 12 the County of Maui? 13 MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 15 Office of Planning? 16 MR. YEE: No questions. Thank you. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, starting with Commissioner Giovanni. 18 19 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair. 20 Mr. Hamasu, I find your testimony to be 21 very interesting, and perhaps to have applicability 22 beyond the instant docket. 23 Would you characterize your findings and 24 conclusions to be unique for the property that is the

subject of this Petition? Or would you find your

conclusion and findings to be more broadly applicable throughout the State of Hawaii regarding the buyer's market for affordable housing?

THE WITNESS: Very good question. We did analyze for -- the garbage truck is running up the hill here, I'll hold off on speaking.

We actually did analysis of Maui County in particular, and it was definitely impacted by offshore buyers in terms of median home price rising and shortage of supply, all of which contributed in addition to the low interest rates that probably helped in the spike. First quarter 2021 we have all seen dramatic increase in homes sales.

And a lot of that was driven by U.S. mainland buyers that were trying to escape metropolitan areas on the mainland, because they could work from home, so why not pick Maui as a place to work from home.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: We have observed on other islands the same type of price spike and low demand. So would you speculate that the scenario which you described specific to this project might be applicable for other islands as well that are considering affordable housing development?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I would agree with that.

1 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair.

I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Commissioner Giovanni.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just have some -- my question is this.

Seems as though that 2019 we were like, according to your documents, like three years behind your schedule. It took additional 2011 to 2014 to obtain zoning approval. I was looking at that.

Are you saying the 2020 events compounded this, and that is why you're requiring 2020 to 2029?

And if so, because it's immeasurable as to when the recovery would take place, would there be a necessity to take a look at further extension than 2029?

THE WITNESS: Well, the report findings indicated that even under the most optimistic of scenarios, based on delay, in terms of approvals, compounded with the need for additional time for both design and development of the next increments as well as possibly the impact of current economic climate, yeah, there is that possibility that it would take longer than just the initial ten years to get the two increments completed and sold.

But I would defer to Ben and to Natalie in regards to what their long-range plans are.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Only talking about the backbone infrastructure, right, Mr. Matsubara?

MR. MATSUBARA: Right, to complete the backbone infrastructure. But the construction of the backbone infrastructure proceeds hand and hand with the development sales of homes.

So the sale of homes has impact on how fast we can move along with constructing infrastructure, and the concern we had was that many of the buyers we design these homes for will still have some impact, even though they're employed again, because of COVID-19.

Based on -- and I misspoke -- Michael also studied the attached report is Exhibit 9, not Exhibit 10.

And on the last page of that report he points out three different scenarios on completion, and the most optimistic is 9.8 years. The base case would be 11.1 years, and the pessimistic case would be 12.6 years.

Considering that we're applying for this extension now, as opposed to 2019, we've lost some years. So I would like to basically extend it from

the time you give us this decision. But there was 1 2 some concern by other parties that we should stick 3 with the original amount that you gave us, which is 4 ten years, even though the ten years would begin from 5 this decision, which will be several years past the 6 expiration of the original ten years. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Matsubara, we're still under questioning for your witness. 8 9 Was there anything further, Commissioner 10 Ohigashi? 11 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: No, but I had some questions for Mr. Matsubara directly, if possible. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me see if there's 14 any other questions for this witness. 15 Commissioners? 16 Mr. Hamasu, can I just ask you to restate 17 the percentage of the units at Kamalani that were acquired by Maui County and/or Hawaii residents? 18 19 THE WITNESS: That would be 69 percent of 20 170 homes. 2.1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And that was Maui 22 residents or Hawaii residents? 23 THE WITNESS: Both. Maui residents, it was 2.4 136 out of 170 sold to actual Maui residents.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:

Thank you very much.

25

Mr. Ohigashi, I'll leave it up to you. Do you want to ask your questions of Mr. Matsubara now or should we go on with presentation from Maui County and Office of Planning?

commissioner ohigashi: Just to follow up on my previous question. My question is, are we really short changing the timeframe here? And is there sufficient evidence that you believe that you provide that supports additional time be granted by Land Use Commission?

If so, based on the projections that you outlined in -- based on those projections that you outlined by Mr. Hamasu, whether or not that would support additional time, at lease maybe 11 years, given the pessimistic outlook of what -- (indecipherable)?

MR. MATSUBARA: I believe Exhibit 9, which is Mr. Hamasu's report, states the reasons as to why Kamalani may be developed in terms of construction scheduling. And on the last page, page 13 of his report, he has those three different scenarios. And yes, 11 years would be helpful, especially if the 11 years ran from the date of your decision on this motion, that would give us time -- not that I don't want to come back and appear before you again -- but

I think reasonably and logically based on data, COVID and the unknown factors, that would be safe and appreciated, because A&B's plan is to proceed as quickly as possible and develop and sell the homes.

They will not sit and wait if they finish building all the homes and are ready for sale. But an extra buffer based on the unknown factors created by COVID would be very helpful. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Would your client accept the ten-year extension from the date of approval this -- of your motion, assuming that it is approved?

MR. MATSUBARA: Yes, if the time runs from this decision, that would be very helpful.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I don't have any further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please continue with your presentation, if any, Mr. Matsubara.

MR. MATSUBARA: The only additional thing I was going to add was that at your Staff's suggestion, we distributed a stipulated decision and order to the parties to see whether or not there were any concerns with what was being proposed by this motion, and whether there were language changes or things that could be resolved ahead of time.

Based on discussions we have had and communications we have had with the parties, we believe the proposed D and O we submitted, except for Condition 23, which Office of Planning has concerns with, has been -- is acceptable.

So I would just, basically, like to comment on our reasons for drafting our Condition 23, our proposed Condition 23 as it was drafted.

And basically the reason is to make the language consistent with your statute, 205-4(g) based on the 1990 amendment which specifically had the provision that uses "commencement" as the threshold as opposed to "completion".

The second reason was the Hawaii Supreme

Court decision in Bridge Aina Lea uses the standard

of substantial commencement. And in your recent

decision on Hawaiian Memorial Park last year in

October, you used that language in your Condition 18.

So since the language that is currently in the D and O for Kamalani occurred in 2009, and since that time various things have occurred, we were just asking to update the wording of the language so it's consistent with statute, case law and what you did last year.

That was the only further comment I had in

1 regard to our proposal, Mr. Chair.

presentation.

- 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr.
- 3 Matsubara. I appreciate your condensing of your
- 5 Commissioners, are there any questions for 6 the Petitioner? Commissioner Okuda.
- 7 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- As a followup question to Mr. Matsubara's statement.
 - Mr. Matsubara, do you have any response to the Office of Planning's concern that to allow these types of amendments may result in allowing amendments to D and O's issued by the Land Use Commission way after the fact that it undermines the Doctrine of Finality of Orders?

Do you have a response to the Office of Planning's concerns of which I've tried to summarize?

MR. MATSUBARA: I recognize and honor also the concept of Finality of Decisions. The only reason I'm doing this is for the Commission's purposes in terms of their decisions and orders that the consistency occur.

So in terms of any potential challenges that come up, you're covered. You're consistent pursuant to the statute, case law, and prior

decisions. So that's the only reason why. I'm not 1 2 asking to change anything, I'm just saying let's be 3 consistent. And if you agree, fine; if not, I 4 understand, but that's the reason why. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further, 6 Commissioner Okuda? 7 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: No. Thank you, Mr. Matsubara, for that explanation. Thank you very 8 9 much. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further for Mr. Matsubara at this time, Commissioners? 11 12 Seeing none. Before I call on the County, 13 for all of you patiently attending and wondering how 14 long will this go on, we don't exactly know on any particular docket. We try to be efficient while 15 16 granting due process. 17 So my guess is this is going well, but I 18 won't prejudge. 19 With that, Mr. Hopper for County? 20 MR. HOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm 21 going to try to be brief here. I don't think it's 22 necessary to call someone from the Planning

Essentially the County does support the

Department. I think I can try to summarize the

23

24

25

County's position.

- 1 time extension, and the amendment to Condition No.
- 2 | 22. This is not a case like some of the others that
- 3 | we have seen where really nothing's happened since
- 4 approval.
- 5 As you heard, a substantial number of units
- 6 have been built, so County is optimistic that the
- 7 project can continue on, and is supportive of the
- 8 | time extension, the request in amendment to Condition
- 9 No. 22.
- 10 With respect to Condition 23, the County
- 11 does not take a position. We understand there's a
- 12 | bit of discussion between Office of Planning and
- 13 Petitioner on this issue, and certainly LUC can
- 14 resolve that as it sees fit.
- But at this stage, we support the amendment
- 16 to Condition 22 and are available for questions.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
- Any questioners, Commissioners?
- Commissioner Ohigashi.
- COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Hopper, do you
- 21 object to adding, extending the date to
- 22 February 20th, 2031 on Condition 22?
- MR. HOPPER: When that came up,
- 24 Commissioner, I did email the department to check
- with them. I needed to check with my clients on

that. I don't necessarily anticipate a problem, but
I didn't want to speak without asking, since that's
different than what was proposed. I think it's up to
the Commission, and if I get a response, I'll let you
know. But right now we don't have a clear position
on extending that time since that wasn't originally
requested.

MR. HOPPER: He actually had to go to the Molokai Planning Commission, Chair, but we do have Kurt Wollenhaupt, and I've emailed the Director, so hopefully we will hear, but if not, then I can't really offer a position right now.

 $\label{eq:Chairperson Scheuer: Further questions for $$\operatorname{Mr. Hopper}$ at this time?$

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Hopper, we hear it over and over again about some of the delays, and when we look at our housing crisis that we have, clearly Maui has a crisis as the entire state does; and yet it took five-plus years to just get to the starting gate here.

Has Maui found a way to get over that? I

mean, does government even realize how much of a huge part of the problem they are, and why we have a housing crisis? I mean, back when the single-wall little redwood homes could get built and you could get them approved, and could get them built within a couple of months, we didn't have a housing problem.

Has Maui -- I guess my question is, has

Maui County recognized this, and have you done

anything in these prior -- in the last five years to

help improve on this problem, or is it still bogged

down in bureaucratic minutiae?

That's my question. Has anything improved?

MR. HOPPER: I'll do my best to answer at least with respect to this project.

The general issue is something that you cite is I think probably a statewide issue where you have the interest of making sure that the development process is conducted in a responsible manner, as well as not trying to, you know, delay projects that have merit that would result in houses being built.

In this particular case, I think one thing that happened, if I recall, was that the Maui Island Plan was in the process of being adopted while this project was coming through, and the County had concerns about the project going forward before that

Maui Island Plan was adopted which would have growth boundaries showing where growth would occur.

This project did end up being in that. I think adopting those boundaries, and that plan being adopted should assist in that clarity, but that may have been one of the reasons for the delay in this case, because that plan was in the middle of being updated, and was something that was important to have updated at the time and has since been updated.

But your general issue I think is probably one that's going to be present across the State, and we will continue to grapple with recognizing that it's important to have responsible development.

Particularly when considering the constitutional requirements of, you know, allowing projects to go forward that will have a permanent affect on the land, and certainly recognizing the need for housing for residents.

I think you've certainly, you know, have repeatedly discussions at your meetings, and it's an issue that is a statewide issue.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Hopper.

Anything further, Commissioner Cabral? Any further questions for Maui County at this time?

1 I note the presence of Ms. McLean. 2 MS. McLEAN: I apologize for being late. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No problem. 4 There was a specific question. I don't 5 know if you were in attendance regarding potentially 6 giving further extension of date. 7 Do you have a response to that question? MS. McLEAN: We do not object to adding 8 9 another two years. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm sorry, actually 11 do you swear or affirm the testimony you gave is the 12 truth? 13 THE WITNESS: I do swear. 14 MICHELE McLEAN 15 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the County of Maui, was sworn to tell the truth, was 16 17 examined and testified: 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Rather you just did. 19 THE WITNESS: I swear to that too. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further, Mr. 21 Hopper? 22 MR. HOPPER: No, Chair. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any other questions 24 for Mr. Hopper at this time? If not, Mr. Yee, how 25 long do you think need?

1 MR. YEE: Minutes, ten minutes.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So it's 10:42 A.M.
3 We have been going a full hour. I'm going to take

Commission deliberations. Break until 10:52.

We have been going a full hour. I'm going to take a ten-minute break and we will reconvene at 10:52 A.M., hearing from the Office of Planning, any final comments from the Petitioner and then moving onto

(Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Back on the record, 10:52. Moving on, presentation of Mr. Yee from Office of Planning.

MR. YEE: Thank you. The Office of Planning supports the motion. We believe that they have documented the reasons why they need the additional time, and I think it's been well presented.

We also have no objections to their proposed Condition 22. We note that this particular project was caught up in the Maui Island Plan revision and as, you know, community plans, such as Maui Island Plan, are revised periodically, but in between revisions, individual developments can go to the County and ask that their particular parcel be included within the development boundaries or growth boundaries, which is probably what A&B intended to

ask just for their particular parcel to be allowed to be included in that growth boundary, which would have been a shorter process to amend.

But because it just so happened that Maui
County was in the midst of doing the revision for
their entire Maui Island Plan, the Petitioner had to
wait not just until the issues about their project,
but the issues across the island were worked out. A
long process.

So that obviously did holdup the development through no fault of the Petitioner.

We, the Office of Planning has no objection to the extension until ten years from today, which would be April 28, 2031. We do however have difference of agreement, it's almost -- it's almost a technical difference in agreement regarding an idea of how conditions should or shouldn't be changed.

Office of Planning has strong feelings about fidelity, and that is once a decision is made, that's the decision. Things can change, and if you demonstrate why that natural circumstances changed, we support these amendments, but, you know, to amend conditions simply to reflect the more recent case law we think is not necessary to do.

In this case it's not that hard to look at

the issue, but in other cases a decision as to what is the current case, what is currently reflective of the current case law could be much, much more difficult. So we don't advise, for example, going back to look at various conditions relating to native Hawaiian rights.

Whatever the condition that was placed in the D and O is the condition that exists. That's important actually for developers, because they need certainty if they want to develop. Businesses cannot operate without certainty. So they need to know that whatever decision that was reached and the wording decided on, and after all the appeals processes are over, that's the decision everyone is going to live with.

And the Office of Planning, even though we disagree with the underlying decision, or even if we think that we would have phrased it differently today, we don't support changes to D and O's.

There was a case on Big Island where the Commission made a decision on a piece of property that didn't get enough votes to approve the reclassification, in part because there weren't -- the full Commission was not present at the time of the vote.

Subsequent motion for reconsideration was raised where more Commissioners were present, even though the Office of Planning was supportive of the initial reclassification, we opposed the Motion for Reconsideration because we said once you make a decision, we think everyone just needs to live by it, unless there's a change in the factual circumstances, you don't reconsider.

We don't support generally reconsideration. So finality is a very, very important concept of which the Office of Planning supports.

In that particular case, admittedly the change is consistent with another decision that you reached, but again, it just goes to the issue of we don't support petitioners coming in, or anyone coming in, petitioner, intervenor or whatever, to just revise conditions because we think the law has changed, or because we think we have a better idea of what the condition ought to be, or better wording of how the condition should be stated.

So because of that, we've taken sort of a bright line rule on this and just have asked, or recommended that the Land Use Commission not make the entire change that the Petitioner has asked for in Condition 23, but just made a small revision, which

in light of the more recent request would have to be amended, but in our -- based upon the original request, we said instead of saying within ten years, say within 20 years, a very simple change.

Let me add, given the more recent request, we assumed Condition 23 would be amended to something like if Petitioner fails to complete proposed infrastructure by April 28, 2031, the Commission may issue and serve upon the Petitioner an order to show cause and proceeding on the remainder of the paragraph.

It's a simple fix. It's clear. It accomplishes everything that Petitioner needs, and we don't think it affects any of the rights.

We don't think -- certainly we're not asking to change the rights, whatever rights they have today should be the same rights they have after the Motion to Amend.

We don't think this change, that this more restrictive change would affect that.

So because we don't think it would prejudice the Petitioner, because we have a strong feeling about the concept of finality, and our strong preference for bright line rule on the issue, we support the motion. We recommend that it be adopted,

- 1 Condition 22 be amended as requested, and Condition
- 2 23 be more simply amended as I've laid today.
- 3 Thanks.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Yee.
- 5 Commissioners, questions for the Office of
- 6 Planning.
- 7 Commissioner Okuda.
- 8 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much,
- 9 Mr. Chair.
- Mr. Yee, I'm going to ask you these
- 11 questions about the standard of review, and I'm
- 12 asking specifically you, because the Office of
- 13 | Planning as a State agency and office is essentially
- one of the guardians of the public trust and the
- 15 | public interest. And I'm asking you this question
- because we have used the term that the Land Use
- 17 | Commission is quasi-judicial, meaning we are not like
- 18 | the legislature where we can just make a decision
- 19 willy-nilly. We have to follow the law.
- In some ways we're almost like a jury in a
- 21 courtroom where the judge instructs us as the jury
- 22 | what the law is, and we are to apply to it to the
- evidence presented to us, even if we might not like
- 24 what the law is.
- So, Mr. Yee, what is the rule of law or the

standard we have to apply in determining whether to grant the Petitioner's request for an extension of time? What is the rule that we have to follow to make that decision? Is it simply good cause?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Yee, you're muted.

MR. YEE: Yes, I think broad discretion is given to the Commission. It is restricted -- it's really restricted not by standard of review, but by other laws which may restrict your ability to make changes. So, for example, the taking question. You cannot amend a decision that would violate the takings law or due process or something like that. But the standard in and of itself I think is simply good cause.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And number two, what is the rule of law or the standard that we have to apply to determine whether or not to grant the Petitioner's second request, which is basically if we agree with their presentation, to basically make the language in that condition consistent with, you know, one of the recent Hawaii Supreme Court cases, which is Bridge Aina Lea?

What is the standard or rule that we have to apply to decide whether we can or should or

1 | shouldn't or can't do it?

MR. YEE: I would say it's the same. It's your discretion to decide, again, restricted somewhat to the extent due process, for example, but if you decide that you want -- I am not objecting to the change, because it is outside your jurisdiction or beyond your authority.

I should be clear about that. We're not saying that you have no authority to grant, to agree to Condition 23 as suggested by Petitioner. We're just saying it's a bad idea.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much.

Appreciate your explanation on what law or standard
we have to apply. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Okuda.

Commissioner Chang, you might have had your hand up first.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Yee.

I really do appreciate your rationale and your desire for finality. But let me just ask you, present to you several questions.

Do you believe that the Petitioner would

have come before LUC to amend Condition 23 to be consistent with the law in the absence of this request for time extension?

MR. YEE: In this case, no. The point we're trying to make is not every case will be as simple as this one.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: That's going to be my second point.

I understand OP is wanting to draw a bright line, but wouldn't you agree that LUC can look at, on a case-by-case basis, the fact that we amend Condition 23 to be consistent with the current law does not in any way set a precedent that petitioners will come in to change conditions based upon changes in the law?

MR. YEE: Well, remembering that it's not just Petitioner, and that other intervenors, for example, might come to you -- when you say "precedence", I think if you're asking like a decisive, no, but in terms of coming back to you and citing prior case, saying you did it before, you should do it again, then certainly, yes.

So one is more of a legal obligation. The other is this is a good practice to follow what you did in the past.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And I guess the reason I say "precedence" is OP's position is wanting to draw a bright line so that we don't -- you know, we're not changing conditions. Conditions are final and there's some degree of certainty.

My final question to you is: Doesn't this create an opportunity for Land Use Commission that there are some very outdated conditions that perhaps would have been decided differently by the LUC Commission in light of changes, that when an opportunity comes up to make appropriate amendment based upon, you know, the specific facts, that making these amendments to be consistent with the law is an appropriate action on the part of the Land Use Commission?

MR. YEE: Every Commissioner, every group of Commissioners have used their own judgment to decide what's the best decision to reach.

Part of it is the acceptance, I think, of subsequent Commissioners to say I would not have decided it that way, not going to change the prior decision.

So when you say does it give you an opportunity to rephrase the language of prior D and O's issued in the past, I think that is a temptation

the Office of Planning would generally discourage you from following.

and I want to clarify. I'm not intending to convey a message that we would go back and revisit all of the previous D and O's, but there's somewhat of a benefit on the part of the Petitioner for coming forward and getting an extension, or when they come forward and ask for modification of amendment, that in light of maybe community request that there be some action taken on some of these other conditions, that there is somewhat of a -- I'm not too sure if it's the right word, "quid pro quo", we give you an extension, but also look at some of the conditions to build a community center or to timely build a community center because you have not, and put a specific timeline on it.

Isn't that reasonable?

MR. YEE: I think we would agree, because if the extension causes an impact, so if because you're taking longer, that is causing impact, then I think you can mitigate that impact.

But if you're simply using the extension as a quid pro quo as sort of a contractual leverage to get agreement from a party for something separate

from and unrelated to the extension, the Office of Planning I think would be opposed to that.

I think that's an appropriate use of motion to amend to get something unrelated to the basis of the amendment.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: That's very helpful for me to understand where you draw the line on. So I have no further questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Chang.

Anything further for Mr. Yee? If not, I will ask Mr. Matsubara to make any final presentation and see whether the Commission wishes to enter deliberations on this.

MR. MATSUBARA: In the essence of time, Mr. Chairman, I'll just basically indicate that I believe through witnesses and exhibits we submitted today we've established enough reason why our motion should be granted.

In regard to Condition 23, I leave it to the Commission's discretion to decide how they would like to word or phrase that, and I have nothing further.

