1	LAND USE COMMISSION		
2	STATE OF HAWAI'I Hearing held on June 10, 2021 Commencing at 9:00 a.m		
3			
4	Held via ZOOM by Interactive Conference Technology		
5		VIII. Call to Order	
6	IX.	Continued action (If Necessary) SP21-411 AES West O'ahu Solar, LLC	
7	Х.	CONTINUED HEARING AND ACTION A11-791 Kaua'i Joint Venture LLC-Hokua Place	
8	( A B I	(Kaua'i) Amended Petition to Amend the Land Use District	
9		Boundary of Certain Lands Situated at Kapa'a, Island f Kaua'i, State of Hawai'i, Consisting of 97 Acres from the Agriculture District to	
10			
11		the Urban District, Tax May Key No. (4) 4-3-003: POR 001	
12		<ul><li>* To Consider Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw</li><li>* To Consider Motions to Dismiss</li></ul>	
13	XI.	Adjournment	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	Before	e: 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)
      LEE OHIGASHI (Maui)
      ARNOLD WONG (Oahu)
4
      DAWN CHANG (Oahu)
5
      DAN GIOVANNI (Kauai)
      GARY OKUDA (Oahu)
6
      STAFF:
7
      DAN MORRIS, 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
      ALISON KATO, ESQ.
      Deputy Attorney General
      RODNEY FUNAKOSHI, Planning Program Administrator
12
      AARON SETOGAWA, Planner
13
      State Office of Planning
      State of Hawaii
14
      DUANE PANG, ESQ.
15
      DINA WONG, Planner
      Department of Planning and Permitting
16
      City and County of Honolulu
17
      CURTIS TABATA, ESQ.
      777 Mililani Street, Suite 300
18
      Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
      For AES West Oahu Solar, Petitioner
19
      CHRIS DONOHOE, ESQ.
20
      Kaua'i Corporation Counsel
      JODI HIGUCHI SAYEGUSA, Kaua'i Planning Dept.
2.1
      County of Kaua'i
22
      WILLIAM YUEN, ESQ.
      JANNA AHU, ESQ.
23
      For Petitioner A11-791
      HG Kaua'i Joint Venture, LLC
2.4
     BIANCA ISAKI, ESQ.
25
      Liko Martin
      For Intervenor
```

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha mai kakou.

Good morning.

This is the June 10th, 2021 Land Use

Commission, which is being held, of course, as you

can tell if you're here, via ZOOM, linking

videoconferencing participants and other interested

individuals of the public in order to comply with

State and County official operational directives

during the still ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Members

of the public are able to view the meeting via the

ZOOM webinar platform.

For all meeting participants, I would like to stress the importance of speaking slowly, clearly and directly into your microphone. It is also helpful if you identify yourself prior to speaking.

Also please be aware that this meeting is being recorded. Your continued participation is your implied consent to be part of the official record of this meeting. If you do not so consent, you should be leaving this meeting now.

This technology allows all of the meeting participants and each individual Commissioner access to the meeting via our own individual personal digital devices. Because of that, due to matters entirely outside of our control, from time to time

occasional disruptions to connectivity may occur. If this happens, please be patient. Please let us know as we will try to restore audio/visual signals so that we can conduct our business during the pandemic.

For any members of the public who wish to testify during our meeting during any matter to which public testimony will be accepted, you can indicate your desire to be raised to a participant in the meeting and testify rather than simply be attendee by using the raise-your-hand function. If you are accessing the meeting during the ZOOM webinar either on your laptop, desktop or smart phone; or if you are calling in by telephone, by pressing \*9.

I'll repeat these instructions as well as my indication that I will try to take a break approximately ten minutes every hour.

My name is Jonathan Likeke Scheuer, and I have the pleasure and honor of serving, along with my seven co-volunteers, as the Chair of the Land Use Commission.

Along with me Commissioner Edmund Aczon,

Dawn Chang, Gary Okuda, Arnold Wong, our Executive

Officer Daniel Orodenker, our Chief Planner Scott

Derrickson, our Program Specialist, Natasha Quinones,

Our chief Clerk Riley Hakoda, our Deputy Attorney

General, and our Court Reporter, Jean McManus, are all on the Island of O'ahu.

Commissioner Lee Ohigashi is on the Island of Maui, Commissioner Dan Giovanni is on the Island of Kaua'i, and Commissioner Nancy Cabral is on Hawaii Island.

We currently have eight seated Commissioners of a possible nine.

I'm going to briefly describe some of the schedule hick-ups we have for today. Commissioner Dan Giovanni I believe needs to be absent between 9:30 and 10:15 A.M.; is that correct?

You're muted, Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair.

I have adjusted my schedule. I'm fully available today.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Excellent, thanks you so much.

Commissioner Lee Ohigashi needs to leave about 1:30, as does Commissioner Aczon; and Commissioner Wong can only stay until 3:00 P.M.

Our matters yesterday took much longer than was initially anticipated. Our hope is that we can get through all of our business by 1:30 P.M., at least that's my individual hope.

# SP21-411 AES WEST O'AHU SOLAR, LLC

With that said, our next Agenda item is

Docket SP21-411 AES West Solar, LLC To Consider a

Special Use Permit Application 2020/SUP-6 AES West

O'ahu Solar, LLC for Construction and Operation of a

12.5 Megawatt Solar Photovoltaic and 50-Megawatt hour

Battery Energy Storage System on Land Owned by the

University of Hawaii, TMK (1)9-2-002, Lot 007 and;

To Consider the Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order related to (CUP 2006/0001).