The only reason there's some sentimental attachment to that was that in 1990 when the Land Use

Commission and Office of Planning moved to amend

205-4(g) to provide OSC language for purposes of

making sure that petitioners did what they

represented to the Commission they were going to do

when they got their approval, the term they used was

if there was no substantial commencement, the OSC was

the basis or tool the Commission had.

Because at that time Commission was fed up with Petitioners who would come, make grand representations of what they would do, and sat on the property, subsequently sell it at a profit, and the Commissioners hated to be used in such a way.

And that's still -- I was still serving as special deputy at the time, so I know how strongly they felt about that. If they hadn't commenced, the theme for them was "use it or lose it".

So if you haven't used it, you should lose the classification.

Sorry for the digression. I have nothing further.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Petitioner.

Mr. Ohiqashi.

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So the Commission
2	will now conduct formal deliberations on whether or
3	not to deny the motion. I will note for members of
4	the parties as well as the public, that during the
5	deliberations, I won't entertain any additional input
6	from the party or public unless those individual
7	entities are specifically requested to do so by me,
8	and if so, comments be limited to the question at
9	hand.
10	Commissioners, let me confirm with each of
11	you that you have reviewed the record and are
12	prepared to deliberate on the subject docket.
13	After I call your name, please indicate via
14	either "aye" or "nay" that you're prepared to
15	deliberate on this matter.
16	Commissioner Chang?
17	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aye.
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral?
19	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
21	Giovanni?
22	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye.
23	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
24	Ohigashi?
25	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda? 1 2 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Wong? COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon? 5 6 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Yes. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The Chair is also prepared to deliberate on this matter. 8 9 Commissioners, I will entertain a motion 10 that the LUC accepts or does not accept the motion 11 for an order granting a time extension, a motion to 12 take acceptance or nonacceptance of the Petition and 13 any conditions that will apply. Commissioners, what is your pleasure? 14 15 Commissioner Ohigashi, you had raised your 16 hand. 17 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chair, I'm 18 going to make a motion, but several parts. One, I move that we authorize the 19 20 substitution of parties as requested by the 21 Petitioner. 22 Second thing, I move to grant the 23 Petitioner's Motion for Order granting time 24 extension, and amend Condition 22 as proposed by the 25 Petitioner, except that the time date would be

1 extended to April 28, 2031.

Also I would like to Amend Condition 23 as proposed by Office of Planning, and that it would include the planning language that if the participants fail to complete the proposed backbone infrastructure on or before April 28, 2031 and continue on.

Also like to authorize Land Use Commission
Staff to make non-substantive changes to conditions
as appropriate regarding format, style, other
modifications to make sure that there is consistency.

Finally, I'd like to move to authorize the Chair to sign the order on behalf of the Commission.

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{I would be glad to explain my reasons for } \\ \mbox{my motion.}$

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi.

A motion with five parts has been made by Commissioner Ohigashi. Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I would like to second that motion being also from a neighbor island.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry, Commissioner,

I tried to -- I muted you inadvertently. I was
trying to lower your hand. Can you unmute?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'd like to second that

motion.

Ohigashi. Would you like to speak to your motion?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner

extend the time because all indications are that this project has been delayed, not only due to the requirements by the County, but it also appears that the problems of the pandemic have affected it, and I would like to give it as best shot as it can because of the Petitioner's dedication to trying to develop the property in accordance, and already there's substantial amount of construction that has already been done.

So that's why I'm asking that we schedule it to April 28, 2031. I don't believe that it's -- given as much time so they don't have to come back. This costs money, time and effort when they should be working on this project.

As to Condition 23, I'm somewhat in agreement with OP, and the reason why I'm in agreement with OP is that the original condition spoke to -- I believe it was the backbone infrastructure, and it did not relate on whether the project was substantially commenced or like that. It spoke directly to the backbone infrastructure.

So for the purposes of making sure consistency, and I don't want to take away from whatever past, or whatever reasons the past why they included -- why they made it backbone infrastructure. I think extension of time to April 28, 2031 should suffice, and it wouldn't affect any of the rights or privileges of the Petitioner.

For those reasons I ask for -- (indecipherable).

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, we are in deliberation by the motion made by Commissioner Ohigashi.

echo the words of Commissioner Ohigashi, and in that I read a lot of this information and was happy to see that a Petitioner, that a developer actually has tried to follow through and do the right thing. And has come to us, because it seems like over the last several years we have had so many developers, again, sort of disappear and not respond, and we've had to chase them down.

So I'm really happy to see that A&B, and whatever format they have morphed into, are following up and trying to provide housing for Maui community.

So I support all we can to enable that to

1 | happen in a timely manner.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Wong.

Support of this motion. The reason is that because of what Commissioner Ohigashi said, but also I'm very concerned about that bright line that Mr. Yee talked about, so I just wanted to say that I understand and hear what Mr. Yee said, and I understand about the term "finality", don't have anyone come back and say I want to change all these things just because, so we should have some sort of bright line that other people understand. So that's the only thing I just wanted to say. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Wong.

Commissioner Okuda, followed by Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will also be voting in favor of this motion. I believe that the Petitioner's attorneys, Mr. Matsubara, Mr. Tabata, and I can say, as usual, have presented clear documentation in support of their motion.

I say that, remembering the fact that the last petition they brought I did vote against them,

notwithstanding what they probably thought was a clear presentation of the evidence.

So I would like to assure everyone I'm not hypotized by either Mr. Tabata or Mr. Matsubara. I'm voting in favor of this motion. I do so with some reservation about the position, which is well articulated about changing the last -- or the second condition.

I believe that good cause for change in a condition can be supported by a subsequent change, or subsequent clarification in the law.

But given the totality of the presentation here, I don't believe that my view on the latter matter should holdup voting in favor of the motion.

So I will support the motion. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I recognize the lengthy entitlement process that took place, and Petitioner's good faith effort to substantial work and construction, and given the fact of the pandemic, I will be voting in favor of the motion.

And I just want to thank the Petitioners for persevering to continue with this project in spite of the delays that happened.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

2 Commissioner Aczon.

Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair.

I also will be voting in support of this motion

primarily for the reasons articulated by Commissioner

Ohigashi. I do, however, want to make an observation

for the record.

I am particularly concerned about affordable housing projects which are -- and the uncertainty associated with them when it's all for sale housing to workforce and lower income people, which as the Petitioner's witnesses put on the record, can result in a lengthy period of time for these projects to come to completion because the demands for these for sale low-income housing may not materialize due to other economic conditions within the state.

I might note that a similar affordable housing project by A&B on the Island of Kauai in which it's all rental affordable housing has enjoyed incredible demand and has been subscribed well beyond its availability.

So the note I want to make is there is a significant difference between affordable housing for

sale, which can take time to materialize, and affordable housing to rent, which there's a great demand for.

COMMISSIONER CHANG:

Thank you. That's all have to say.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Chang.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I too will be voting in favor of the motion. While I may have a difference of perspective from the OP on Condition 23, ultimately I think we've come to the same point with this particular project.

I found Mr. Matsubara's testimony to be very interesting and telling. I think it kind of confirms a lot of our instincts about the market, and I appreciate the fact that this developer is trying to create opportunities, recognizing the economic impacts of COVID on the particular constituency that it intends to serve.

I would like to see housing affordable that is available for the local community.

I do echo Commissioner Giovanni's comment about affordable rentals as well. I think we have to provide an array of different options for our local community so that they can stay here and live.

But I do appreciate the Petitioner, the work that they've done, and the work that they're

planning to do. So I will vote in favor of this
motion. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further, Commissioners?

of this motion for the good cause described very articulately by Commissioner Ohigashi, and like Commissioner Giovanni and Chang, very briefly I will note that my concerns -- and it's really less about this project and more about affordable housing in general -- that this project is a really good example of a project that is truly targeted in local community to local residents, and at best now they're hitting about two-thirds of it actually going to local buyers.

And so we just have to do better as a State to actually do a good job at building housing for people who actually live here already.

If there are no further questions, Mr. Orodenker, please poll the Commission on the five-part motion.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The motion is to authorize the substitution of the parties, to grant the Motion to Amend

Condition 22, accept to extend the deadline to

```
4/28/2031, amend Condition 23 as posed by OP,
1
2
      including language referencing the 4/28/2031
 3
      deadline, and to authorize Staff to make
 4
     non-substantive changes, and to authorize the Chair
 5
     to sign the order.
 6
                Commissioner Ohigashi?
7
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI:
                                        Aye.
 8
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
9
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
10
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
11
                VICE CHAIR ACZON: Aye.
12
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
13
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
14
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
15
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
16
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Giovanni?
17
                COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye.
18
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Chang?
19
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aye.
20
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
22
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23
                The motion passes unanimously with eight
2.4
     affirmative votes.
25
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:
                                      Thank very much, Mr.
```

1 Matsubara. 2 MR. MATSUBARA: On behalf of my client, 3 Commissioners, thank you very much. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let's just pause for 5 a moment while the parties on this docket leave the 6 virtual meeting room, and the parties on our next docket come in. 7 We have made it through the opening act and 8 we are on to the main show. 9 10 MR. YEE: If I could just note, Alison Kato 11 will be the attorney for Office of Planning for this. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We have City and 13 County, Office of Planning. 14 MR. HOPPER: Goodbye, Chair. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Goodbye, Mr. Hopper. 16 We have Mr. Young and we have Ms. Wong for 17 City and County of Honolulu. For everyone in the audience, thank you for 18 19 your great patience as we clear another important 20 matter. 21 (Recess taken.) 22 CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU - IAL 23 It is now 11:26. 24 Our next agenda item action regarding the

Conformance of City and County of Honolulu's

25

Important Agricultural Lands or IAL Recommendation to Applicable Statutory and Procedural Requirements.

specifically we are to consider whether or not the City and County of Honolulu's recommendation for the designation of Important Agricultural Lands on the Island of Oahu complies with the requirements of Sections 205-47, 205-48 and 205-49 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes, and whether the proper procedural, legal, statutory and public notice requirements were met in developing the recommendations.

The lands recommended for designation are listed in Appendix H of City and County's IAL Petition which are available for public review in advance of this meeting of the Land Use Commission's website.

Parties, please identify yourself for the record.

MS. APUNA: Good morning, Deputy Director Dawn Apuna on behalf of DPP. Also on the panel is Ray Young and Dina Wong.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think Ms. Wong might need to be admitted.

MS. APUNA: I think she's with Ray. They're in a conference room together.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Understood, thank

1 you.

2.4

2 Office of Planning?

MS. KATO: Alison Kato, Deputy Attorney
General's Office of Planning. Also here is Rodney
Funakoshi from Land Division.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, and welcome Ms. Kato.

Before we begin, and for members of the audience, the next thing I'll do is update the record which describes the filings that the Land Use Commission has received on this matter.

On February 11th -- and other matters, related matters.

On February 11th, 2021, the Commission met via ZOOM virtual conference technology to inform the Commissioners and the Public on the Process and Procedures Required to Review and Render a Decision on the County IAL submittal pursuant to Part III of Chapter 205 Hawaii Revised Statute, and Subchapter 17 of Chapter 15-15 Hawaii Administrative Rules.

On February 12th, the Commission mailed out the Meeting Agenda Notice for the April 24 and 25 meeting to the Parties and Statewide County mailing list.

On February 16th, we mailed out an Amended

Meeting Agenda on the same.

On March 5th, the Commission received public testimony from Blue Ivory Hawaii Company.

On April 12th, the Commission mailed out the Agenda for the April 28 and 29th meeting, along with the Notice for this proceeding to all property owners of the TMK's identified as the proposed IAL designation for the City and County of Honolulu.

April 20th, the Commission mailed out the Meeting Agenda for the April 28 and 29th meeting to Statewide and County mailing lists.

On the 21st we received City and County of Honolulu's recommendation of Important Agricultural Lands.

And on April 27th we received Department of Planning and Permitting's errata to the City and County of Honolulu's recommendation.

From April 12th to April 27th, the

Commission has received at least 120 phone calls from
the public regarding this proceeding. I would note a
record in my six-and-a-half years serving on the

Commission.

On April 20th to 27th the Commission has received multiple additional testimonies by email, which are posted on the website as received.

1 Let me now go over or procedures for today.

2.1

I realize many of you who have been waiting to testify are particularly interested in this.

I'm going to go through in the order they were received by LUC, noting the written public testimony that has been submitted on this matter.

If you are in the audience and you wish to give oral testimony on this matter, when I call your name on written testimony, you should use the raise-your-hand function on the ZOOM meeting software; or if you're calling by phone, press *9 to raise your hand.

At that point in the order that written testimony was received already by the Land Use Commission, I will admit you into the hearing room. You will then have the ability to enable your audio and video.

I will swear you in, given -- and this is always a struggle at the discretion of the Chair, I will give everybody two minutes to try to summarize your testimony on this matter. The reason for the small amount of time is to allow as many people as possible who are waiting to testify.

Following the conclusion of your testimony, you will be asked to remain on the line to be

available for any questions from the City and County's counsel, counsel from Office of Planning or any of the Commissioners.

After that, I will move you back into being a meeting attendee and resume on the written testimony list.

Following that, I will then ask for any individuals who have not provided written testimony but wish to provide oral testimony today to use the raise-your-hand function, and I will call them in order that their hands are on my meeting screen.

Following the conclusion of public testimony, should we be able to conclude public testimony on this matter today, I will ask the City and County of Honolulu to make their presentation.

The Commissioners will then ask questions of the City and County.

Following that, we will make some time available to hear from the Office of Planning on this matter. And finally, based on those presentations and questions from the Commission, the Commission will determine how, and if it will proceed with regard to the County's request to this Commission.

For the County and Office of Planning, are there any questions on our procedures for today?

1 Ms. Apuna? 2 MS. APUNA: Mr. Chair, did you say that there would be a break at 1:45 to 2:30? 3 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No, I said Commissioner Aczon might need to leave us at 1:45. 5 We will need to take a break for lunch. I try to 6 7 take a break every hour or so, both so that the Commissioners can be as fresh and listen as keenly as 8 9 possible to all testimony and presentations, as well 10 as to give a break to the court reporter. 11 In ten minutes we will have gone for another 50 minutes. So my intention is to take --12 13 well, what we might do, we might go slightly longer 14 than an hour, take a break at noon, take a brief 15 lunch break at noon to 12:30, given the number of 16 people patiently waiting and then -- but I noted 17 Commissioner Aczon has to leave the meeting at one 18 point. 19 Does that answer your question? 20 MS. APUNA: Yes, thank you. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning, 22 any questions on our proceedings, Ms. Kato? 23 MS. KATO: No questions. I just wanted to 24 mention that Earl Yamamoto is also here.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:

Thank you.

25

With that, Commissioner Okuda, I'm going to ask any Commissioners, do you have any disclosures to make at this time? Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

At this time I would like to announce and state that I will be recusing myself from this matter. And let me provide the explanation why I am recusing myself.

Our firm represents a number of landowners whose properties are subject to this IAL Petition, and even though we have not been retained by these clients with respect to land use matters, it creates a potential for an appearance of bias.

I would also like to disclose the fact that

I am representing two parties on different matters

that have items which are pending before or affected

by the Department of Planning and Permitting.

So, again, to avoid even the appearance of a potential bias, I will be recusing myself. But before I recuse myself, I would like to thank all the citizens of the community that have logged onto this meeting who are participating, or simply are taking their time to listen and participate by listening and attending this meeting.

I have said this before. I know my other 1 2 Commissioners share the same feeling that our 3 democracy functions the more people get involved, and 4 the more we have an honest and clear discussion of 5 the issues. 6 So with that, Mr. Chair, I will be recusing 7 myself. And unless you instruct me to stay on, I'll 8 also be signing off from this meeting. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The Chair would like 9 10 to object because you're always so helpful in our 11 deliberations, but I understand your recusal on this 12 matter. 13 Any further comments on this recusal by the 14 parties or Commission? If not, thank you very much, 15 Commissioner Okuda. 16 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I will be signing off 17 now. Thank you very much. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral. 18 19 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Is it possible that he 20 can stay on listening and provide input and just not 21 vote? 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No. When the Chair 23 recuses you, you need to leave the room.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Mr. Chair, I'm not too

Commissioner Chang.

24

sure if this is the right time. I'm not raising a conflict of interest, but I do want the Attorney General at some point in time to address the question of -- this will take -- an action on this item will take six affirmative votes, and with Commissioner Okuda leaving, that leaves us seven.

If anyone of us has an interest in one of the TMK parcels, are we then conflicted from hearing the entire Petition, or just on matters related to that particular parcel?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. China?

MS. CHINA: I would try to figure out -- I mean, we are at the beginning right now. I would try to figure out a way to separate one parcel out from this right now, if we intend to have all of the Commissioners deliberate and listen to the testimony on this, otherwise it might be an issue.

As far as whether or not there is an actual conflict of interest, I think you'd need to consult with, I think -- what is it, ethics, right? Because it's a personal matter.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may manage this discussion a little bit.

First, Ms. China, can I confirm with you, or Mr. Orodenker, whether Commissioner Chang's

statement that we need six affirmative votes is correct, or five, a simple majority on this designation?

- executive Officer: Mr. Chair, it depends on the nature of what you are voting on. If we are voting to adopt the maps in their entirety, or in part, then we need six.
- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Which is not before us today.
- 10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: That's correct.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What about the action before us today to simply determine whether or not the City and County of Honolulu's submission has met all applicable requirements?
 - EXECUTIVE OFFICER: I think it's kind of unclear, but my personal initial opinion is that it's five, because it's a procedural matter.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Sorry, and then going on to the conflict.
 - If I may interject into this discussion, Commissioner Chang and Deputy AG China.
 - Part of the answer on whether there's a conflict or not depends on the pending question of whether or not people's actual rights are affected by this matter or not, of which there are different

opinions; is that correct? 1 2 MS. CHINA: Yes. My understanding, today's 3 decision will not affect any private property rights. 4 So as far as today's discussion is concerned --5 sorry, hold on. 6 The light is automatic and goes off if I 7 don't move around. Sorry, it's ridiculous. So I think -- so I think that Commissioner 8 9 can participate in today's discussion, because it is 10 a procedural discussion, and it's not going to affect 11 anybody's property rights, not even anybody in the 12 waiting room or anything, it's just a procedural 13 discussion today. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Should the 15 Commission -- which I'm not prejudging one way or the other -- but if the Commission decides that the City 16 17 has not met its procedural burden, that would possibly be the end of the matter before us right 18 19 now. 20 Does that address your questions, 21 Commissioner Chang?

Thank you, Ms. China.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, any

further disclosures at this time? If not, I'm now

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Yes, it does.

22

23

24

25

going to move on to the proceedings with public testimony.

The last thing I'll say before starting to read names, I want to re-emphasize to everyone, especially those attending this meeting, that we are not today reviewing whether or not City and County's recommendations for IAL designation are appropriate for any particular property, or whether any individual property should or should not be included in the County's recommendation.

Today's proceedings are limited to whether or not the procedures used by the County in developing its recommendations met the requirements of Chapter 205 Hawaii Revised Statutes.

To the degree you are able -- and we appreciate both the emotional intensity and concern that this matter has raised -- but to the degree you can limit your comments to whether or not you believe the City has met their procedural burden, that will assist us even more in our deliberations.

Should the Commission choose to proceed with the review of the County's recommendations, each and every landowner who so desires will be given opportunity to present evidence as to why or why not property should be included in the County

1 recommendation designation at a later date.

With that, it's 11:32. We are going to start down the written testimony list. If you are in the attending room and you hear your name raised, I'm going to ask whether or not to raise your hand when I state your name, or the organization you're representing, if you wish to provide oral testimony.

Wendy Hee of Blue Ivory Corporation.

You're here. Your hand was just raised, and it's not raised. Is that because somebody has admitted you?

Scott or somebody, did you admit -- there she is.

I'm going to admit you, promote you to panelist. When you come in, please enable your audio and video. You're now in the meeting room, Ms. Hee. Please enable your audio and video. Towards the bottom of your ZOOM screen --

You might have to move your cursor. I can hear you now. Can you enable your video? I'm going to swear you in. You have two minutes for your testimony, then questions from the parties.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

1 WENDY HEE

2.1

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Aloha. My name is Wendy Hee.

I'm Vice President of Blue Ivory Hawaii, Corp.

About two months ago a lawyer emailed us about IAL lands and the proposed designation of a parcel we had just purchased less than a year earlier. So our awareness of this issue was quite accidental.

We had not received written notice, so I called State Land Use Commission and was told, but because Blue Ivory never received prior notices, I wrote a letter on March 4th to make sure our objections were on record. And most of that letter talks about the inappropriateness of the designation of Important Agricultural Lands for the property at 77-808 Kamehameha Highway, which is TMK 9-5-02:003.

However, because you're focusing on the procedural matter of whether the City has followed its procedure, I would like to make note that prior to last week we did not receive any written notice of hearing for this matter.

1 Also I would like to go on record to say 2 that the process that the Land Use Commission is 3 using to make this designation is unclear. We were 4 informed that this is a modified rule-making process 5 that may not be proper in comparison to the typical 6 petition that affects a private landowner's property 7 uses. Basically those are our objections about 8

Basically those are our objections about the procedures.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,
Ms. Hee. Thank you for keeping it under two minutes.
Are there questions for the witness from Ms. Apuna?

MS. APUNA: No questions.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Kato?

MS. KATO: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes. Thank you for coming and talking to us.

You say you purchased the property about a year ago, and in that timeframe have you received bills from the City and County to pay taxes, upon which you had to pay taxes, or have you never received anything from anyone?

THE WITNESS: I believe we had one tax bill

perhaps.

I have a question. I just want to make sure that I understand correctly that at a later date you will be looking at the question of the appropriateness of the designation of Important Agricultural Lands for specific property.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Should we proceed, should we decide as a Commission, which is not determined yet, whether the procedural requirements of Hawaii Revised Statutes 205 have been met by the City, then we would move onto that question.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral, you still had a question?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I just want to see if, because I deal with this myself, I'm always tracking down people.

So when you purchased the land, was it a private transaction and you just did paperwork, or did you actually go through like an escrow company, and have your purchase of the property recorded with the Bureau of Conveyances, and everything one would call normal?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it was documented in the Bureau of Conveyances, so it went through the normal

1 process.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: So you're not aware of any reason that your ownership of it would be hidden or not able to be found for someone looking for the proper new owner of the property?

THE WITNESS: Correct, it's all public.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much.

Thank you for coming and talking to us also. Thank
you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you for talking to me.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good morning, Wendy.

Nice to see you again.

I wanted to ask you, when you submitted the letter, did you submit that to the City, or to the Land Use Commission?

THE WITNESS: To the Land Use Commission, because it was -- the lawyer who emailed us, who we just didn't even know, sent us information about a Land Use Commission process or procedure or something, and so that was the phone call, and that was the followup that I made was to the Land Use Commission.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Can I ask you, have you submitted anything to the City objecting to this

designation?

THE WITNESS: No. From what I understand, when I spoke to the person at the Land Use Commission, he had indicated that the City had already gone through its full process, so I felt that the appropriate venue would be the Commission, having heard that the City was all pau with what it was doing.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I guess my final questions is: Do you know whether the previous owner received any notice from the City about this IAL designation?

THE WITNESS: I do not know. I looked in the documents that we received as part of the sale, and found nothing.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much. And I really do appreciate you coming to us this morning. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there further questions for the witness? If I may, briefly, Ms. Hee.

A few questions. Do you understand the role of the LUC today is not as the proposer of the designation, but rather we're sitting essentially in a quasi-judicial manner to decide whether or not the

adequacy of the City's proposal has been met?

2.1

THE WITNESS: I understand now that you're looking at the procedure, and whether or not the City has met it, met its requirements. And that is why my oral testimony is a bit different from the written testimony that I sent on March 4th, which talks more about the appropriateness or inappropriateness really of designating our parcel as an Important Agricultural Lands.

However, because you indicated that it is a procedural matter that you're looking at, I did want to make sure that you were aware that we had not received any written notices prior to last week.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Anything further? If not, I'm going to move you back to being an attendee. Thank you very much for your testimony this morning.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The next public testimony that we received was from Roland Harvest.

If Roland Harvest is in the room and wishes to provide oral testimony, please raise your hand using the raise-your-hand function or *9 if you're calling in. If not, your written testimony is on the website and reviewed by the Commissioners.

1	Following Roland Harvest we received on
2	April 20th testimony from John Foti.
3	On April 22nd and 23rd we received
4	testimony from I'm sorry, I'm looking sorry,
5	from Kainoa or Bronson Azama. I see your hand.
6	Thank you very much. I'm promoting you to panelist.
7	Enable your audio and video.
8	THE WITNESS: Aloha mai kakou.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or
10	affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the
11	truth?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed and
14	I'm going to give you two minutes.
15	BRONSON AZAMA
16	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
17	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
18	testified as follows:
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	THE WITNESS: Mahalo.
21	So I understand that this matter was more
22	of a procedural matter. I know my written testimony,
23	as of last night, former testifier, was more so
24	regarding the designation.
25	But I do think there is still some

underlying concerns whether or not C and C really did due process in the land designation that proposed for the Koolaupoko moku, because for our moku which is the Koolau all the way up to Maunaloa, which is Hawaii Kai, there's a whole lot more agricultural lands that should be designated as IAL based on the traditional use, as well as the purpose and resurgence of practices to restore kalo and various other things, in particular the lands of Waikane, Waiahole, Kahulu'u, a majority of the heiaus in the ahupua'a of Kaneohe, which includes Lulu Point, in particular, where there is resurgence of kalo production, and Kailua, some of the organizations that had listed in my written testimony are actively working to restore their places and spaces for traditional agricultural use in Kawainui Marsh, as well as in Maunawili, which is the upper reaches of Kailua. And then other areas in Waimanalo as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think for me it's just a matter of the C and C needing to revisit the process in the Koolaupoku moku, just to ensure as much of our lands are included as much as possible.

I'm not sure these organizations that I listed were contacted for C and C for proposed designation.

1 That's all I have to say. Mahalo. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo. Mahalo for 3 keeping your testimony under two minutes. 4 Questions, counsel? MS. APUNA: No questions. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP? 6 7 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, 8 9 beginning with Commissioner Chang. 10 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good morning, Bronson. 11 Thank you for being here and your patience. 12 I wanted to ask you, were you aware of any 13 of the previous meetings that the City and County 14 held on this IAL designation? 15 THE WITNESS: I was not aware. I was still 16 in high school at the time too, so I was definitely 17

trying to keep tabs with a lot of issues, but I didn't hear too much about Important Agricultural Land designation.

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

COMMISSIONER CHANG: As I understand your testimony, yours would be a little unique. You're not necessarily opposing any of the -- opposing the designation of any IAL lands, you're actually saying more land should be in IAL designation; is that what you're saying?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, correct. 2 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much. 3 appreciate your testimony this morning. 4 THE WITNESS: Mahalo. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions for the witness? 6 7 Commissioner Wong. COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair. 8 9 Good morning, Mr. Azama, I think it's still 10 morning yet. You know the land that you're on right 11 now, is that yours or your parents? Who owns that 12 land? THE WITNESS: So right now I'm at my 13 14 grandparents hale, which is in Kalihi. So we have 15 our own garden and such. But my Azama side has lived here for like over three generations. 16 17 COMMISSIONER WONG: I'm following 18 Commissioner Chang's line of questioning. 19 Were they ever notified about the City 's 20 process or talk story process? 21 THE WITNESS: In regards, like my public 22 process more so on the Koolaupoko region which is 23 where I live. To my knowledge the area where my 24 grandparents live, it's not agricultural lands. 25 COMMISSIONER WONG: I'm just wondering

```
about the Koolaupoko region, if they were ever
1
2
     notified about talk-story sessions?
 3
                THE WITNESS: In particular for the area, I
 4
     believe we weren't notified of anything, to my
5
     knowledge.
 6
                COMMISSIONER WONG: So none of your friends
7
     or family members were, correct?
                THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge.
8
9
                COMMISSIONER WONG: So I just wanted to
10
      reaffirm that and put it on the record that no one,
11
     that you know of, was ever touched by the City.
      That's all I needed to know. Thank you, Mr. Azama.
12
13
                Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other questions for
15
     the witness?
16
                Very briefly, can I surmise from your
17
     testimony that there seems to be an orientation from
18
     the County in which lands to designate as IAL, that
19
      there's a preference or prejudice towards lands
20
      former used for plantation agriculture and away from
21
      lands used for traditional and customary in
22
     agriculture?
23
                THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that question,
24
     again?
25
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:
                                      In reading your
```

testimony, is one way to summarize your testimony
that there may appear to be in the City and County's
decisions regarding which lands to propose as IAL, a
preference for former plantation lands and
non-preference for lands used for traditional and
customary native Hawaiians for agriculture?

exactly answer that. It's like close enough to bias,

I think, more so my only concerns are like these

areas that aren't designated, at least in Koolau

region, were former lands for development in previous

years that our kupuna still fought for to ensure that

agricultural use could be permitted today.

I think that's more so where I fall in line is the concern that it can be turned into real estate in the future, again, an issue we would have to face once more.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. Any further questions?

If not, thank you very much for your testimony -- Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I don't have a question for this witness. I thought we were through. I wanted a question for the Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to move you

1 to be an attendee, Mr. Azama.

2.1

2 Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I am really overwhelmed with the public interest in this docket, and I welcome the citizens and residents of Oahu in particular having come forward to the Commission.

At the same time, it appears that their interest is really driven by whether or not specific lands are designated or not designated, which is really not the procedural question of this docket at this time.

If the first two witnesses are any indication, time that will be devoted to their particular individual interests, which are not necessarily the procedural interest in this docket, we're going to be here 25 to 30 hours listening to this testimony.

I want to raise a concern about that and ask if there's any way that we can work with the public to focus their comments to the issue at hand.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The comment is well taken, Commissioner Giovanni.

I do -- when the Commission, this

Commission had an option before us to simply attach
to our regularly posted agenda, and sent to only

people on the mailing lists, the list of TMKs, but we chose instead to individually mail notice of this proceeding to every owner to just ensure that there might be plenty people who don't normally track LUC, don't normally subscribe to our list, so this has indeed generated a great deal of interest.

I do request again that members of the public try to restrict your statements to with regard to procedure.

So were you told by the patient City? Were you informed? If you were informed, when, and matters pertinent to that.

And I realized, yes, we might be in for a long day or two days given the public interest in this. I want to err on the side of caution. If people feel the need to testify on this, I'll ask them to keep their comments related to the question before us.

With that, our next testifier who provided written testimony -- sorry, I'm looking at the wrong screen -- Bert Beaman.

If you are in the audience and wish to provide oral testimony, please raise your hand.

Bert Beaman followed Pepito Paguirigan.

John Foti. Michael Shuman. Michael S. Shuman. If

1 | you heard your name, please raise your hand.

Next group of public testifiers, Alexander

Garber, Alexander Garber. I see you in the audience.

If you wish to provide public testimony, please raise

5 your hand.

Albert Chiappetta. I note somebody with the same last name raised their hand on the previous docket. Sylvia Chiappetta, I'm going to admit you. When you come in, please enable your audio and video. It should be down towards the bottom of your screen. I saw you briefly. I believe I can hear you. I can see you and hear you.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: In two minutes try to summarize your testimony particularly in relation to the procedural question at hand.

SYLVIA CHIAPPETTA

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: One is procedural. I did not receive notice until the meeting of April 12th, other

than that, I have no information or notices as to the property being on this list, and why it's on this list.

And basically as far as procedure, that's it. Just a little note, my property is only an acre with a house on it, so I don't understand why the department would put little small parcels of acres or less on the list for agriculture when you cannot farm for a livelihood on that property.

That's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Please remain for any questions.

Mrs. Apuna?

MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Commissioner Chang.

And I will similarly ask, I know we've been asking questions of witnesses, in part, educational towards the audience, but I will try to limit

Commissioners' questions as well to give everyone a chance to speak.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you for being here this morning.

1 I just want to ask you how long have you 2 lived on the property? 3 THE WITNESS: Five years. 4 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Are you the owner of 5 the property? 6 THE WITNESS: Me and my husband. 7 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So do you receive the 8 real property tax assessment? 9 THE WITNESS: Yes, we pay property tax 10 every year. 11 COMMISSIONER CHANG: And during that period 12 of time that you've owned the land, have you received any notice from the City and County of Honolulu 13 14 regarding this IAL process? 15 THE WITNESS: We received something a 16 couple years ago about this. Other than that, 17 nothing. Just a letter about they're going to be 18 doing this agriculture designation thing. But since 19 then, I haven't heard anything. I never got any notices about any meeting since. That was couple 20 21 years ago. 22 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Do you recall in that 23 letter whether it was an invitation to attend a 24 public meeting or submit any comments? Do you 25 remember what that letter was about?

1 THE WITNESS: It was to attend the public 2 meeting somewhere in downtown, and we did attend it. 3 It seemed like it was a done deal. The message we got from it, it was a done deal, and that was it. 4 5 But we didn't get any other further notices 6 about any other meetings or information, nothing 7 until I got this letter dated April 12th. COMMISSIONER CHANG: So after that meeting 8 9 that you attended, did you ever -- did the City ever 10 notify you that your land was going to be designated 11 IAL and you had an opportunity to object? THE WITNESS: No, they did not. 12 13 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much. 14 really appreciate that. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 17 Commissioner Chang. Any other questions? 18 Commissioner Wong. 19 COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair. 20 Ms. Chiappetta, I got a question. So you 21 know where your house is, or where your land is, is 22 there any other agriculture lands around it or just 23 houses? THE WITNESS: Next to me is a farmer. 24 25 COMMISSIONER WONG: One farmer. Is it left 1 side, upside --

THE WITNESS: Coming up to my house, it's on the left side, and he's the only farmer. After that we're all houses, like eight houses in that area. Hawaiian Homes above us, but all of us have like an acre. He's the only one who is a farmer.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So I'm just trying to kind of think it through, just because I want to make sure that if there's lots of farms around you, or just like just houses.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: One second. Can the room be quiet that Commissioner Wong is in? Picking up some audio.

THE WITNESS: There's one farmer before me, he farms green onions. There's my house, another house, and a group of houses after that, and that's it.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So the other side of the road --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Wong, are your questions going towards procedural matters?

COMMISSIONER WONG: Part of the procedure to see if the City has met the requirements to see if it's a contiguous agricultural area.

THE WITNESS: It is not, because across

- 1 from me is a watershed, Board of Water Supply.
- COMMISSIONER WONG: That's it. Thank you,
- 3 | ma'am. Thank you, Chair.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other questions for
- 5 | Ms. Chiappetta? If not, thank you for your patience
- 6 and testimony before us today.
- 7 I will note that I blew past the
- 8 | 12:00 o'clock stop time that I promised, and it is
- 9 | 12:10. I'm going to put you to be an attendee again.
- 10 Thank you again for your testimony.
- It is 12:10. We do need to take a pause
- 12 | for lunch, so that we can in part continue to
- carefully listen to all of the testimony.
- Sot it's 12:10. We normally take a 45
- 15 | minute lunch. I'm going to ask us to take a limited
- 16 | 30 minutes, reconvene our procedures at 12:40 P.M.
- 17 With that we will go into recess until
- 18 | 12:40 P.M. promptly, thank you.
- 19 (Noon recess taken.)
- 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We're ready to
- 21 proceed. We're back on the record.
- Just to recap where we're at. We have our
- 23 procedural matter before us today to determine
- 24 | whether or not the City and County have met the
- 25 procedural requirements under Chapter 205, not on the

merits or substance of whether or not any individual property does or does not meet the criterion required for IAL designation.

To recap, also for those who tuned in perhaps at different times, due to our technical difficulties, just a reminder.

As all of you are attending this meeting on your own time, the Commissioners, all seven of us here, serve as volunteers. We are not working today at our paid employment. We are working trying to make Hawaii a better place by helping implement Chapter 205 in a fair and impartial matter.

With that we are going through the witness testimony first, and offering people who filed written testimony the opportunity to amend their written testimony with oral statements.

After that we are providing for people who have not provided written testimony, the chance to provide oral testimony.

We are -- we left off with Chiappetta.

Kathleen Shimizu. If so, use the raise-your-hand in the ZOOM software.

Samantha Grossi, Samantha Grossi.

Mieko Yamamoto. I believe I saw you earlier, Mieko Yamamoto or Yamamoto Mieko. Raise

your hand on the ZOOM software. I see you, okay. 1 2 I'm going to admit you as a panelist, and we're going 3 to do our best to receive your request, but before we 4 can address it in terms of providing a translator, 5 there will be attempts to do so in a future hearing. 6 I can see your image. Can you say something? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are receiving an 8 9 echo. Can you enable your video? 10 THE WITNESS: First I would like to thank the Land Use Commission for --11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Yamamoto, one 12 13 moment. Are you connected in two devices? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You need to mute one. 15 16 We're getting feedback. And then I need to swear you 17 in before you provide testimony. I can see you. 18 THE WITNESS: Yes, and we got this letter 19 in August 2018. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: One moment. 21 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 22 you're about to give is the truth? 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. 24 MIEKO YAMAMOTO 25 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the

1	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
2	testified as follows:
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
5	THE WITNESS: My problem is English.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You're doing very
7	well, thank you. Please proceed.
8	THE WITNESS: Can I start?
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, please.
10	THE WITNESS: We got this letter 2018
11	because this was not agriculture land with a history
12	of the lot being single family not for over 80 years.
13	And this is reason
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We were never
15	notified.
16	THE WITNESS: So any way, we don't know for
17	the first time we hear the kind of using for
18	agriculture land.
19	Unidentified speaker: First time heard it
20	was when
21	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can the individual
22	for our record, there is another individual with you.
23	Please identify yourself.
24	MR. LENZ: This is Michael Lenz, and we are
25	at the same address, and I wrote written testimony as

well.

And, yes, her English isn't that good, but what she wanted to say is -- what we discussed was, we wanted to thank the Commission for giving us notice. We had never heard of it before. We got this land in 2018, and this is the first that we have heard about this procedure.

And so what we did, of course, is wrote you a testimony and wanted to be present here today to reflect our feelings on this. And that they hadn't notified us, and the lot is too small, feasibly, to farm and make a living off of. And that we have even tried a little bit of gardening here. It's too rocky and infeasible. So that being said, we don't really have access to ag water.

I wanted to ask. I looked at rules of this law, and part of it was access to water. And my question would be, would that be public water at that rate? Or would there be ag water? And at that point I wouldn't be eligible, because I don't have ag water.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Since we seem to be taking both of your testimony simultaneously, I'm going to swear you in.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony

you're about to give is the truth? 1 2 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 3 MICHAEL LENZ 4 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 5 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 6 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 9 If you could offer some concluding remarks, 10 and then I'll offer the opportunity for City, the 11 Office of Planning and the Commissioners to ask any 12 questions, and respond to your inquiry. Do you have any further thoughts --13 14 THE WITNESS: I do, actually. I was 15 looking at the HRS Section 205-44 sets forth the following standards and criteria. And --16 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If you can limit it 18 to the procedural matters. 19 THE WITNESS: Wouldn't this be about what 20 we're talking about today, procedural matter, if they 2.1 did it correctly or not? 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Go ahead. 23 THE WITNESS: So it says here that 24 agricultural production could be beneficial and 25 profitable in the future to my land, doesn't really

apply. And that the soil quality of the land, the 1 2 fact that it's full of rocks would be very difficult 3 to farm. And that there was nobody that ever came 4 5 out to even look at the property before putting me on 6 a map. 7 So my question would be, how do they come up with this map that includes, I understand, 8 9 graveyards and churches and residential properties? 10 What was the procedure that was taken to 11 produce this map? 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your 13 testimony. 14 THE WITNESS: I think that's about the gist of my questions. 15 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you to both of 17 you for your testimony. 18 I'm now going to ask the parties whether they have some questions for you, some of your 19 20 questions may be answered later in the procedures. 21 Any questions for the witnesses the, City 22 and County? 23 MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.

```
CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
1
2
     questions, Commissioners?
 3
                If not, thank you very much for your
     patience and for your thorough written testimony
 4
5
     which we received -- oh, Commissioner Cabral.
 6
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, thank you very
7
     much, and thank you, all you folks, for appearing.
8
                It's a mystery. I don't believe I heard
9
     how large is your parcel of property that has been
10
      identified?
11
                THE WITNESS: I believe it's 085, under an
12
     acre.
13
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: And you said you've
     owned it since about 2018?
14
15
                THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
16
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
17
     Hopefully we resolve all these mysteries. Thank you
     very much.
18
19
                THE WITNESS: You guys have a good day.
20
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much
21
     to the witnesses.
22
                I'll move you back to an attendee. Aloha.
23
                Linda Baptiste. Back to written testimony.
24
      I see your hand. I'm going to admit you to be a
25
     panelist. When you come in, if you can figure out
```

how to enable your audio and video. If you move your cursor around the bottom of your screen, you'll see an icon with the camera and the microphone. I can see you, can I hear you.

THE WITNESS: I hope so.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'll swear you in.

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

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. So please proceed.

LINDA BAPTISTE

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: You know, my letter was very specific in my opposition to this IAL, but I was also very specific about the fact that I had not been informed. And I'm not a new owner. I have owned my property for 53 years. I get taxes. I comply with all of the ag rates that are involved.

This IAL designation, while I'm opposed to it, I believe procedurally the announcements and notifications, to the most important people, have not

been transparent and not clearly presented. And the most important people are the landowners.

I did not get all of those notices that you read off starting from February until the April 12th.

If my neighbor hadn't called me, and said did you get this April 12 letter from the LUC, which I did not receive, I initially thought it was her property that was involved.

It wasn't until I got a letter from a law firm, that is completely unacceptable that that's how I had to find out, that I realized my properties were involved. We're not new to the neighborhood. We've been there a half of a century. And when I started talking to my neighbors, did you get these notices? They did not get the notices either.

So in my opinion, that's a very serious procedural error. You know, the owners need to be notified. And my neighbors are long-time owners. They've been down there as long as I have, and they had no idea that this was going on.

These are honest law abiding citizens who pay taxes, who file ag documents that we're required to file, and they had no idea that this was going on.

So honestly, I feel that under due process my rights have been diminished, because I haven't

gotten it. If you guys are notifying the owners, the 1 2 most important people, you should be doing it by 3 certified mail, some documentation from your part 4 procedurally that these folks have gotten the 5 notification that they need to protect their 6 property. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize, please? 8 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. 10 If this is supposed to help me, then it 11 should be an option of whether they want to 12 participate or not participate in it, individually, 13 assessed individually. And I understand that some of 14 the parcels have already been excluded from this 15 prior, because they were notified, and on what basis 16 were they excluded? 17 Thank you so much for your time. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo for your 19 testimony. Are there questions for the witness from 20 the County? 21 MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you. 22 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 24 Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG:

Thank you, very much

```
Mrs. Baptiste, for being so patient and participating
1
2
      in this process.
 3
                I just want to confirm several things that
     you said. One, you are the record of owner of this
 4
5
     property?
 6
                THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.
7
                MS. APUNA: Where is this property located?
                THE WITNESS: Located in Waimanalo.
8
9
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: And how big of an acre
10
      is this property?
11
                THE WITNESS: It's two parcels that make up
12
      8.89 acres.
13
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: What I heard you say
14
      is that you have never been notified by the City and
15
     County of Honolulu of this IAL process.
                THE WITNESS: That is correct.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.
18
      I appreciate it.
                THE WITNESS: Thank you.
19
20
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions?
21
                Commissioner Wong.
22
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair.
23
     Baptiste, I have a question for you.
24
                You know, did you ever look at the Land Use
25
      Commission's website regarding this issue at all?
```

1 THE WITNESS: Not until I got a letter from 2 a lawyer that informed me that this was going on. 3 That was the first time I would even think to look at 4 it. 5 COMMISSIONER WONG: The other question, Exhibit H in the Land Use Commission about the IAL, 6 7 Appendix H. Is your TMK, the property, the TMK 8 number in this Appendix H? THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm 179 and 180. I 9 10 only looked that up this morning. COMMISSIONER WONG: That's all I needed to 11 12 know if it was even on there. Thank you. 13 THE WITNESS: Thank you. That's what I 14 thought too, because I've never heard anything from 15 you folks. Thank you. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions for 17 Ms. Baptiste? If I can ask you about this. You are not 18 19 the first witness to mention a letter from an 20 attorney, who seems to have whipped up a certain 21 frenzy. 22 Are you aware whether or not this attorney

has ever appeared in front of the Land Use Commission in any matters?

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: I have no knowledge of this.

- If you call informing people about what is going on,
 whipping up a frenzy, then I'm very grateful that I

 got this, because I had no idea I was whipped up in
 this frenzy until I heard from them.

 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The point I'm trying
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The point I'm trying to make -- I'm not going to opine the representations by the attorney who contacted you, correct or incorrect. I am noting for the record that I've never seen that attorney appear in front of the LUC.
 - THE WITNESS: Again, I would like to state that had I not gotten this letter, I would have had no knowledge that I was involved with the IAL procedure.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I hear you very clearly on that. I appreciate that.
 - And I appreciate your patience and your participation in these matters.
- THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further for 20 Mrs. Baptiste?
- 21 THE WITNESS: Thank you so much.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Seeing none, I'm
 23 going to move you back to being an attendee.
- Our next written testifier Karen Wong. If
 you are here and you wish to orally testify, please

1	raise your hand.
2	Triple G Stables. Any representative from
3	Triple G Stables?
4	Unfortunately if you are here, I let me
5	pull up the testimony to see whether there was an
6	assigned testifier, Bonnie Costa Grassi.
7	Derek Arakaki, Derek Arakaki.
8	Yvonne Watari. Yvonne Watari. I see you.
9	Thank you for raising your hand. I'm going to admit
10	you to be a panelist. You should see an ability to
11	enable your audio and video.
12	Aloha, I can see you. Can you say
13	something?
14	THE WITNESS: Can you hear me?
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's a little soft,
16	maybe speak louder.
17	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
18	you're about to give is the truth?
19	THE WITNESS: I do.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
21	YVONNE WATARI
22	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
23	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
24	testified as follows:
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Before I start, can I read what I wrote? I'm not a speaker, at the same time it's short. During lunch --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Go ahead. I have read and received and posted your written testimony, but please go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I feel that small landowners have not had proper notification, as many of us do not have the knowledge, the intelligence with all of these processes like for the resources like big landowner -- I'm not blaming you guys. The government did not contact landowners adequately for each individual property proposed.

My property, for example, doesn't have any water. I would have appreciated if I had gotten a notice, and time for an official to actively visit my property and discuss and inform me of the proposal for my property.

We should all have been individually notified and to be part of informing us, and -- many of us have not be been able to attend meetings for some reason or other. All owners, whether or not attending or not could have been sent notices so we know what was covered, and should be in terms that we understand. Not everyone of us is educated.

Also I know of a property owner that has no idea what was going on until I called them to find out if they understood, because like the lady prior, I got a letter from the attorney.

And the thing is, they're in a trust.

There are several owners on this property. The other owners had no idea at all as to what was going on until I called them on Saturday. So that means that the communication part was not done properly.

They should have been notified. And also if the person that got the letter, and I spoke with him, had gotten like say a notice, saying okay, we have to come and inspect your property, I'm sure he would have informed the other people on the trust of this and taken some action.

He thought that -- even me, I'm sorry, I did get the notice, but in my mind I thought -- I wasn't able to attend for some reason, but I thought, oh, no, the government is just -- they want more tax money, just going to tax my tax. I have to pay more taxes. And I had the similar --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize, please?

THE WITNESS: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

```
Questions for the witness from the County?
1
2
                MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you.
 3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP?
                MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.
 4
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
5
                Commissioner Chang.
 6
7
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good afternoon, Ms.
     Watari. Thank you for being here and thank you for
8
9
     your patience.
10
                I just want to confirm that your testimony
11
      is that you did receive a notice, but you didn't go
12
     to the meeting; is that correct?
                THE WITNESS: Yes, I didn't go. I wasn't
13
14
     able. I think I got maybe two so many years apart,
     but for some reason I didn't go. Maybe it's my fault
15
16
      too. But same thing like my neighbor, I just
17
     thought, okay, the government doing something, going
18
     to get more money for my taxes.
19
                Maybe stupid of me, but we should have been
20
     given more information in that letter.
21
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: That's a fair
22
     question.
23
                Can I ask you, do you recall if any of
24
     those letters that you did receive, did any of those
25
      letters say your land is being designated as IAL, and
```

- if you have an objection, this is what you have to
 do? No, okay.

 And how long have you lived on your land?
- THE WITNESS: See, I don't live on the land. It was land that I inherited from my father.

 It's in Waianae.
- 7 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Is anybody on the land 8 right now?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

- it, 40, 50 years ago, so they're being rented, but that's on about an acre. The other four acres, they were being farmed by the farmer next door, but my property doesn't have any waterline. He was using the waterline on his property, but he retired. So now, because I don't have a water, what you call pipeline, or whatever that is called, I can't find a renter.
- 18 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you again. Go
 19 ahead.
 - THE WITNESS: So just being rented so I can pay my property taxes.
- COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you again for being here and your patience.
- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions for the witness, Commissioners?

1	Commissioners, any further questions? If
2	not, thank you very much for your testimony and your
3	patience in attending today's meeting and making your
4	efforts to help us through this issue. We really
5	appreciate it.
6	I'm going to move you back to being an
7	attendee.
8	I'm going to call on Mr. John Foti. You
9	raised your hand in the chat I'm going to you
10	were one of the earliest testifiers. I'm going to
11	move you into being a panelist.
12	When you come in please enable your audio
13	and video.
14	THE WITNESS: Did I get it?
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, you did.
16	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
17	you're about to give is the truth?
18	THE WITNESS: Yes, I swear.
19	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. So please
20	proceed.
21	JOHN FOTI
22	Was called as witness by and on behalf of the Public,
23	was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
24	testified as follows:
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: My name John Foti. I appreciate you guys being on the Commission. I know that's got to be a difficult job. You but put in a lot of hours.

In the meantime though, I'm a life-long resident of Hawaii. My kids are fifth generation.

We have a farm out in Kahuku. I just found out about this like this is kind of a broken record, everybody got caught by surprise by this thing.

So the April 12th letter was my first knowledge, which I got on the 16th. And if you look in the letter, it actually says there was a hearing, and it recommends that I go to it on March 24th, but the letter isn't even dated until April, so how could I possibly go to that?

In any case, right off the bat, from a procedural standpoint, we don't have enough time to study this to know whether we want or not IAL. I think IAL is a good idea but, you know, whether it has the kind of attributes that are good for us farmers and landowners, I cannot say. We need more time.

But from everything that I can tell about it, just for starters, the criteria for designating a piece of property to be in the IAL is incomplete or

1 | inadequate. There is three criteria.

You have to have water.

You have to be designated ag.

And you have to have good soil conditions and growing conditions.

And the third one, which is the most critical, is the one that's the most challenging for my farm. I'm making a go of it anyway, but if that throws me into IAL, and then there ends up being, you know, a lot of restrictions and other things that make it more difficult for me to farm an already difficult piece of property, I don't want to have anything to do with this thing.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize?

THE WITNESS: At the end of the day, we need more time, and it appears that the law is flawed in that Honolulu should just opt out of this whole damn thing, if you ask me, until we get the law right. That's my summary.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

I will reserve my comments. Questions for the witness from the County?

MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

```
1
                MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.
2
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
 3
                Commissioner Chang.
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Foti.
 4
      I'm asking all the witnesses a series of the same
5
 6
     questions.
7
                Is it your testimony that you have -- let
     me ask you this one first.
8
9
                Are you the registered owner for this
10
     property?
11
                THE WITNESS: Well, I have a LLC that is,
12
     yes.
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Do you pay taxes?
13
                                                         Do
14
     you receive the real property tax assessment?
15
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
16
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: And is it your
17
     testimony that you have never received any notice
      from the City and County of Honolulu either inviting
18
19
      you to a meeting or to provide comments, or to let
20
      you know that your property is being designated IAL?
21
                THE WITNESS: No, I hadn't received
22
     anything until the April 12th letter.
23
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: And the April 12th
24
      letter, was that letter from the City or from the
25
     Land Use Commission?
```

THE WITNESS: That was from the Land Use

Commission. I never received anything from the City,

I quess.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much, and I appreciate your patience, because I know you were here earlier, and you submitted written testimony.

Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thanks again for your guys' work.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, further questions for the witness?

I will share with you more of a comment than a question for the witness.

I am not a fan of the IAL law. I do not think that it necessarily achieves what it is intended to do, but when we become Commissioners we take an oath and swear to uphold and defend the constitution and laws, and so we don't get to choose whether or not to follow a law. We commit ourselves to implementing it.

So when the County comes before us with a request, we need to consider that request, rather than ignore it because maybe we don't agree with it or not.

Thank you for your comments, your presence

1 | and your patience, really appreciate it.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Could I just make one closing comment.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please go ahead.

THE WITNESS: One of my biggest concerns here, and I know this doesn't apply to you guys, but I would like to state for the record that I don't think that it's right that a bureaucrat sitting in some office who's never done any farming or any of that, is making decisions about how our land should be used and all that kind of thing.

That law just doesn't have enough detail in it for us to know, so somebody is going to be making these decisions and isn't going to be me if I'm stuck in that IAL.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your testimony. I'm going to move you back to being an attendee.

Our next witness is Randall Sakumoto.

Randall Sakumoto is here and available to testify if you choose to testify.

Paul and Kathleen Shimizu.

Moving onto testimony received on April 26. We have already heard from Michael Lenz along with Ms. Yamamoto.

Kaipolani Laea. If you are here and wish 1 2 to testify, please use the raise-your-hand function. 3 I can go through again the list of people who have 4 submitted written testimony before moving onto 5 others. 6 Diana Young, testimony of April 26. 7 I will move you to be panelist. When you come in, please enable your audio and video. Do so 8 9 by moving your cursor below on the bottom of your 10 screen. 11 THE WITNESS: Okay, I made it. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to swear 13 you in first. 14 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth? 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. DIANA YOUNG 18 19 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 20 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 21 testified as follows: 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION 23 THE WITNESS: My name is Diana Young. I 24 live at 41-655 in Waimanalo, Hawaii. 25 Our land has been in four generations. Му

husband's grandparents, his parents, him -- and I lost my husband two years ago. We dedicated our property to do ag, and we did it for ten years. And I'm already -- I've already signed up for another ten years.

So I was really shocked that I got this notice on April 12th, which was just -- that was the only notice I ever received about this program. And I was really in shock.

And so I started asking a lot of my neighbors, and a lot of them had not received notice, but they got a letter from the attorney. And then some of them, they got their letters -- matter of fact, ones here at my house today who only got her notice today, and so I feel that the communication of this program that they're trying to start is not real clear.

It doesn't explain it real well. And I wouldn't want to give up my nursery. I've been happy doing it, and want to continue doing it.

And when you read the information that resource that I'm doing now on it, it feels like a land grab. It feels like they're not explaining in detail to the landowners about what's going on.

When I pass away, it's going to be handed

1 down to the next generation. Our property is in 2 trust. So if you don't think I wasn't in shock. 3 have been very upset. And I would like to be removed 4 from it, because I don't feel that if I'm already 5 doing ag, why am I getting this letter? Why are you 6 changing what we're doing already? 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. That's two minutes. Any concluding remarks before 8 9 questions? 10 THE WITNESS: I just want to make sure that 11 you folks know that a lot of people did not get this letter, and this is the first time I was informed of 12 this program, and first letter I got was April the 13 14 12th. Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there questions 16 for Ms. Young from the City? 17 MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 18 19 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 21 Commissioner Chang. 22 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aloha, Ms. Young. 23 Thank you. I'm sorry about your husband's passing. 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 25 COMMISSIONER CHANG: I appreciate your

family's commitment to this land, obviously, and you're going to want to keep it in ag?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

The first time you ever received any information from a government agency about this IAL designation was from the Land Use Commission on a letter dated April 12th, 2021?

THE WITNESS: That is correct. And I'm very -- whenever I get anything from the State, I'm right on it. I'm that type of person. And I pay my taxes. My husband was sick. I was a home caregiver for a long time. And trust me, if something would have came in the mail, we would have been right on it. And my husband would not have wanted to do a program like this.

We do landscaping plants, and he was retired. He was a school teacher for 32 years. I worked, and now I'm retired, and I continue doing the nursery. I makes me feel close to my husband. So why would I want to give it up?

You know, if you was to ask me to try to grow food, sure, I'd try; if I could help the community out, I would do it. But the problem is

they're not even asking. No one ever came to test
our soil, never came out to check our property in any
way.

So the community, the people that are involved are having to do their own research to find out what the guidelines are. It is very upsetting.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I'm sorry to hear that. Again, I thank you so much for your patience and for your testimony. That's been very helpful. I wish you well. Thank you again.

THE WITNESS: Than you for your time.

Aloha.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other questions for Ms. Young, Commissioners?

If not, thank you very much for your patience and for your testimony before us today. We really appreciate it.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to move you back to being attendee.

Robert Cherry. I see you again. When you come in, you should be able to see if you move your cursor to the bottom of your screen and enable your audio and video. You might need to move your cursor over the bottom of your screen. See an icon of a

1 camera and microphone? Right on. I see you.
2 Can you say something?

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

THE WITNESS: Can you hear me?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do swear.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo. Please

proceed.

ROBERT CHERRY

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: I want to address the criteria in which they failed on.

According to the statute, Hawaii Revised

Statute 205-44(c) there's eight criteria to be

followed. The City and County has chosen to use only

one criteria, and there's no way to determine whether

or not a piece of land is an important piece of ag

land, and belongs in IAL simply by using one

criteria. And the one criteria that is such badly

flawed is if the property is already in agricultural

use.

That does not determine whether the property is suitable for IAL. All it does is tells you that it is agricultural land. There's so many different types of land that have been put into this IAL, because of the one criteria threshold.

So I think that is one of the major flaws of this.

And the other thing is, is that in the statute it says that there will be things given to us, tax breaks and so forth and so on, if we're in the IAL. Instead the City and County has come up with some very harsh and very unreasonable rules that -- well, they're going to enforce on IAL land. And they've given no perks that I am aware of.

Now, I received one letter. And I went to the meeting in Haleiwa in 2016, I believe. And unfortunately what we were told in that meeting does not apply at this time. We were told that there would be -- the only way that it would affect our land if it was put in the IAL would be that we have -- we would have to go into front of a nine member committee and get at least six votes in order to rezone our property.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize now, please?

```
THE WITNESS: Yes. Basically it's a flawed
1
2
      system and it shouldn't be allowed.
 3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
                County, questions for Mr. Cherry?
 4
5
               MS. APUNA: Thank you, no questions.
 6
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
7
               MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
8
9
               Commissioner Wong.
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair. Good
10
11
     afternoon, Mr. Cherry.
                THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
12
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Just want to make sure
13
14
     you can hear me. I got a question.
15
                So you went to the City talk story
16
     meetings?
17
                THE WITNESS: I did in 2016.
18
                COMMISSIONER WONG: So did they ever give
19
     you a chance to say or even talk to you about saying
      I want to be opted out?
20
21
                THE WITNESS: I asked to speak in that. I
22
     had a rotator cuff surgery and I stayed and stayed
23
     and stayed, and couldn't stay any longer because of
24
     the pain, so I didn't have my opportunity to speak.
25
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Do you know if any of
```

your friends was there at that meeting? 1 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. I had friends there. 3 COMMISSIONER WONG: Are they going to testify today? I just want to know, or do you know 4 5 if they're going to testify? THE WITNESS: I have no idea. 6 7 COMMISSIONER WONG: So I'm going to ask you just the question about them now. Did they ever say 8 9 they could opt out or what I just asked you? 10 THE WITNESS: They said that we would have 11 an option to opt out. It was not clear when we would 12 have that option. But the biggest point about that 13 is the information that they fed us at that time was 14 that we basically didn't need to opt out because it 15 was going to have no affect on us basically. COMMISSIONER WONG: That's all I need to 16 17 know. 18 Thank you, Mr. Chair; Thank you, Mr. 19 Cherry. 20 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are 22 there further questions for this witness? If not, 23 thank you very much for your patience and for your

testimony before us today. We very much appreciate

it. I'm going to move you back to being an attendee.

24

1 Our next written testimony Michelle 2 Correia. I see your hand. Thank you very much. Ι'm 3 going to promote you to be a panelist. When you come 4 into the room, you should see at the bottom of your 5 screen, if you move your cursor, camera and 6 microphone icon. If you click on those, enable them. 7 I can see you, now I can hear you. Thank you very much. I'm going to swear you in. 8 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Good afternoon. 11 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth? 12 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 15 MICHELLE CORREIA 16 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 17 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 18 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 20 THE WITNESS: I understand there's many 21 people that wish to speak, so I'm going to try to 22 keep my comments brief. 23 First, in regard to the written testimony I 24 submitted, there was an indication in there as to the 25 lack of objection and to specific property.

I understand this does not pertain to the specific property, but based on further information received and discussion with my mother-in-law, I would like to retract that statement from my written statement. We no longer are objectionable to the redesignation.

As to the notice requirements by City and County, my mother-in-law who has been an owner of the property these past several years and lived on the property since 2012, outside of the April 12th, 2021 letter, she never received any notification, any letter from City and County in regards to the IAL, and no information in regard to these talk story sessions that I keep hearing about.

In regards to the notice requirement, it's our position that the City and County has not met the requirement required to proceed further with the recommendation. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, and actually for the kindness you've shown your fellow testifiers in keeping your comments as brief as possible. We appreciate it.

County?

MS. APUNA: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP, Office of

Planning? 1 2 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 4 Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony. 5 We really value it. Thank you for your patience. 6 I'm going to move you to be an attendee. 7 David Apana. David Apana if you are here and with to testify orally. 8 9 Chow Wang and Norman Wang. 10 Diana Puulei. Again, if we have received 11 your written testimony and you don't give oral 12 testimony, we still read all of the testimony. 13 Margaret Isaacs. Margaret Isaacs. 14 James Shipman. 15 Nodie Namba. 16 Lawrence Uyeda and Eunice Uyeda. 17 Tom and Janet Witten, Tom Witten. Kaleo Searle. 18 19 Joshua Ramos and Caridad Leiva. I see you. 20 I will admit you. Thank you for raising your hand. 21 I'm promoting you to be a panelist. Again, if you 22 move your cursor, you'll see an icon of audio, camera 23 and microphone. When you click on those, they will 24 enable your audio and video.

25 Aloha.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed, and thank you for your patience.

CARIDAD LEIVA

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Me and Joshua Ramos purchased this property in 2018. Upon purchasing the property, we had no information on the possible designation of the IAL.

After purchasing it, a neighbor had informed us of a meeting that was to take place in Pearl City, I believe it was. I did attend the meeting. I was not informed that I would be able to opt out of being part of the IAL. I was informed that I would be notified of more information about it, and upcoming meetings. And I have not heard anything since that meeting.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Is that it for now?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, because you don't want

```
to hear how much I object to it, but I'm trying to
1
2
     keep it short. Don't want you guys to fall asleep.
 3
                I was not informed anything before
     purchasing. It after purchasing it from the City and
 4
      County, no letter was sent. I was informed by a
5
 6
     neighbor. I did attend the meeting and did not get
7
     any information about anything written.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo.
8
9
                Questions for the witness, County?
10
               MS. APUNA: No, questions. Thank you.
11
               MS. KATO: No questions.
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
12
13
               Commissioner WONG.
14
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair. Good
15
     afternoon, ma'am.
                I have a couple questions. Where your
16
17
     property is, are there other ag lands around it, or
      is it all houses?
18
19
                THE WITNESS: I believe this whole street
20
      is designated ag.
21
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Is it houses around you
22
     or all farmers around you?
23
                THE WITNESS: Houses.
24
                COMMISSIONER WONG: That is all I need to
25
      know. Thank you.
```

```
1
                THE WITNESS: Also military land right
2
     directly across the street, so all military. So
3
     houses and military.
                COMMISSIONER WONG: So you live on the
 4
5
     upside of area by the pig farm?
 6
                THE WITNESS: Not by the pig farm. No pig
7
     farm around my area, but by the military antennas.
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Sounds good. Thank
8
9
     you, ma'am; thank you, Chair.
10
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other questions for
11
     the witness? If not, again, we really appreciate
12
      your patience and participation and your testimony.
13
      Thank you so much.
14
                THE WITNESS: Thank you.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to move you
15
16
     back to being attendee.
17
                I noticed while this witness was
18
     testifying, Nodie Namba raised and unraised their
19
     hand. I had called on Nodie earlier. If you wish to
20
      testify now, please do so by raising your hand.
21
                I'm going to promote you to be a panelist.
22
     Again, move your cursor to the bottom of your screen.
23
                THE WITNESS: There I am.
24
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, there you are.
25
     Aloha. I'm going to swear you in.
```

1 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 2 you're about to give is the truth? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. NODIE NAMBA 4 5 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 6 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 7 testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 10 THE WITNESS: First of all, thank you very 11 much all of you for your time, attention and a lot of 12 patience for everyone involved today. You know, not to beat a dead horse, but 13 based on previous testimony today, obviously the City 14 15 has not fulfilled its procedural obligations to include landowners in a, quote/unquote, inclusive 16 17 process of public involvement, or as the IAL law 18 requires, develop the maps of potential IAL with 19 consultation and cooperation of landowners. 20 Just from a personal experience to add to 21 all the other testimony, you know, our first 22 notification of this was the LUC letter that we 23 received, the famous or infamous April 12th letter.

We've also heard from a law firm as well.

Beyond this, I would just like to kind of

24

1 broaden out the issue by saying that for effective 2 IAL policy, and I think we all are for agricultural 3 lands and its preservation and development, you know, the City should consider including the landowners, 4 5 and based on all these angry responses from us 6 landowners, obviously the policy is not proceeding in 7 the correct way to be very effective. I really feel that it should consult with 8 9 landowners in drafting not only restrictions, but

also benefits and incentives.

Finally, on the much larger issue, enforced agricultural land policy have not had a good history of being successful.

Fortunately we're in a democracy, and we can hopefully rely on due process, of which this hearing is a part.

Thank you very much. I hope that you will listen to all of us upset landowners, and consider this when you decide on your recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. Questions for the witness, County?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. APUNA:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Ms. Namba, for your testimony. Q Could you provide us your TMK number, if

```
you're willing?
1
2
                Let me look it up. 5-9-005:040.
 3
          Q
                Thank you.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
 4
5
                MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
 6
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
7
                Commissioner Chang.
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good afternoon, Ms.
8
9
     Namba, thank you so much for being here and taking
10
     the time to provide your statement. Thank you very
     much.
11
12
                I just wanted to followup and ask you, how
13
     long have you owned your property?
                THE WITNESS: Probably around 12 years,
14
15
      something like that.
16
               COMMISSIONER CHANG: And you're the owner
17
     of record?
18
                THE WITNESS: Myself and my husband, yes.
19
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: So that your address
20
      is, for real property tax purposes, you get mailed
21
      your tax property assessment?
22
                THE WITNESS: Yes, we do.
23
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: And you receive that
24
     regularly?
25
                THE WITNESS: Oh, yes.
```

```
1
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Okay. And again, just
2
      confirming you have never received a notice from the
 3
      City regarding IAL? Is that correct?
 4
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
5
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much.
6
      really appreciate your time.
7
                THE WITNESS: Thank you very much all of
     you for your time and really patience.
8
9
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners,
10
      further questions?
11
                I may have a disclosure. Ms. Namba, are
12
     you related to Zoey Namba?
                THE WITNESS: Yes, my niece.
13
14
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: She is my son's
15
     teacher.
                THE WITNESS: I'll put in a good word.
16
17
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No. I need to be
18
     fair and impartial on this.
                Any further questions? Seeing none.
19
20
      you very much for your testimony. I'll move you back
21
     to being attendee.
22
                It is 1:41. We have now gone a full hour.
23
      I'm going to take a ten-minute break and reconvene at
      1:51.
24
25
                (Recess taken.)
```

1	I think we are back on the record. So it
2	is 1:52, and the next written testimony was received
3	by Lucy Miranda.
4	And I see Alexander Garber has raised his
5	hand. I called his name. I'll admit Alexander
6	Garber to be an oral testifier.
7	When you come into the room, if you can
8	enable your audio and video. You do so by moving
9	your cursor at bottom of the screen. You should see
10	an icon of a camera and microphone.
11	I can see you, and I can hear you. I'm
12	going to swear you in.
13	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
14	you're about to give is the truth?
15	THE WITNESS: I do.
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
17	ALEXANDER GARBER
18	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
19	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
20	testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	WITNESS: So I'm going to try to stick to
23	what was asked is, has the County fulfilled its
24	obligation under Statute 205-47?
25	I submit that they have not. Other people

have already done this to a certain extent. I'm going to try to do in a little more detail and evidence.

In part, the statute states that each

County through its Planning Department shall develop

an inclusive process of public involvement.

If you have my written testimony, it has the full, more of a complete amount.

So I submit that having public meetings where you give false information is not involving the community. False information at public meeting is not an inclusive process involving public and landowners.

So I have evidence that you can find on the LUC website under the City and County report under Appendix D, under meeting two, Kapolei.

It says question: No. 41, can you give examples of what uses will be more difficult to get permission for?

The response was the only difficulty really would be if you wanted to urbanize your land. If your land is zoned ag for the County level, again, you're entitled to take advantage of all the benefits that agricultural zoning has allowed you.

Other people have stated that, but it's

documented in the City and County's own report. 1 2 Additionally question No. 37, what is the 3 significant difference in IAL versus agricultural land designated AG 1 or AG 2 now? 4 5 Response: The basic difference in 6 designation of IAL opens up opportunities to take 7 advantage of incentives. Additionally, also mark meeting two in 8 9 the --10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to 11 summarize, please? 12 THE WITNESS: Oh, so we have evidence that the City and County's process mislead, either 13 14 intentionally or through negligence, mislead the 15 ability of landowners to understand what this process was, so it did not qualify as an inclusive process. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. 18 Are there questions for this witness, 19 County? 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. APUNA: 21 22 Are you a landowner? And are you willing 23 to provide the TMK for your property? 24 Α 6-6-02-7:011. 25 MS. APUNA: Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 2 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? Commissioner Chang. 4 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good afternoon, Mr. 6 Garber. Thank you so much for your written and oral 7 testimony. I just want to confirm, did you receive 8 9 notice from the City about any of these public 10 meetings? THE WITNESS: I did receive notice. 11 Ιt 12 wasn't very clear. I did not attend the meetings, 13 but I knew people who did, and they took away exactly 14 what's written, you know, written in evidence here. And that's that this wasn't going to affect us. 15 of us want to urbanize our land. They said you can 16 17 urbanize it. We don't want to urbanize it. 18 I'm in business, I have a day job, then I 19 have the weekend job, which is the farm. 20 As soon as I heard it only affects you if 21 want to urbanize your land, I didn't pay any 22 attention until somebody said you also can't retire 23 on your land. 24 In my written comments here, if you go 25 farther down, I do put in there from the State

statutes the difference in farm dwellings between an agricultural property and the IAL property. And it's very significant.

And they had multiple times that they could have said this during their public meetings, and they did not. And so that got out into the community.

Which is exactly what a public meeting should do, should get information out into the community, however this was false information.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Can I ask you, did they ever send out information either inviting you to submit comments, or letting you know that you could opt out of the IAL designation?

THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much,

Mr. Garber. I really appreciate your testimony.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there further questions?

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Garber, when you said retire on your land, where did it say that, or who told you that?

THE WITNESS: Do you have my written testimony in front of you? I wasn't able to get through the whole thing. Right below where the

second page of the written testimony, it says in regard to farm dwelling, subsection 4, so this is from Chapter 205-4.5 pertains to uses within the Agricultural District, so that would be not IAL district, but the Agricultural District.

We're all in right now, and that says No. 4 farm dwellings, employee housing, farm buildings or activities or uses relating to farming animal husbandry, farm dwellings as used in this paragraph means a single-family dwelling located on and used in connection with the farm, and then goes on beyond that.

Basically the farm dwelling has to be located on, and used in connection with the farm. Once we change designation to Important Agricultural Lands, we will be under, what I understood, is Chapter 205-45-5. And that says No. 1: The farm dwelling, employee housing uses shall be used exclusively by farmers and their immediate family members who actively and currently farm on important agricultural lands which the dwelling is situated.

So to me that means I have to be actively and currently working the land as a farmer. I'm doing that now. Most of my family is. My one year old does not actively and currently farm the land.

According to this statute, the way I read it, the immediate family members must also be actively and currently farming lands.

So if by letter of this law, if you pass today, my one year old has to move out and start farming.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Sorry, I'm just trying to ask the question about if you retire, let's say you retire from a day job, right? You go to retire out to the land, and you're going to still farm?

THE WITNESS: Until I'm unable to, right. Farming's hard.

COMMISSIONER WONG: That's the way you interpreted the HRS. No one else told you about it, correct?

THE WITNESS: I think somebody told me -so I got something saying this means we're not going
to be able to retire. Retired farmers are going to
have to move out. I said that's fake news, not real.
No way anybody put this out there.

Then I looked it up, and I found out that it is real. Somebody wrote this. This is law.

COMMISSIONER WONG: That's all I need to know. Thank you. I just needed to know where you got that information from.

1 THE WITNESS: I got it from the internet on 2 the State, the government, the State website that has 3 the Hawaii Revised Statutes. 4 COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, sir; thank 5 you, Chair. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 7 Are there further questions for this witness? Seeing none, thank you for your written 8 9 testimony, as well as your oral testimony on this 10 matter. We very much appreciate it. 11 I'm going to move you back to being 12 attendee. And I'm going to continue to call others 13 who have submitted written testimony. 14 Marcia Peterson. Reuben Fung. Joann 15 Robello. Gary Ilalaole. Joann Robello, I see you. I'm promoting 16 17 you to be a panelist. Again, okay, you seem to be on 18 it. Enable your audio and video. 19 Aloha, I'm going to swear you in first. 20 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 21 that you're about to give is the truth? 22 THE WITNESS: I do. 23 JOANN ROBELLO 24 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 25 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and

1 testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

THE WITNESS: Well, like everybody else, the same thing, I hadn't found out about this until just this April 12th letter, and then something from a lawyer. And then like I said, you know, from a neighbor, you know.

And I don't agree with that, because when I purchased this land, I purchased my land 17 years ago, and it's hard enough as-is. I'm a single parent, and I don't agree with this because I didn't even understand any of that.

I don't know where this came from, just out of the blue, and then a neighbor came up to me and said, you know, did you get something? And the neighbor next door wasn't even aware of any of it, you know.

So then we got together, and I'm here today. I'm against it because like the previous guy was saying too, also I'm a single parent. I work and the ground out here where I live, it's clay, you know.

So it's harder to farm if you're going to be like planting, you know, and the water situation,

just everything.

But, you know, I would like to know how to opt out. Is that going to be available for us to do that? You know, because like I wasn't even aware. So if I wasn't aware of this going on, but like I heard that they had a meeting where you could opt out.

How can I get a part of that opting out?

Maybe it should have just been where the people who are for this should just opt in. You know, we shouldn't be, because of being notified and all that, it wasn't really clear. So maybe should just, if you didn't respond to one of the -- then you just out, you know?

I think that would have been like more fair. And how will we find out what you folks determine? You know, it's like when are they going to notify us again through the mail with the outcome of all of this?

That's my question. Are we going to be notified the same way where we might and might not get it?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo for your testimony. I'm going to see if there is people who have questions for you.

```
1
                County, Mr. Young, City and County?
2
                THE WITNESS: Maybe they opted out.
 3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: City and County?
 4
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
5
     BY MS. WONG:
 6
                Could you provide your tax map key parcel
7
     number or address?
                Address 87-1001 Ili'ili Road, Waianae
8
      96792.
9
10
          Q
             The name of the road?
11
          Α
                I-L-I-I-L-I.
12
          Q
                Thank you. No further questions.
13
     you.
14
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP, Office of
15
     Planning?
                MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.
16
17
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
18
                If I may, Ms. Robello.
19
                THE WITNESS: Is that still available for
20
     us to opt out like right now?
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: This portion of the
22
     proceedings is just public testimony. We're supposed
23
     to hear a presentation from the County on their
24
     proposal, and like today all we're looking at is did
25
      they procedurally follow the law, before we even get
```

1 | into the substance of it.

THE WITNESS: I know I wasn't even aware of this, so kind of scary. I just went forward and had --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I can say with great confidence, I am sure one or more of my fellow

Commissioners will be asking the County during the presentation what the procedures, if any, that have been provided and may be provided in the future for opting out.

THE WITNESS: All right, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I want to follow up with you. You made a quick reference to the water situation.

Could you expand a little bit on the nature of water issues with your property?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I guess like the water pressure and stuff, you know, our property is like -- I got 2.8 acres, and it's kind of, it's longer like, you know, wider where closer to the house. So I guess the pressure is like not as good.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: From County water?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: From BWS. Mahalo.

25 Thank you for that clarification.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there further 3 questions, Commissioners? If not, mahalo for your 4 testimony, we really appreciate it and your patience. 5 Going to move to You attendee again. 6 Gary Ilalaole. Hobbushin International 7 corporation, which I believe an attorney for Damon Key submitted testimony on. Hold on. Let me pull 8 9 that up, get the correct name. 10 Have patience with me as I scroll through 11 this voluminous testimony. Nicholas Ernst. I see your hand. Promoted to panelist. Aloha, Mr. Ernst. 12 13 THE WITNESS: Aloha. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You're counsel, so 14 15 I'm not going to swear you in. You're representing a 16 client. Please proceed. 17 NICHOLAS ERNST Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 18 19 Public, was not sworn to tell the truth, was examined 20 and testified as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 THE WITNESS: I'm here on behalf of the law 23 firm Damon Key Kupchak Hastert on behalf of my 24 clients.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

THE WITNESS: Thank you for your time in allowing us this testimony to be as brief as possible.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please speak up.

THE WITNESS: Is that better?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Little better.

THE WITNESS: I'll try to slow down as

well. I do talk kind of fast.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

our clients have with the IAL designation that we also mention in our written testimony has to do with the idea that there are no land use ordinances that provide any guidance. And we would think that the City would establish a little bit of procedure, and articulate how this whole process is brought about with the Land Use Ordinances.

The Land Use Ordinances in Chapter 21 currently mention Important Agricultural Land, but only in relation to AG-1 land automatically, and this is the case with our clients, you know, when some portion of the land are also designated as AG-2, we don't know what that necessarily means or implies for the property in terms of what kind of restrictions are now being imposed on that property.

1 Does tat land get promoted to AG-1? 2 it stay AG-2? And have IAL AG-2 even though 3 ordinances only make mention of IAL and AG-1 land? So without this clarity, we think there are 4 5 too many problems, and we are hoping that we would 6 get a response from the Department of Planning and 7 Permitting when we received a notice back in 2016 8 regarding this process. 9 We had rejected the process back then, and 10 asked for clarification with the same complaints, but 11 we haven't received a response since. The only other notification our client 12 13 received afterwards was the April 12th letter from the Land Use Commission. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's two minutes. 15 16 Did you have any concluding remarks? 17 THE WITNESS: Other than we think the 18 procedure is a little premature, that's it. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there questions 20 for Mr. Ernst, City? 21 MS. WONG: No questions. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Dina. 23 Office of Planning? 24 MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 25

1 Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, Mr. Ernst. When you wrote the letter in 2016, did you write it to the City and County of Honolulu, a government official, or was it to a consultant? Who was the letter written to?

THE WITNESS: To be clear, we had received a letter from Department of Planning and Permitting in late 2016 and we responded in early 2017. The letter was written to Kathy Sokugawa of Department of Planning and Permitting.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And your representation is you have not received any response from the City in regards to the letter that you sent?

THE WITNESS: Again, to clarify, we received a response saying we will get back to you; and they never got back to us.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Did you ever receive a letter regarding opting out of the IAL designation?

THE WITNESS: So the initial letter that our client received in 2016 did mention -- cover letter, then had attachments saying what was IAL procedure, meaning what does it look like, then it had a paragraph that had a section that said what if

I don't want my property to be designated IAL, please contact Department of Planning and Permitting if you don't want your property placed in IAL. Contact Department of Planning and Permitting and we will address the issue before it comes before the City Council and State.

Unfortunately, that process didn't go (indecipherable). Here we are before the Commission without having a response to our letter asking to opt out.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.

I appreciate your comments.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions for Mr. Ernst? Seeing none. Thank you very much for your testimony with us today.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Moving back to the written testimony, Alicia and Zac Aletha. Alicia and Zac Aletha. If I'm going slower, my eyes are getting slower as I look at the list of people whose hands are raised in the ZOOM meeting. It's a lot of screen time.

Jennifer and Jieson Ballera. I see you.

Jennifer Ballera, I'll promote you to be a panelist.

We can hear you. I'll swear in.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

JENNIFER BALLERA

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: So me and my husband, we bought a parcel of land that was included in a TMK list from the State, but when I was looking through the Land Use Commission website, it said that DPP deemed certain lands IAL in April of 2018, yet that property that we bought was given a building permit in November 2018 of the same year.

So what I don't understand, if it's IAL, why is the same people saying it's IAL, giving a building permit for that parcel of land? And I was not given any notice of it being IAL when I bought it.

I went through the regular process when I bought it, private purchase. We didn't get anything saying it was considered.

That's it, thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo for your
2	testimony.
3	Questions, City?
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. WONG:
6	Q Could you provide us your tax map key
7	parcel number or street address?
8	A TMK 7-1-001:011.
9	MS. WONG: Thank you. No more questions.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
11	MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
13	Commissioner Giovanni.
14	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: When you purchased
15	the property in 2018, did you do did you purchase
16	title insurance policy?
17	THE WITNESS: No, I did not actually,
18	I'm sorry, so I wasn't I actually bought the
19	property in 2020, so last year I got it.
20	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: So you purchased
21	the property after it had the building permits on it?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.
23	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: When you did
24	purchase it, did you do a title insurance policy?
25	THE WITNESS: No, I did not.

1 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you for your 2 testimony. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions for this witness, Commissioners? 4 5 Can you, for the record, just share. You 6 said the regular process. Can you detail, was it 7 listed on a multiple listing service and that's how you purchased? 8 9 THE WITNESS: That's correct. It wasn't 10 advertised as IAL land. My husband is building our 11 home right now on the property, so I wouldn't waste my time buying this lot if I knew it was agricultural 12 13 land, because that's not what we are going to use it 14 for. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 16 Are there further questions for this 17 witness? If not, thank you for your patience in 18 providing testimony today. We really appreciate it. 19 I'll move you to be attendee. And continue 20 down the list. 21 Marcus Gillespie. Mark Hamamoto. Michael 22 G. Wright, W-R-I-G-H-T. 23 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 24 you're about to give is the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1 MICHAEL G. WRIGHT

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Chairman and Commissioners.

We own a five-acre parcel of land outside of Haleiwa zoned AG-1 restricted. We live full-time on the land and have done so for ten years and have farmed the land for ten years.

We have about 50 fruit producing trees including avocado, citrus, banana and mango.

I'm strongly opposed to the placement of designation on property for reasons I articulated in my testimony. I realize today's meeting is about process, so I want to make comments about City and County process in determining IAL.

I've also, to my best recollection, never, ever received any notice from DPP or City and County prior to receiving the April 12 letter from LUC.

I would like to point out a couple things in the process that I think are flawed.

No. 1, I have no clue how various committees that were established to assist the

criteria against the various properties, how they were able to make their determination without ever setting foot on the land.

For example, I don't know how they would know what our soil conditions are, water capacity, how our land is used when nobody has visited the property.

Secondly, I think the IAL designation is not applied evenly, and has not been through this process by way of example, myself and my three neighbors who all live on agriculture land, actually there's four neighbors, about 19 acres surrounded by hundreds of acres of ag lands owned by Kamehameha Schools, yet the land to the makai side of us as well as to the west and north side of us, none of their lands have been identified as IAL land, even though our properties are. So land immediately next to me, same zoning, same land, same attributes has not received an IAL designation.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize.

THE WITNESS: Also would have liked to have the opportunity to opt out if possible, and never was presented that opportunity.

I think there are a lot of question marks

1 with regard to process. Thank you for hearing me 2 out. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much 4 for your testimony. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. APUNA: 6 7 Are you many willing to provide your TMK Q 8 number? 9 Α TMK is 1-6-1-5, parcel 21. 10 Q Thank you. No further questions. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 14 Do you -- you have an orchard on your property? Is it for sale or mostly non-sale 15 16 consumption? 17 THE WITNESS: It's for our family's consumption. And part of our service to the 18 19 community is we give everything away. We probably 20 give away a couple thousand pounds of fruit every 21 year, and literally have no revenues from our farming 22 operation. Never have for the last ten years. We 23 give it away. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: But you feed people? 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further,
2	Commissioners?
3	If not, thank you very much, Mr. Wright,
4	for your testimony. Thank you for your patience.
5	THE WITNESS: Aloha.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Moving you to be an
7	attendee.
8	Shirley Simao. Shirley Simao. I see you.
9	I'll move you to be a panelist. You somehow
10	disappeared in the course of coming into the room.
11	There you are. Didn't want to lose you. I can see
12	you, and I think
13	THE WITNESS: I think my internet is slow
14	here.
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's good now. I'll
16	swear you in.
17	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
18	you're about to give is the truth?
19	THE WITNESS: I do.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
21	SHIRLEY SIMAO
22	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
23	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
24	testified as follows:
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION

1 THE WITNESS: My name is Shirley Simao.

Our family purchased five acres of Agriculture 1 property nearly five years ago.

The letter that we received dated April 12th from the LUC was the first we heard of the proposed IAL designation.

After reading through the City's recommendation submitted to the LUC on April 21st, we believe there are problems with how the maps were compiled.

HRS 205-47(b) requires the mapping process be in consultation and with cooperation with landowners, the Department of Agriculture, agricultural interest groups, et cetera.

The City's document goes onto say that in their Technical Advisory Committee there was only one landowner included. We don't believe that that is fair, and we don't believe that is a fair representation of landowners to have only one landowner on the committee.

First in 205-47(c) inclusive process for public involvement, the landowner feedback that was gathered through the City's method of public involvement yielded 90 per cent landowner dissatisfaction with the preliminary designation, and

as a result more than half of the landowner requests were granted. By this overwhelming percentage, there should have been more widespread notification and landowner involvement in the process.

205-47(d) the City was required to take reasonable action to notify each owner.

Our family did not receive any notice from the City. The first notice we received was this month from the LUC.

Further problems for the properties included in the mapping are the size of the parcels, slopes on parcels, infrastructure and water available to parcels, to name a few. Due to the under-representation of landowners in the process, these problems were not adequately addressed.

We just heard in the previous docket that the State is faced with housing inventory shortages. we believe that as landowners who want to build on our property some day, this would add further restrictions to our building homes on the property. We haven't built a home yet on the property. So we strongly oppose this.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Exactly two minutes.

Just as if you had rehearsed it. Well done.

Are there questions for this witness, City?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

- 2 BY MS. APUNA:
- 3 Q Thank you for your testimony.
- If you're willing, can you provide us TMK
- 5 number?

- 6 A 6-5-001:042, Unit 1.
- 7 MS. APUNA: Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
- 9 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
- 11 Commissioner Chang.
- 12 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good afternoon. I
- greatly appreciate your well-thought out testimony.
- 14 You hit all the right key elements, and thank you
- 15 very much.
- I wanted to know, you said you bought the
- 17 | property five years ago. Do you know who the
- 18 previous landowner was?
- 19 THE WITNESS: Well, obviously we signed
- documents, but I don't know her name offhand.
- 21 COMMISSIONER CHANG: And she made no --
- 22 during your transaction, she made no indication that
- 23 | the City was considering placing this property in an
- 24 IAL designation?
- THE WITNESS: No, she did not. And that's

a good point, because normally when you buy property,
the seller is required to make certain disclosures
that would affect your value and so forth.

And, yes, we did not receive any such

notification from the seller.

was by the LUC on April 12, 2021?

COMMISSIONER CHANG: The first notification you received regarding IAL designation by the City

9 THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct. We
10 received no prior notification from the City; and,
11 yes, we do pay real property taxes; and, yes, we do
12 get billing from them, so they have our address.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions?

You're ready to get back to work, right. Thank you very much for your testimony. We really appreciate it.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We have four more pieces of written testimony that has been submitted, then I can go to people who just submitted oral testimony.

174 Power Global. The signatory of 174

1	Power Global there is no name, not sure how I'm
2	going to know if the signatory, the non-signatory for
3	174 Power Global wishes to put in Q and A who I
4	should call on, that would be appreciated.
5	Hawaii Clean Power Alliance, Frederick
6	Redell. Hawaii Clean Power Alliance.
7	Marisa McKnight. Marisa McKnight.
8	Colleen Hanabusa, who I believe was on
9	behalf of Dairy Company, Ltd.
10	Was there anyone who submitted written
11	testimony who I called their name but I have not
12	called on you, and you wish to testify orally?
13	Randall Sakumoto. Promoting you to be a
14	panelist, Mr. Sakumoto.
15	THE WITNESS: Aloha, Chair.
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: For everybody who
17	might be wondering, you're an attorney. I'm not
18	going to swear you in.
19	RANDALL SAKUMOTO
20	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
21	Public, was not sworn in, was examined and testified
22	as follows:
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	THE WITNESS: I'm here on behalf of a
25	client, and you know I appreciate everybody's

patience. It's been a long day. I'll try to make it brief.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you going to disclose the name of your client?

THE WITNESS: If it is not necessary, I prefer not to. They didn't give me the authority to do that.

I think the testimony I have is in a letter -- I'm not sure why it didn't show up in your list of written testimony, but I did submit a letter on the 23rd.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I've seen and read the letter. I'll follow up with staff as to why it was not posted.

THE WITNESS: In any case, it's very short what I have to say and it is procedural, but it doesn't relate to City's procedures, but it does relate to matters related to the Commission's agenda that was posted to today's meeting.

Agenda Roman numeral V indicates that the lands recommended for designation are listed in the Appendix H of the City and County IAL Petition.

And with all due respect to the Commission staff, and all the hard work they put in to prepare for these meetings, I believe, as I indicated in the

letter I submitted, references to Appendix H was in error and that the land that the City actually recommended for IAL designation are the lands listed in the City Council Resolution 18-233, CD1, FD1.

The short history behind this is -- I'm sure the City will explain it in their presentation -- Appendix H was the initial list of properties being recommended by the DPP to the City Council. I think it was back in 2018.

In contrast, a list of properties that the City Council ultimately approved for being recommended for IAL designation was the one attached to Resolution 18-233, CD1, FD1.

So there is a difference between those two lists, and I raise this as a matter of the Sunshine law. I don't need to tell the Commissioners this, you're painfully aware, the agenda has to be detailed to provided public with adequate notice that the Commission is going to consider, so the public can, you know, decide whether they want to participate in these meetings or not.

And, you know, if you do participate or if you do proceed, and the agenda doesn't provide -- doesn't meet the description requirement, actions taken by the Commission could be voidable.

1 So in the interest of efficiency, due 2 process and to try to, you know, not have to redo the 3 process, my thought is the appropriate course of action is to continue this matter, publish the 4 5 correct agenda, which actually refers to the 6 property's listed in Resolution 18-233, CD1, FD1. 7 And that's all I have to say. 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. 9 Sakumoto. City and County? 10 MS. APUNA: No questions. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP? 11 12 MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 14 As an initial matter, Mr. Sakumoto, while I 15 appreciate very much your keeping an eye out for our 16 procedural integrity, the notices that we sent out 17 were from the broadest possible list of people 18 affected by this property. 19 So if we toss the net maybe wider, who is 20 harmed? 21 THE WITNESS: Well, I think if you read the 22 agenda and it said that the properties being 23 considered are the ones in Appendix H, and if I'm an 24 owner and not on Appendix H, I'm thinking I'm in the

clear. So I'm not attending the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So you're suggesting that there are properties that were included after, not just excluded?

THE WITNESS: I don't know. All I'm saying is that there was a process that the City went through for one year, such that that list has evolved. Because as you heard earlier, people did object and try to take their names and properties off the list.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Understood. But my questions is, if the list that we gave included everybody who was on the final list, and in addition, some people who perhaps have been removed, but we want to err on the side of giving full notice, how is anybody harmed?

THE WITNESS: I can't say how that would happen. In my view, as long as the Commission does consider the correct list, which is the one attached to the resolution, I think that from my standpoint, I'm good.

I just wanted to be sure that that's what's being considered, and the fact that the agenda was written the way it was doesn't cause some type of basis to challenge the action later on.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your

- 1 comments.
- 2 Any comments or questions from the
- 3 | Commissioners?
- Thank you, very much, Mr. Sakumoto. We appreciate it, and we will make sure your letter is
- 6 posted. And as to the error of not calling on you
- 7 could be entirely my blurry eyes.
- 8 THE WITNESS: No problem, no problem.
- 9 Thank you.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to move you
- 11 to be attendee.
- Okay, it is 2:38. Let's see how many
- people we can get through before we need another
- 14 break.
- Who did not sign up for written testimony
- but orally? The list of people who have raised their
- 17 | hands has maintained itself.
- 18 I'll first call on Anna Murray and admit
- 19 you to be an attendee. I'm promoting you to be a
- 20 panelist. When you come in please --
- 21 THE WITNESS: I don't know why it's a green
- 22 screen.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And I do not either.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I know why, I think I have a
- 25 thing over my camera.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Technical 2 difficulties resolved. 3 I'm going to swear in and ask you to give 4 you testimony. 5 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 6 you're about to give is the truth? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 9 ANNA MURRAY 10 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 11 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 12 testified as follows: 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 THE WITNESS: My only real comments are 15 echoing other people, and I ended up sending a little note about this. Is that I too -- we too did not 16 17 receive notice until your letter and then the letter 18 from the attorney. And we do pay our property taxes 19 and we did receive that. 20 My only other comment, which has been made 21 before, is we purchased the property in 2016 and have 22 heard nothing about this, and we're really caught off 23 quard.

One of the earlier testimony people is our neighbor, and she was quite upset when she came to

talk to us about it the other day. And then I was 1 2 like wait, wait, what? So we discussed it with her. 3 But no one has come out to our property to 4 talk to us or give us any indication or check on our 5 property to see if it would be appropriate for this besides the no notice. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your testimony. Are there questions. 8 9 City and County? 10 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. APUNA: 11 12 Thank you, Ms. Murray, for your testimony. 13 If you're willing, can you provide your TMK number or 14 address? 15 Four -- I don't know the TMK, have to look 16 it up. Probably should have been prepared. 17 41-625 Kaulukanu in Waimanalo. 18 Q Thank you, Ms. Murray. No further 19 questions. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 21 MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 23 Commissioner Chang. 24 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aloha, Ms. Murray. 25 live in Kaneohe and it is pouring rain right now.

1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, just got here.

2 COMMISSIONER CHANG: I hope you can hear

3 me.

2.1

I just wanted to clarify.

It was your testimony that you have never received notice from the City in regards to any public meetings or the ability to opt out or information about IAL; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, we didn't know about it until we received the notice at this, then I looked -- you know, from you folks. Then I looked into it there. Then I received a letter from an attorney who I didn't follow up with, I just spoke to our neighbor.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And I may have misheard you, but you said in 2016 you heard about it. Did I --

THE WITNESS: No, no, we purchased the property then, and I would have thought if the previous owners had known, they would have mentioned it to us.

The brother owns the property next door to us, and so we have a relationship with the family, and no one has ever mentioned this to us; no one said anything. They didn't tell us, hey, we've gotten

1	these notices in the past, you should be aware.
2	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much. I
3	appreciate your testimony. Take care.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there further
5	questions? Your hand was virtually up so long your
6	arm must be sore.
7	THE WITNESS: Thank you all for today. And
8	I realize this is going to take you a long time.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,
10	we really appreciate it.
11	I'm going to admit Gene Dumaran as a
12	panelist, followed by Racquel Achiu.
13	Gene Dumaran, when you come in, can you
14	enable your audio and video, assuming you are still
15	at your computer after this long time. I can see
16	you.
17	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
18	that you're about to give is the truth?
19	THE WITNESS: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay, please proceed.
21	GENE DUMARAN
22	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
23	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
24	testified as follows:
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION

1 THE WITNESS: I just have a question. Му 2 wife's dad is 92 years old. He retired in Waianae as 3 a farmer, and he's no longer farming, and his son 4 isn't farming either who lives in the house. 5 Now, with this IAL designation, what's 6 going to happen to him? He's not farming. Is he 7 going to be kicked out or what? That's my only question. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. So, 10 again, in response to your question, the City and 11 County has come to us with their proposal for 12 designation, and right now we're just considering 13 procedurally whether or not they followed the 14 process. We certainly will hope the City, when we 15 16 are done with public testimony and they present to 17 us, they will directly answer that question as the 18 proposer of the action. 19 THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there questions 21 for this witness from the City? 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MS. APUNA: 24 If you are willing, can you provided your

address or TMK of your father's home?

1	A The TMK is 8-7-01:005.
2	Q Thank you very much.
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
4	MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? If
6	not, thank you for your great patience in waiting to
7	testify and ask your question today. We really
8	appreciate it.
9	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to move you
11	to be an attendee.
12	I'm going to bring in Racquel Achiu
13	followed by Ron Tubbs.
14	Aloha.
15	THE WITNESS: Aloha, everybody. Thank you
16	for hanging in here all day.
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. I'm going
18	to swear you in.
19	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
20	you're about to give is the truth?
21	THE WITNESS: I do.
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
23	Racquel Achiu
24	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
25	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and

testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Thank you for everyone's time. I know it's been a long day, and I suspect you'll have several more.

Right off the bat, I never -- I did not receive any type of notice. I was aware of the discussions with IAL. We had a community meeting out in Haleiwa Elementary School several years ago. It was hugely informational.

I don't recall there being an opportunity to opt out. I don't believe anybody would have at that time, because there was so little knowledge about it. I wasn't aware that it had advanced so much.

You know, I would say that most people -but really speaking for myself -- all ag land is
important. I don't think there's a designation.

Everything is important and usable.

There's agriculture. I don't need to tell you guys, not just in crops, but a variety of ways that can used.

But I think there are several ways, and I'm all for whatever we can do to protect those lands, but the protection of the farmers and ranchers is

just as important, and I think a process that puts
faith in those people is critical because that allows
your process to be more successful.

We have a small ranch out here, and we also have a larger ranch up on Mount Ka'ala. Obviously we want to ensure the protection is there for it.

I'm fortunate enough to be able to live on my property. I think most people doing agriculture in any sense, it's critical, and almost necessary for them to be on their property today.

And I think we just -- we really do lose so much critical land due to loopholes in processes, and so forth, to a large amount of real estate developers, and the loopholes that they're able to get around to misuse ag land.

So I believe there is a good protection. I think the criteria needs definite review. Someone mentioned about the retiring aspect of it. I'm not sure if you guys have seen --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

This letter that everyone -- I'm assuming it's the same from the lawyer. I don't know who these people are, but they sent us a letter. So

there is questions to a lot of the criteria that's 1 2 been shared, and I'm hoping that -- I'm grateful for 3 your letter dated April 12, but I was a little 4 disturbed that there was a meeting in March that I 5 didn't know anything about. 6 So definitely communication is critical for 7 us to be able to make sure the land is protected 8 properly. Thank you. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo. Are there 10 questions, Ms. Apuna? 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. APUNA: 12 Thank you for your testimony. If you're 13 Q 14 willing, can you provide us your TMK? 15 TMK 6-6-029:011. Α 16 Q Thank you. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP? 18 MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 20 Commissioner Chang. 2.1 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aloha. Thank you for 22 hanging in there with us. You've been here as long 23 as we have. 24 What I heard you say, you've never received 25 a notice from the County regarding the IAL

```
designation; is that correct?
1
2
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
 3
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: But you recall
 4
     attending a community meeting in Haleiwa?
5
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
 6
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: How did you hear about
7
     that meeting?
                THE WITNESS: You know, North Shore,
8
9
     everything is coconut wireless.
10
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: I get it; I get it.
11
                THE WITNESS: We're heavily involved in the
12
      community and neighborhood. When word got out,
13
     obviously it was shared with all the right people.
14
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Can I ask you,
     obviously you're here today, and you have some
15
16
      concerns and issues.
17
                Do you know whether other similarly
      situated farmers like yourself in the community share
18
19
      similar concerns about notification of the IAL
20
     process?
21
                THE WITNESS: Yes. I would say the vast
22
     majority of farmers or ranchers aren't real familiar,
23
      if at all, about the process. They've heard maybe,
24
     you know, whimsical things in the past, but nothing
25
      that would lead them to be able to really understand,
```

because a lot of the farmers are generational. So there's older people that require little extra guidance and, you know, that kind of situation.

It's not a really well-known topic.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: What I'm hearing you say is that many people that you personally know are not aware of this process.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And that the City has not effectively communicated in ways that, like you said, these local farmers or ranchers can understand?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Maybe this is a good thing, but they don't understand enough to make a good decision, is that what you're saying?

THE WITNESS: Yes. You know, too, when you're out here, when we bought our property -- there is a lot that is not disclosed when you buy agricultural land. I had to really kind of dig my feet in the ground and kind of learn on my own.

Fortunately I'm heavily involved in the community and things that go on, so I have access to be able to research.

But there is quite a bit of information, when you purchase ag land, I wasn't even aware that I

- had to dedicate my land, which was already in

 dedication when I purchased it.
 - So those kinds of things kind of hurt when you don't know it, and when it comes to bite you later and your property goes up.
- 6 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you. I get it.
 7 I appreciate you taking the time and your testimony.
- 8 THE WITNESS: Thank you so much.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further? If not, mahalo nui for your testimony.
- THE WITNESS: Mahalo.

- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha. It is 2:54, we have gone another full hour. We have 12 more people, I believe, who have their hands raised to give testimony. I believe we're going to lose one more Commissioner at 3:30.
- I just want to do quorum check with Mr. Orodenker or Ms. China.
- To continue to accept testimony, how many do we need? Five. So we would have just have five. Okay.
- It is 2:54. We need to take a break.

 There are biological and other needs. We will go
 into recess until 3:00 -- it's 2:55, go into recess
 until 3:05.

1 (Recess taken.) 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Our next witness --3 I'm going to start. Commissioner Cabral might have 4 to review a small portion of the transcript, but we 5 have quorum. 6 I'm going to bring in Ron Tubs followed by 7 Kelly Colbin. I realize everyone who has been 8 waiting has been super patient. I'm going to ask 9 people to try to summarize testimony as much as 10 possible, because I would like to get everybody whose 11 hand is raised to testify, so we have -- before we have to end, certainly no later than 4:30. 12 13 Ron Tubbs, if you can enable your audio and 14 video. I can see you. There should be a little 15 microphone icon, click on that and that will enable your audio. 16 17 THE WITNESS: Hello. 18 Thank you Commissioners --19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to swear 20 you in. 21 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 22 you're about to give is the truth? 23 THE WITNESS: I do. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 25 -000

MARY TUBBS

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Thank you for your most valuable time today, and this opportunity to testify.

I'm Mary Tubbs, I live on this, our property parcel of land in Waimanalo designated as Country Zoning for 20 years. And I have received --we did receive proper notice --well, of the meetings, et cetera. And at the time in late 2016.

We did subsequently follow directions and submit a request for exemption which was denied.

Today's focus on the criteria or -- excuse me, on whether the procedures were followed or not.

So technically on the surface it looks like it was, but for those of us in Country Zoning I still think that the procedures were not that good.

The City and County did explain in their letter that IAL lands for City and County were three criteria, availability of water, good soil quality, and in agricultural use.

Now, as I said before, we're Country zoned. We are not AG-1, AG-2. In fact, it wasn't until a

few minutes ago I was saying how can you speak, and I guess I'm in an Agricultural District.

Nevertheless, we did go to the meeting and submit request for exemption. I pay taxes on this higher rate. My parcel is relatively small .735 acres, tax rate is nearly doubled what my neighbors pay. And so I assume that we're in a different area, because we're located along the stream which looks like the only criteria that they paid any attention to, even though the availability of water is there, there is an -- City and County has an easement to use that water whenever they want.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize?

THE WITNESS: Yes. They did not come out and look at the soil. A lot of it is clay. We are on a very steep side valley of the stream, and with very little land to farm anything on.

As far as being in agricultural use, when I pay my taxes, it does not say I'm ag. It says I'm residential. I pay a higher rate than my neighbors. I know across the street is ag and up and down across the stream are houses.

In my view, I do not think that they followed in agricultural use. That was not clear to

1 me in Country Zone that I'm in. It's a muddled 2 process at best. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. Questions for the witness? 4 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. APUNA: 6 7 Can you provide your address or TMK number? Q TMK is 4-1-010-018:000. 8 Α 9 MS. APUNA: Thank you. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 11 MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 13 Commissioner Cabral. 14 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much for 15 coming forth. 16 You indicated that you did receive notice, 17 but you also indicated that you asked to be exempt, and that you were denied that ability to be exempt 18 19 from this classification. 20 THE WITNESS: Yes, we were -- we were told 21 we were IAL lands, but no explanation of why or how this decision -- on what basis. 22 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: And you're less than 23 24 one acre and you pay residential in terms of your tax 25 base?

1	THE WITNESS: I believe so. It says
2	residential on it. I notice other properties you can
3	have a residential and ag with it. There's just the
4	next parcel down was vacant, then right after that I
5	know they had residential and ag, they had both.
6	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much for
7	the information. It's another piece to the puzzle,
8	thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there further
10	questions for this witness? Thank you for your
11	detailed testimony and your patience. We really
12	appreciate it.
13	I'm going to move you to being an attendee.
14	I'm going to promote Tameria Kelley Colbin, followed
15	by Sharlette Poe.
16	Tameria Kelley Colbin, if you can enable
17	your audio and video.
18	We can hear you, so that's fine. Let me
19	swear you in sworn.
20	Do you swear that the testimony you're
21	about to give is the truth?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
23	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

1 TAMERIA KELLEY COLBIN

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the

Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and

testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: So my TMK number is 8-5-005:010.

My husband and I bought this land back in 2013. We did receive, I guess it was the 2016 community letter to come at the Kapolei High School, which was a whole big mess. We didn't understand, because they were still fighting over the land between Kapolei and Ewa Beach, so they kept interrupting.

I do not agree with this. That is the only letter that I received until last week when we came home from vacation and got the April 12th letter.

They only want to do a portion of my land, but then they want to do -- because my land is in between State land and Camp Waianae land, so they want to do a portion of my land, and then a portion of Camp Waianae's land.

I don't know how that is going to work. So basically I think that the City and County procedurally-wise should have notified all the

204 landowners of every meeting and not just the ones 1 2 that they want us to be a part of. 3 The other thing is the land, the State land 4 next to me is for the orchid farm, so they rent that 5 from from the State, and that's fine, but the land 6 coming down my driveway I don't know who's 7 representing the land or State. They allow big trucks to park over there, and those trucks leak oil 8 9 and gas and everything else on that land. 10 So that land can't be used, but yet they want to make it IAL land. So my thing --11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to 12 summarize, please? 13 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. I do not agree. I was not given the opportunity to opt out. Given the 15 16 opportunity to opt out, I definitely will. Thank 17 you. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you so much for 19 your testimony. 20 Let me see if there's questions for you. 21 City and County?

MS. APUNA: No. Thank you for your testimony, and thank you for providing the TMK. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

25 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.

22

23

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners. Sorry
2	we missed seeing you.
3	THE WITNESS: I've never stopped hitting
4	the video play. It still's not coming on.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We got your
6	testimony. Thank you so much. We appreciate your
7	testimony. I'm going to move you back to being
8	attendee.
9	And Sharlette Poe followed by Mahelani
10	Cypher.
11	THE WITNESS: Aloha, can you hear me good?
12	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, we can. I need
13	to swear you in.
14	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
15	you're about to give is the truth?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
18	SHARLETTE POE
19	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
20	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
21	testified as follows:
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	THE WITNESS: Aloha, Sharlette Poe. I'm
24	from Waianae. I also Chair Waianae Coast
25	Neighborhood Board, and the community for the housing

and development.

So I do not own property that is being identified or designated for IAL. Potentially, however, I was contacted by a number of community members that are concerned because of your infamous April 12th letter, as well as being contacted by a law firm. So community members have been upset, scared and confused.

And I do want to speak to the City DPP process, the process they used to inform, involve and engage community and public. I believe it was lacking, so I heard 2016 mentioned about an initial letter, invite to attend a meeting.

For our community out here in the Waianae Coast, sometimes getting to community outside of our community are problematic. So it would have been appreciated if, in the different areas where IAL potential lands were designated or identified, they held meetings in those areas.

I heard about Haleiwa. As I spoke to the former Chair of the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board, we've never gotten an ask or a request to present at the neighborhood boards. That would have been one way to engage our communities in our grass root levels, and we could have helped to get the word

out and create a space for outreach and education on this.

We are not scaring our farmers. We're not trying to mislead and misinform, but education and inform them so they would make informed decisions.

There are pros and cons depending on situations, especially if you have generational families that have farmed before but may not be farming now, but the family has gone from parent with three or four children to multiple families and generations on the lands.

So there is various considerations that we would have appreciated DPP coming back out. And I did go back to agenda and minutes to see if all the way through December 2014 there might have been presentation. There was none.

So the request and the ask is that you consider extending this process and have DPP come back out to share better education and information identification on the pros, the cons, the process how this designation process came into being, because I believe it was initiated at State level.

So some of this information would have helped to ease the way for community to not be so confrontational and confused, but to come before you

folks with good testimony on the pros and cons and for them to decide whether or not it's beneficial to them or not. Mahalo.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo. Questions, City and County, Ms. Apuna?

MS. APUNA: Aloha, thank you for your testimony.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aloha, Shar, nice to see you. And, you know, mine is more a comment then a question for you.

I have greatly appreciated your constructive testimony today, that the neighborhood boards provide a forum and platform to reach community members. And you confirmed.

Mahalo for going back to all your previous minutes, but that there has not been a request to the Waianae Neighborhood Board, at least that you are aware of, because there is both the Waianae Neighborhood Board, the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board, and then the North Shore Neighborhood Board as well as Koolauloa, so thank you again for your

```
testimony, as it is constructive, and and mahalo for
1
2
     being an advocate for your community, because I
 3
      appreciated you coming forward, taking the time to
 4
      express your community's concerns, but also to
5
     provide the City a constructive way to use the
 6
     neighborhood boards to get information out.
7
                So mahalo to you and all your good work.
                THE WITNESS: Aloha.
8
9
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions,
10
     Commissioners?
                I just echo Commissioner Chang's mahalo
11
      for. Your work in the neighborhood board, it's so
12
13
      important. Really appreciate it. Mahalo nui.
14
                THE WITNESS:
                              Mahalo. Have a good day.
15
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha.
16
                I'm going to admit -- we have 13 people
17
     with their hands raised now. We have Mahelani
18
      Cypher, followed by John Costland.
19
                If you can enable your audio and video.
20
      There you go.
21
                THE WITNESS: I want to thank all of you --
22
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or
23
     affirm the testimony you're about to give is the
2.4
     truth?
25
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
```

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

2 MAHELANI CYPHER

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Thank you all for waiting so long to hear some of our redundant testimony, but I want to start off by saying I am very concerned that you have so many people testifying against the IAL program, because the IAL program, which I think the idea first came up in '70s and '80s when a lot of communities came out in support of preserving Important Ag Lands throughout the State, and this was to provide food security for our islands to make sure that the best lands that were actively farming or potentially used for active farming or any kind of farming that involved food production, that also includes pasture lands, poultry, piggeries.

I also advocate for traditional Hawaiian lands. Somebody early testified about Koolaupoko organization, there is agricultural work going on in every single ahupua'a. And in the City's maps there's only like one or two that show very much activity. That's very disturbing and troubling to

1 us, but we think the City's process was incomplete.

2 We think you should send this back to the City and

3 | work on it some more. Even the criteria needs to be

4 updated because there's a lot of activity going on

5 | right now, a lot of farming all to support food

6 sustainability for our island.

When you allow people to take themselves out of this Important Agricultural Lands, the category, if they upzone their lands, that means that much less lands can be used for farming, and that troubles me.

I also want them to also consider fishponds. The fishponds can provide a lot of food too, and that doesn't seem to be addressed.

The two criteria that apply, other

Important Ag Lands and unique ag land cover

traditional food production activities by native

Hawaiians.

So I'm going to urge you guys to consider sending the matter back to the City and ask the City to revisit the program, because IAL is an important program.

It started in '70s and '80s, and I would hate to see it diminished by so many people opting out. A lot of people opt out because they want to

sell their lands and sell it for more money than they 1 2 bought it. So I just kind of worry about that 3 because we need the ag land. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo, Mahelani. 4 5 Questions for the witness, Ms. Apuna? 6 MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Kato? MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 10 Thank you for your extreme patience and 11 thank you for also bringing the conversation partially back to the constitutional amendment that 12 13 is the generator of this effort to actually protect 14 lands that feed us. Anything further for this witness? If not, 15 16 mahalo nui, Mahelani. We greatly appreciate it. 17 I'm going to promote Jeff Bloom, followed 18 by Samuel Campbell. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm here seeing if I can get 20 my video --CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You should be able to 21 22 click the video icon at the bottom of the screen next 23 to where you enabled audio. There you are. 24 I'm going to swear you in. 25 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony

213 you're about to give is the truth? 1 2 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. JEFF BLOOM 4 5 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 6 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 7 testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 9 THE WITNESS: First of all, I have never 10 received the notice that most people have said as 11 well. It's possible I could have two or three years 12 ago, but in my recollection I don't. 13 The only neighborhood I belong, other than 14 Waimanalo, I belong to the Waimanalo Agricultural 15 Association. A lot of small farmers. 16 I'm not speaking on behalf of the 17 association or any other farmer, just myself. 18 I have asked them if they were giving 19 testimony, but obviously it doesn't seem like they 20 are. Maybe they're not even aware of it. 21 I just want to say, again, I think the 22 process is flawed. Not sure I agree or disagree.

As other people have said, I received a letter from the Commission and a law firm on the same

Don't know enough about it.

23

24

day. When I got the letter from the Commission, I appreciated all your efforts and everybody being a volunteer, but it was a little frustrating to see that I missed a meeting in March when the letter was dated April 12th and I received it on April 15th.

Maybe that was just a typo.

But again, I've lived here in Waimanalo for over 30 years. I have children and grandchildren who have been born and raised here. I would love to give my property to my children. Everybody is worried about their property values going up or down. I'm worried about taxes when I have to give it to my children when I die and they have to pay inheritance taxes and no one has talked to that.

So there are other issues to be discussed, a number of discussions in the last week or two with other people in the community. A lot of local Hawaiians, a lot of varying opinions on it, a lot of other things.

Most people in Waimanalo, at least in my group, farmers do not grow food, they grow plants for the agricultural industry that they sell to stores.

They sell to landscapers, other things.

So, again, I really question what the City and County's motive is for this.

1	I do raise crops, mostly fruit trees as
2	well as flowers. Most people belong to the ag
3	association here do not. So I think it's time to go
4	back. I would have loved to hear from DPP at the
5	beginning instead of the end. Been here since
6	8:00 o'clock this morning, my wife and I.
7	I would love to participate in any
8	discussion that comes forward, and I certainly will
9	bring it up at the meeting next week with Waimanalo
10	Ag Association to make sure those farmers area aware
11	of it. That's all I have to say.
12	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo for your
13	testimony.
14	Ms. Apuna?
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION
16	BY MS. APUNA:
17	Q If you are willing, can you provide your
18	TMK or address?
19	A 4-1-0-24:086. I live on 2.01 acres in
20	Waimanalo, AG-2.
21	MS. APUNA: Thank you.
22	MS. KATO: No questions.
23	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
24	Commissioner Chang.
25	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aloha, Mr. Bloom,

greatly appreciate your patience in hanging in there
with us and providing us your testimony.

My understanding is, besides being a farmer in Waimanalo, you belong to the Waimanalo Ag
Association?

THE WITNESS: Yes, but I'm not speaking on their behalf.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: No. But I would like to know, since you have a reach of similar voices, or people who are doing similar things in Waimanalo, farming or growing nursery plants, have these members, your neighbors or other farmers, expressed similar concerns that you have?

THE WITNESS: Only the ones I've talked to, again, various concerns, I guess, not just one.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Has anyone that you've spoken to expressed that they have been informed of the IAL and that they, you know, they have -- they understand the process? Anyone that you've spoken to?

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure they understand the process. I talked to a couple people last night. I called a few people I knew who are very local in the community, been here the entire third, fourth generations. They were aware, they told me -- one of

1 my friends he went three years ago or something and

2 never heard anything. He's on ag land, all legal.

He had a lot of other concerns. He's gave me an earful for about an hour last night.

He has a business to run. I can understand that he has a farm. People can't just sit there for a day, but hopefully if it's at night or on weekends people can spend time.

I think the process needs to be reach out to the real farmers whose land is affected, not people that have property just trying to -- (indecipherable).

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Did you indicate that you did participate or you attended a meeting several years ago?

THE WITNESS: No. I had no notice whatsoever, but I had heard about it. I'm not sure whether, again, coconut wireless. Participating in the community in a lot of things, so I heard, but that's all I heard.

I figured I would receive an official notice or something. When I got these two letters last week, obviously, I made some phone calls and started digging into it, that's the first time.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: When you heard about

it, was the meeting in the evening, the afternoon, or 1 2 the middle of the day? 3 THE WITNESS: I don't know. My friend told 4 I only got these two letters. Both believe it or not, both dated April 12, same day, and one from a 5 law firm and one from the Land Use Commission. 6 7 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you again for your testimony, appreciate it. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Mahalo. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further? 11 I know you said you mostly farm fruit, but I do appreciate that Mr. Bloom also farms flowers. 12 13 THE WITNESS: Yes, Waimanalo Bloom. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And I appreciate greatly your patience in attending our meeting today 15 16 and waiting to give testimony. Thank you so much. 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to move Mr. 19 Bloom to be an attendee and admit Samuel Campbell 20 followed by Michael Pietsch. Aloha. 21 THE WITNESS: Aloha. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 23 affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the 24 truth? 25 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

SAMUEL CAMPBELL

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the

Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and

testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Samuel Campbell and my parcel of land is TMK 8-5-0-19:036.

My wife and I are former school teachers.

We are retired. She has recently passed away just one year ago, and we bought this land. And like I believe it was somebody else, Ms. Cypher, who was talking about how important it is to preserve ag land.

That was our desire as school teachers here on the west side. We believe in that as well.

The land, originally we bought it from the bank, but the owner before that turned this into like an industrial park. So that there was contractors' trucks that were parked here on the land. He put in a lot of fill dirt and rocks in order to make a parking lot for the semi-trucks and heavy equipment things for construction.

So the land is totally unusable. We bought it to preserve the land and to hopefully develop

```
220
      self-sustaining farmer and be a model for our
1
2
      community. That is our goal as educators. We would
 3
      love to do that.
 4
                I'm fulfilling my wife's and my dream.
5
      love this land. I love Hawaii. I really want to
 6
     work this but, you know, it's self-sustaining
7
      farming, it's not an agricultural business. The
      land, I had to bring in soil in order to have my
8
9
     garden. And get a backhoe in order to dig the holes
10
      so I can plant fruit trees and get good soil in
     there.
11
12
                It's very, very difficult. I'm doing the
13
     best that I can, but it's not an agricultural
14
     business. And I'm retired. I don't want to lose my
15
     home. And I was never ever contacted until the April
16
      12th letter and the law firm, like everybody else.
17
     Thank you everyone.
18
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you so much for
19
      your testimony. City and County.
20
```

MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you for

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP?

your testimony, Mr. Campbell.

21

22

23

24

25

MS. KATO: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Sorry for your loss of your wife. Thank

1	you for your service as a public school teacher as
2	well as your commitment to restoring land and your
3	testimony today and your patience. We appreciate all
4	of them. Anything further?
5	THE WITNESS: No. Just to be on the record
6	that I never did receive any notice, and so the City
7	did not follow their requirements.
8	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
9	I'll move you back to being an attendee,
10	and I'm going to admit Michael Pietsch, followed by
11	Melissa Ginella.
12	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
13	you're about to give is the truth?
14	THE WITNESS: I do.
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
16	MICHAEL PIETSCH
17	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
18	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
19	testified as follows:
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commission, for
22	hearing all these testimonies.
23	My wife Malia and I own property in Wailua,
24	TMK 1-6-7-3-5 and TMK 1-6-7-3-3.
25	And we the purchased in 2015. Been

following this process a bit. Wrote a letter back in 2016 requesting that our lands not be included in IAL due to the topography, soil quality C, rocky, steep gullies, lack of water, and not meeting the criteria.

I got a letter back that just said it was denied, and included in IAL with no discussion, no phone call, nothing.

And I think that really was my concern, the community really wasn't included, at least the small landowners. Big landowners did understand how to navigate this, but the small landowners didn't. And it's difficult.

So there was a petition that was created on April 17th that I want to point out to the Commission that has roughly 500 signatures, all of who report that IAL be voluntary, and I'm an in agreement with that request.

And if you're looking at the rules and how if the rules were followed or not, I want to point out City and County Honolulu did not contact landowners adequately to conduct agricultural economic feasibility analysis on each property. This requirement is outlined in LUC 15-15 Administrative Rule 10-19-19 under 15-15-125(b)(5)(d), the viability of existing agribusinesses. Just following these

rulings to understand that is extremely difficult from a layman's terms.

And I also want to point out that the large landowners did dedicate their lands, which I think was a success for IAL, but after contacting multiple law firms, the minimum cost was 50 to 70,000, and that is cost prohibitive of any landowner. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much for your testimony.

Questions for the witness, Ms. Apuna?

MS. APUNA: No questions. Thank you for your testimony.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Pietsch, you said there is a Petition that is part of the record. Do you know if anybody submitted that?

THE WITNESS: I submitted written testimony, then I included a link to the Petition.

And I hope -- I had sent it to the wrong email address, so that's why it wasn't on the list, but

- 1 since then I got it correct and sent it late last
 2 night.
 3 COMMISSIONER CHANG: These people, are they
- 5 THE WITNESS: I think primarily from the 6 North Shore.

primarily from Wailua or any geographic area?

- 7 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Are you currently 8 farming the land right now?
- 9 THE WITNESS: We have cattle on the land 10 and also farmers on the land.
- 11 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you so much for 12 your testimony. I really appreciate that.
- THE WITNESS: Thank you, guys.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions for
- 15 Mr. Pietsch?

- Is it possible, Mr. Pietsch, that you

 might, if you're willing, put the letter of your

 rejection of your request to be exempted into our

 record as well? You're not the first person who's

 referenced this. We are trying to understand exactly

 how the City did and did not deal with these kind of

 requests.
- THE WITNESS: Absolutely I'll submit that letter.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. We know

1	you're busy. Thank you for your great patience in
2	testifying.
3	THE WITNESS: Thank you all. Appreciate
4	your help.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yeah, mahalo.
6	We have eight people with their hands up.
7	Melissa Ginella followed by Sean Anderson.
8	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
9	you're about to give is the truth?
10	THE WITNESS: 'Ae.
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
12	MELISSA GINELLA
13	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
14	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
15	testified as follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	THE WITNESS: Aloha and thank you for your
18	time, you guys, it's a long day. We appreciate you.
19	I did not receive any notification prior to
20	the LUC's April 12th letter. We have never received
21	anything.
22	So there has been no notification, so I do
23	not believe the City and County fulfilled the
24	requirements to communicate with people. Others, no
25	transparency, no notification to landowners.

I agree greatly with Michael Pietsch, who just spoke. A lot of that is completely right on track.

And nobody came to our land and saw that it's sloped, and it's clay. And we have done a lot to try to get the ulu trees to live. We have ulu trees, we have animals on the property. Nobody has ever come out. We pay our bill, so I know that they know where our address is. We just never received any notification. This almost feels like a land grab to me, which is not right.

So that's all I have to say. I do not agree with the City and County, that they did not fulfill the requirement, simple as that.

I did send an email, but it wasn't shown, so maybe for tomorrow it will show.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry. We have a very small, awesome, but very small staff, so if somebody comes in right before the hearing, they might be busy getting ready for the actual hearing.

Are there questions for our witness, Ms.

Apuna?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MS. APUNA:

Q Can you provide your TMK or address?

1	A 57-548 Kamehameha Highway, Kahuku, Hawaii
2	96731.
3	MS. APUNA: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning.
5	MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
7	Thank you so much for your brief and direct
8	testimony. We appreciate it.
9	THE WITNESS: Mahalo.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sean Anderson
11	followed by Ken Church.
12	Sean Anderson, if you would enable your
13	audio and video. We can see you, and I think we will
14	be able to hear you.
15	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
16	you're about to give is the truth?
17	Please proceed.
18	SEAN ANDERSON
19	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
20	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
21	testified as follows:
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	THE WITNESS: Hello, everybody. Thanks
24	again.
25	Like everyone is getting tired, so I'll try

and go as quickly as I can.

I have a lot of the same testimony that other people said. I only have a small parcel of land that's being considered for the designation that we are talking about. I've owned it for about a year-and-a-half, and I pay taxes on it.

We did an environmental assessment, title search, everything is public. I feel like I should have been easy to get ahold of and contacted.

And basically the testimony I'm offering is that I don't believe that the City and County's recommendations for this designation does comply with 205-47, specifically Part B, which states that this recommendation was to be made in consultation and with the cooperation of the affected landowners.

And I understand that maybe some were, but nobody that I know of was. And I got no notice other than the letter that everyone got from you, even the lawyers ignored me.

But I think that I also saw that Petition had over 500 signatures when I saw it, and I think the reaction is largely based on the fact that people aren't getting the proper notification.

And you can see the testimony today, people didn't even really know what they were supposed to be

testifying about for the most part, so you saw a lot of confusion. And I think we could have avoided a lot of confusion and testimony if that notice was given, and if there was a larger attempt to actually do what that Section 205 says, which is include us in it, and consult with us.

And I feel like those 500 people that don't feel like that's what happened. That's one of my big concerns.

My other concern is that --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to summarize?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Just going to finish, if I could, which is just that I think that a lot of people might be for it, if they understood it better.

I also think that there are some things in there that I read, it causes confusion. It's vague. There's no commas. There's not the proper punctuation that should be in there. And people are feeling like they're going to get kicked off their land.

And I think it also fails to take into consideration that agricultural has changed a lot in Hawaii. Like what I'm doing is something that maybe it doesn't help, but it does help to keep agriculture

```
1
      alive. It does help to provide food for the
2
     community.
 3
                I just think that all of that is why people
     are so negatively charged up about this. That's all
 4
5
      I've got. Thank you.
 6
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
7
                Questions, Ms. Apuna?
8
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
     BY MS. APUNA:
9
10
                Thank you, Mr. Anderson, for your
           Q
11
     testimony. Would you be willing to provide your TMK
12
     or address?
13
          Α
                Sure, it's 1-6-5-001-051:002 and also
14
      there's two, and one ends in 001.
15
                Thank you very much.
           Q
               You're welcome.
16
          Α
17
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning.
18
                MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
19
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
20
                Commissioner Giovanni.
21
                COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Mr. Anderson, when
22
      you purchased your -- going through the purchase
23
     process a year-and-a-half ago for your land, was
24
     there any disclosure made to you by any entity --
25
                THE WITNESS: There was not.
```

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: -- subject to IAL consideration? 1

THE WITNESS: No, there was not. I literally just found out when I got the letter from the Commission.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions?

Would you be willing to briefly describe the nature of the agriculture that you're doing on your property that you alluded to?

THE WITNESS: Well, we have started off by growing like fruit trees, avocado and stuff like that, but what we aim to do is more community supported agriculture where especially for people who are low income would be able to come and participate in agriculture and learn how to grow for themselves, and also take home food when they did that.

So we're in the early stages of that right now. That's what our hope was. So we're really interested in actually sustainability and Hawaii's ability to feed itself. And that's why this kind of concerns me, because one of the reasons our land sat vacant for decades because it couldn't scale up.

We're not able to compete internationally, but we can do the smaller things.

For me, I want my grand -- my uncle, who's 1 2 elderly, to live on the farm, and I want to die and 3 be buried on that piece of land. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 4 5 Mr. Anderson. Appreciate it. 6 Moving Mr. Anderson to be an attendee. Ken 7 Church followed by Alisa Keamo. Mr. Church, if you can enable your audio 8 9 and video at the bottom of your screen, moving the 10 cursor over it. Commissioner Giovanni. 11 12 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: There's a number of 13 interesting attachments that are showing up in the 14 chat. Is there a way that those can be made part of 15 our record? 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We will seek the 17 staff to see if those can be added in. 18 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Church, I can see 20 you. I can hear you now. 21 I'm going to swear you in, but even before 22 that I'm going to ask, is your testimony on the 23 matter before us right now? 24 THE WITNESS: Yes. 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or

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

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

KEN CHURCH

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: I believe the Land Use

Commission concept has been flawed right from the

beginning. I echo what Mr. Bloom said. The Office

of Planning website describes it pretty well. Talks

about how Commission relies heavily on the Office of

Planning rather than County or State.

It may rely on individuals, but you're pretty hard pressed. The Office of Planning has legal assistance, they have research available to them, but individuals aren't at the same status level when they come before the Commission, and that weighs heavily on outcome.

As you're aware, we have zoning issues.

(Indecipherable). And I want to speak to two things.

After reclassification happens, which in this case it

may, reversal begins to apply to a Petitioner who

wants to say this was wrong or whatever, they have to prove it.

They have to prove that something was done wrong, and that's very, very expensive, time consuming. It's a huge process. And I sort of harken to what (indecipherable) was said in the recent Barry Trust things, after years of this thing, she said, I think I know more about that property than mine. That speaks to what I'm talking about. Takes hundreds of pages of application, et cetera, to get in front, and still things don't get resolved.

And even worse, error builds on error. And I give the example of how the community development plan evolved, and they rely on existing zoning and existing zoning error.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Two minutes. Ask you to summarize, please.

THE WITNESS: That's my summary. Error builds on error. Errors are made, and then another thing evolves, and you get looped into something that is very hard to change. And that's my testimony.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:} \mbox{ Thank you very much}$ for your testimony.

Questions for the witness, Ms. Apuna?

MS. APUNA: No questions. Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
2	MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
4	Seeing none, thank you very much, Mr. Church, for
5	your testimony on this matter.
6	Alisa Keamo followed by Sandra Van. If you
7	can enable your audio and video, Alisa Keamo.
8	THE WITNESS: Hi.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We can see you and
10	hear you, welcome. Thank you for your patience.
11	I'll swear you in and then you can testify.
12	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
13	you're about to give is the truth?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, I swear.
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
16	ALISA KEAMO
17	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
18	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
19	testified as follows:
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	THE WITNESS: So I have first I just
22	want to say that wait. First I'm speaking on
23	behalf of my mom on TMK 8-5-004:070 consisting of
24	2.41 acres of lands up in Waianae Valley.
25	I'm speaking on behalf of my mom. She said

we did not receive written notice, City and County did not provide written or verbal notice about designation of our parcel as IAL.

Second, strangely more than five years ago an individual from DPP had called my mom and, you know, now that we are educating ourself about this whole process, we're finding out that that individual might have been doing research for the criteria, you know, the water, agricultural use and soil.

So when he asked her questions about whether we use the land for agricultural use, and she felt really pressured in answering this individual. She felt if she answered wrongly that we would possibly lose our land.

But she does remember stating to this individual that we do use half of our property for agricultural purposes, but there is no education about the designation or that there was even a process of designation going on.

Third, since 1959 our family had moved into Waianae Valley and they were self-sustainable and they were farmers, and they grew their own food. But the big problem about that now is that the natural resources, the natural resource that they used to irrigate the crop, which was the stream that borders

our property, was cut off in the nineties.

So from that time on, it was really difficult to get water for our crops and our plants, and so it's kind of funny that the State wants to use our property for agriculture purposes, but they cut off a huge resource that allowed us to do that.

Also next door to us there is a solar farm, so we're confused because we get this notice from you guys, and we're learning about IAL literally from participating in today's meeting, but we understand that in order for a parcel to even do solar farming, they would have to also go through the rezoning process.

And that's really a concern for us, because we don't know what the health risks are, and we don't know what the long-term effects for the environment are, and for anyone who surrounds that property.

So we wanted to notice here there is a human fear if our property is deemed IAL, unforeseeable regulations as far as the City/State or any entity determining how we utilize the agricultural property.

We are definitely opposed, and we did not receive any invitation to participate in this process until now.

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your
2	testimony.
3	Questions, Ms. Apuna?
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. APUNA:
6	Q Thank you. If you could provide your TMK
7	or address if you're willing.
8	A TMK 8-5-004:070.
9	Q Thank you.
10	A And also like to thank Sharlette Poe for
11	participating and providing information. She
12	prefaced some of the things that I had to say today,
13	so mahalo, Sharlette.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning,
15	questions?
16	MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
18	Commissioner Chang.
19	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Mahalo, Alisa. I
20	don't have a question other than to say mahalo for
21	your testimony in representing your mother's
22	interest. Thank you so much for being patient and
23	staying with us all day. Mahalo.
24	THE WITNESS: We learned a lot today, thank
25	you.

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We have as well.
2	Thanks to your testimony and the testimony of others.
3	Thank you very much. Really appreciate it. Aloha.
4	Okay. We have four more hands raised,
5	Sandra Van followed by Bruce Hart. The last two are
6	or Primrose Leong Followed by Phyllis Dudoit.
7	Aloha, Sandra Van I think your audio
8	MS. VAN: I don't think the video is quite
9	up yet. Would you like me to go ahead without that?
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Did you press the
11	video icon?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It might be a band
14	width thing. We can proceed.
15	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
16	you're about to give is the truth?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
19	Thanks for your patience. Please proceed.
20	SANDRA VAN
21	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
22	Pubic, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
23	testified as follows:
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	THE WITNESS: First of all, thank you very

much, Chair, Commissioners and panelists. It's been a long day and I feel like I have learned a lot today.

My name is Sandy Van and I own two small parcels here in Waianae totaling 2.1 acres. The TMKs are 8-6-008:023 and 8-6-008:024.

I've lived here for more than 16 years and have received no notice of this planned action prior to the April 12th letter. Nor has anyone ever visited my property to assess the water quality, or suitability for crop production.

I don't know exactly what the required procedures were or are, but clearly the process is deeply flawed resulting in a lack of transparency and engagement.

If this goes through as presented, there will be unattended consequences, and many stand to lose their homes. Those are the people most impacted by IAL designation and must be a foundational part of the decision-making process.

I'm keeping it very short because I know it's been a long day for everyone.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your very clear and direct testimony, Ms. Van.

Questions for Ms. Van.

1 MS. APUNA: No questions, thank you. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 3 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 4 5 Commissioner Cabral. 6 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Sandy, are you the 7 Sandy that also has horses? 8 THE WITNESS: That's me. Hi, Nancy. VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Hi, good to see you 9 10 again. Time to have a rodeo. 11 Thank you. Good luck. We will see what happens. Thanks for testifying. We need to know. 12 This is very enlightening, all the information folks 13 14 have provided us. 15 THE WITNESS: Good to see you again and 16 thanks again for everyone. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further for 18 Ms. Van? Thank you very much for your testimony and for your clarity and brevity. We appreciate it and 19 20 your patience. 21 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Moving you to be an 23 attendee. 24 There's now four hands raised. We need to

stop at 4:30, and my intention is to close public

testimony so we can hear from the City tomorrow and get information on what they think their process has been.

So Primrose Leong, Phyllis Dudoit and Charles Kelly.

I'm going to admit Bruce Hart followed by
Primrose Leong. If you could enable your audio and
video. We can see you. If you move your cursor over
the icon, can you say --

THE WITNESS: Hi.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Great.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

BRUCE HART

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: So I vaguely remember getting something in the mail years ago about IAL. My wife doesn't remember anything. I spoke to my neighbor and she said that she and her husband did attend a hearing at a school, but they haven't heard anything

since then, which was four years ago plus or minus, and haven't heard anything either this whole time.

So kind of, you know, I kind of understand the IAL and how they're trying to preserve agricultural lands, but it seems to be some of the rules might be punitive. I know there is a lot of agricultural land that people don't do anything on it. And so they pay a higher property tax.

I dedicated my land in 1990, I think, and it's a really small parcel, but why pay the City higher taxes when I can spend a few dollars and grow plants in my yard, you know, fruit trees, ornamentals. It just seemed advantageous. I have to do yard work anyway.

At one time I grew landscape plants, and then I kind of got out of that. I got old. I'm 69-and-a-half years now, and I think I had to rededicate my land five years ago. Someone came from the City and County. You know, I applied for the designation, and you know I told I was going to plant trees, and I had all the trees in the yard, and we had started planting.

She said just make sure you plant them, because there is a lot of people that ask for the dedication, and it's awarded, but they don't do

```
anything. They get a tax break. So I guess --
1
2
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Two minutes.
 3
                THE WITNESS: -- any more about the IAL
 4
      since it's moved along. Nothing in the mail, nothing
5
     to tell me what was going on.
 6
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you so much.
7
     Are there questions, Ms. Apuna?
8
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
     BY MS. APUNA:
9
10
                Mr. Hart, can you provide us your TMK or
11
     address?
12
                4-1-10 -- wait, 4-1-010:070.
          Α
                Thank you, Mr. Hart.
13
          Q
14
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
15
               MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
16
17
                You know, even though many of the points I
     think echo what others have said, it really, really
18
19
     helps us to hear from as many people as possible.
20
                Thank you so much for your patience and
21
     testimony today. We really appreciate it.
22
                I'm going to move you to be an attendee.
23
      I'm going to admit Primrose Leong followed by Phyllis
24
      Dudoit.
25
                If you can enable your audio and video.
```

1	THE WITNESS: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha.
3	THE WITNESS: Aloha.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or
5	affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the
6	truth?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Please
9	proceed.
10	PRIMROSE LEONG
11	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
12	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
13	testified as follows:
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Primrose
16	Leong Nakamoto. I'm the property manager for AOUO
17	Kemoo Camp, and that camp is consisting of 66 homes,
18	with 132 homeowners on it, and over 300 people living
19	there.
20	We're a little unique. We have 91.687
21	acres zoned at AG-1, restricted Ag District. And we
22	also have a variance on it. I have three TMK's for
23	that. We've been paying for the taxes.
24	We were not notified about this IAL,
25	however, somehow I got wind of a meeting and went to

that particular meeting. And when I wanted to get more information, it was told to me that they would follow up and let me know when the time comes.

And then all of a sudden -- and that must have been the letter mailed out on April 12 -- the whole entire association got that letter. And I was inundated with all the calls, and this is why I said, nobody called the LUC or DPP or anyone. Let me handle this. And this is why I'm here with my testimony representing the whole association.

So earlier you had talked to Ballera,

Jennifer Ballera. She was one of them that gave me a

call also, so I'm very happy that she put in

testimony here. However, I want to correct her TMK.

It's 7-1-001-011-0073. I believe that 7-1-001-011

and then dash 000, is the property that holds -
consists of 33 acres where all the homes sits on.

So think about each of those individual homes that sit on there, those 66 homes. They pay their property taxes individually. Therefore, none of them did receive the letter until this letter came in.

Secondly --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Kala mai, Ms. Leong,
I'm trying to keep people to two minutes. I'm trying

to end by 4:30 hard. So I realize you're
representing a whole association, but if you can do
your best to summarize.

THE WITNESS: I just want to say, none of us was aware. We're still trying to understand what this IAL is, and feel at this point, when I got all of the majority of calls, it did not feel that they should be part of this IAL.

Although we have 52 acres that we are planning to do Ag for the State, and as long as for the homeowners, but for our State, because majority of the farmers when they grow, they sell their product to the mainland.

We're thinking of taking care of home today, and this was our agreement with the association and myself.

So I have two more TMK's. Shall I submit that now?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please.

THE WITNESS: Okay, that would be 7-1-001-011-0077, that's for 52.141 acre, AG-1 property; 7-1-001-011-0078 is 1.616 acre AG-1 property. And that's the end of my presenting.

I just want to make sure that you are aware that the whole entire camp is shaking right now

because this camp, all 66 homes ties into the ag 1 2 property. That's why I said it's a little bit unique 3 because they own the Ag property, all of them. So they should have gotten the notice, but 4 they never did until this one came. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Questions for the 7 witness from City? 8 MS. APUNA: No questions. Thank you. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 10 MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 11 Commissioner Cabral. 12 13 I'm just going to remind everybody, we are 14 running up against a deadline. I want to get everybody with hands up. 15 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. I manage 16 17 homeowners associations, so God bless you for doing 18 the job. Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further? 20 Thank you very much for your persistence 21 and patience with us and for providing your testimony 22 to us, it's very important. Mahalo nui. 23 Charles Kelley followed by Gordon Aken.

I'm moving Charles Kelley to be a panelist. I can hear you and see you.

24

1 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 2 you're about to give is the truth? THE WITNESS: Yes, do. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 4 5 CHARLES KELLEY 6 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 7 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 8 testified as follows: 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you for your patience 11 today. My name is Charles Kelley. My family owns 12 two TMKs in Wailua 6-7-002:043, and 6-7-002:040. 13 When we purchased the land in 2013 we had 14 Group 70 do an assessment for development potential. 15 In that document there was no notice of the IAL 16 impending designation. 17 We looked at our Title Guarantee title 18 report. There's no designation -- there's no mention 19 of that in that document either. 20 Our land is currently in agricultural use. 2.1 We plan to keep it that way for as long as possible. 22 When I received the notice in 2017, November, of the 23 IAL impending designation, my first thought was

couldn't be us, we are agriculture, but we are not

good agriculture. We have 800 feet of elevation

24

between the front and back of our property. It's a mountainside. You need ropes to go up and down it.

You might grow goats, but not prime agriculture.

So when I got the notice, I thought couldn't be us, and I put it off, and then tried to learn as much as possible, even though I couldn't go to the meetings.

By reading all of the testimony provided at the Oahu public meetings, it still didn't answer my questions. I was unclear what the benefits were; unclear what the long-term consequences were. I looked into voluntary designation of our land, and consulted an attorney and found it would cost 75 to \$100,000 to go through the process of doing that. That wasn't exciting.

I looked into trying to figure out if we could opt out. Never saw a good way to opt out, but I did notice on the website that my neighbors on both sides of me were very similar properties, had requested to opt out and were denied. So that seemed like no option.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Summarize, please.

THE WITNESS: The process has been difficult to understand and confusing. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: A fair summary.

1	Are there questions for the witness?
2	MS. APUNA: No questions. Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?
4	MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? Thank
6	you so much for your detailed testimony and for your
7	patience and your good humor that you bring to us
8	despite the length of the day.
9	THE WITNESS: Mahalo. Have a good day.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo.
11	Gordon Aken. This is the last call for
12	testimony on this matter. Aloha.
13	THE WITNESS: Aloha. First of all just
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or
15	affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the
16	truth?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes.
18	GORDON AKEN
19	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
20	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
21	testified as follows:
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	THE WITNESS: I just wanted to say mahalo
24	to everyone. It's been a long day, since 9:00.
25	I just wanted to say that we couldn't get

- any information, and this is our family property.

 It's been in our family since 1953. So since then my

 grandparents have passed, so my mom's kind of taking,
- 4 you know, does all the paperwork and the taxes and

5 all.

And my uncle lives on the property now. He has medical issues right now, so needless to say it's really not ag land that they're saying, but I just wanted to say that there is some properties that, yes, you can consider that IAL, but there is some that we will really can't -- they just need to come out and see it, and evaluate that instead of just trying to say that it is IAL.

That's all I wanted to say. Just to note that, and that we got the only information on April 12th, 2021.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. Questions, Ms. Apuna?

 ${\tt MS.}$ APUNA: No questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

MS. KATO: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Thank you so much for sticking with us since 9:00 A.M., not necessarily how you expected to spend your day at 9:00 A.M., but we very much

1 | appreciate it.

I'm going to move you back to being an attendee.

There are two Phyllis Dudoits with a hand raised. I'm going to admit one.

Phyllis, if you can enable your audio and video. You can do so by putting your cursor over the bottom of your screen. You should see a little image of a camera and image of a microphone. I will note that you're logged in twice. So I'm going to admit the other. I assume it's not two people with the exact same name wishing to testify. So I'm going to also admit the other Phyllis Dudoit.

I can see you. Cannot hear you yet. Can see your lips moving, not picking up your audio unfortunately. You're unmuted, so I think it might be -- do you have an earphone plugged in? Maybe unplug it, replug it in.

I'm so sorry, I can see you. I can see you talking. I cannot hear you. You had two devices, correct, logged in?

We cannot hear you. I'm so sorry. We're getting video but not audio. I don't know if you still have that other account logged in. If you do, perhaps log out of that.

1 You're going to hangup and try again.

opportunity to give testimony.

We'll wait a moment then. Noting what was previously testified, had your hand raised, I really do not believe we have the band width to take a second round of testimony from people who testified today. We have endeavored to give as many people as possible

You may continue to submit written testimony on this matter. Ms. Dudoit, try speaking now. I think I heard you. Say something.

Your audio -- your video is frozen. Do you want to try no video, just audio?

Folks, I am very sorry, due to problems which may be entirely outside your control, we're not getting your audio. We will wait one more moment. We can go to 4:30, she's been very persistent. Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair.

While we are waiting for Ms. Dudoit, earlier this morning I made comment to the Chair about my concern about all the public testimony and about how long it would take.

I just want to say that I really do appreciate the public coming forward in the volume and number that they did. And I have found it to be

very worthwhile and I appreciate it. 1 2 And let me also commended you, Chair, for 3 your administrative eloquence in managing the 4 situation. Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 6 Commissioner Giovanni. 7 Ms. Dudoit, I can hear -- I think I can 8 hear you. 9 THE WITNESS: I apologize for holding 10 everybody up. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Quickly. 12 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 13 you're about to give is the truth? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. You are our last testifier. 16 17 PHYLLIS DUDOIT Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 18 19 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 20 testified as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 THE WITNESS: Thank you so much. I just 23 wanted to say that the letter we received on April

12th is, I guess, the second notice. And I

believe -- I don't believe that the City adequately

24

provided notice to all the agriculture owners. I think that I agree with the person Shar that we should have been informed and had the meeting out in Waianae so that a lot of the people could show up.

And, you know, we own a small parcel of land, two acres, and we're trying to be self-sustainable for ourselves so that we can, you know, grow fruits and live off the land.

And we didn't have an opportunity to opt out, and if we did, we would. And so I just wanted to state that.

Thank you to all the people that submitted their testimony, and I hear that a lot of them didn't get adequate notice. I tried to educate myself by going on the website and trying to read everything, but didn't really understand everything.

So I just wanted to say that if I had the opportunity to opt out, that I would and just keep ag, but not Important Ag Land. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you so much for your extreme persistence, and the gold star patience of being the last testifier.

Let me see if there are any questions, County?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. APUNA:

- 3 Q Thank you.
- 4 Ms. Dudoit, can you provide your TMK or
- 5 your address?
- 6 A It's 8-7-2:110.
- 7 Q Thank you very much.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Questions, Office of
- 9 Planning?
- MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
- 12 It's 4:28. I intend to go into recess at
- 13 4:30 until tomorrow morning. Seeing none --
- 14 Commissioner Chang.
- 15 COMMISSIONER CHANG: No, no. Just
- 16 | congratulations. You did a wonderful job
- maintaining. Really appreciate it, and you were able
- 18 to get through everybody's testimony.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm very appreciative
- 20 to all the testifiers. We all are deeply
- 21 appreciative. I'm going to close public testimony
- 22 | now, but let me be very clear.
- 23 This is just regarding the procedural
- 24 motion before us. Should the Commission move on to
- 25 actually consider the merits of the County's

proposal, we would reopen public testimony at that

time, and absolutely provide any individual landowner

the opportunity to present an argument against their

inclusion of their property.

Closing testimony is only in regard to this

procedural matter that we had. We deeply appreciate

it. So to Ms. Dudoit who has closed us out, and for

your patience, as well as to everyone else.

It is 4:29 P.M. and I'm going to call this meeting into recess until 9:00 A.M. tomorrow morning when we begin with presentation of City and County of Honolulu.

Thank you to everyone for your patience and efforts today. Aloha.

(The proceedings recessed at 4:29 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE
STATE OF HAWAII)) SS.
COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
That on April 28, 2021, at 9:40 a.m., the
proceedings contained herein was taken down by me in
machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
typewriting under my supervision; that the foregoing
represents, to the best of my ability, a true and
correct copy of the proceedings had in the foregoing
matter.
I further certify that I am not of counsel for
any of the parties hereto, nor in any way interested
in the outcome of the cause named in this caption.
Dated this 28th day of April, 2021, in
Honolulu, Hawaii.
/s/ Jean Marie McManus
JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156