Will the parties, beginning with the Applicant, please identify yourselves for the record?

MR. TABATA: Good morning, Chair and Members of the Commission, Curtis Tabata for AES, Petitioner.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And are any of your clients with you, Mr. Tabata?

MR. TABATA: Yes, also present is Nick Molinari, the project manager.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

City and County of Honolulu.

MR. PANG: Good morning, Your Honor, good morning Commissioners. Duane Pang on behalf of Department of Planning and Permitting. Also with me

is Dina Wong, Planner, representing Department of 1 2 Planning and Permitting. Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Mr. Pang. May I assume that on the ZOOM window that 4 5 the second entrance of Duane Pang is actually Dina 6 Wong? 7 MR. PANG: No, I think I just was mistaken. That's probably me making a very big mistake. 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No, no. There's two. 9 10 The staff can check and rename. There's two entries 11 for you. Thank you very much. 12 Office of Planning, Ms. Kato. MS. KATO: Good morning, Chair. Deputy 13 14 Attorney General, Alison Kato for Office of Planning. 15 Also here with me is Rodney Funakoshi and attendees Lorene Make from the Office of Planning. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. 18 Now, let me first update the record. 19 On March 3rd, 2021 we received public 20 testimony from Senator Kurt Favella. 21 On April 27, 2021, the Commission received 22 Special Use Permit Application for AES West Oahu

On May 5th the Commission received Planning Commission's index of records containing Exhibits

23

24

25

Solar.

1 | 17-A through 17-H.

On May 13th the Commission received the Applicant's proposed Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, Exhibit A, and as well as a Certificate of Service and an Amended Certificate of Service.

On June 4th, the Commission mailed the Meeting Agenda for today's meeting to the Parties in this docket, Statewide and County Lists.

On June 7th, the Commission received Office of Planning's Comments on this Special Use Permit Application.

Also on that day, the Commission received additional Public Testimony.

On June 8th the Commission received email from the Applicant stating AES had no objections to Office of Planning's Proposed Conditions stated in the June 7th letter.

Now, for the parties and public, let me describe our procedures for today.

First, I will acknowledge all written testimony received to this point on this matter.

After the completion of noting that, I will offer the opportunity for individuals of the public to offer oral testimony on this matter. I will do so

by asking them to raise their hand using the
raise-your-hand function in the attendee room. I

will then enter you into the meeting room one by one,
offer three minutes to provide testimony, following
your being sworn in. Following the testimony, you
will be available for questions by the parties and
the Commissioners.

After the completion of all public testimony, I will call for the Applicant to make their presentation and Commissioners to ask questions of the Applicant.

I will then provide opportunity for the County and Office of Planning to offer comments on this docket.

Following that, the Commission will ask any final questions and then the Commission will move into deliberation.

As I stated before, from time to time, approximately ten minutes every hour, we will take breaks.

Any questions with our procedures for today?

MR. TABATA: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Pang?

MR. PANG: This is Duane Pang. No

1 questions. Thank you, Your Honor. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Kato? 3 MS. KATO: No questions. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm now going to note 4 5 the written testimony that we have received as I 6 previously stated, March 22nd we received testimony 7 in opposition from Senator Kurt Favella. On June 7th we received testimony from 8 9 Hawaii Operating Engineers Industry Stabilization 10 Fund. 11 On the 7th, also from Pacific Resources 12 Partnership, from Scott Enright and Rebecca Dayhuff 13 Matsushima on behalf of Hawaiian Electric Company, 14 Incorporated. 15 And this morning we received testimony from Damon Kim of the International Brotherhood of 16 17 Electrical Workers. I'm now going to call on any individuals 18 19 who wish to provide public this testimony on this 20 docket. 21 I'm going to first let in Pane Meatoga, 22 III, followed by Michael Pacheco.

Again, if you wish to testify, use the raise-your-hand function; or if calling in by phone, \*9. When you come into the meeting room, please, you

23

24

will now be able to enable your audio and video, so

please do so.

And then I will swear you in; ask you to

state your name, address and any affiliation for the

record, and have three minutes to testify.

Mr. Meatoga, would you please enable your audio and video?

Aloha, good morning.

THE WITNESS: Good morning, aloha.

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

THE WITNESS: I do.

### PANE MEATOGA, III

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

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: State your name, address and affiliation for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: Pane Meatoga, III, address is 2180 Lauwiliwili Street, Kapolei, Hawaii 96707. I represent the Operating Engineers Industry Stabilization Fund. That is a labor management fund comprised of our 3,000 local 3 union members, and our

600 signatory contractors.

So I just wanted to submit -- you have my written, but also to give some oral testimony regards to supporting of this project.

As you know, in my oral testimony -- and I'll just quickly summarize really quick regards to the State's renewable energy goals.

I've worked on many projects. My area that I live in is out on the North Shore in Kahuku, so obviously, I am very well aware of what goes on there with the winter runs and such. That was a very controversial project, but when I see projects like this that make sense and combine both agricultural and renewable energy goals that we have for the State, to me that's a big "no brainer" and makes more sense, you know, PV as opposed to wind, so I'm really happy to see a project that makes sense and works for everyone in the community.

Obviously, there is an economic aspect to it in regards to job creation, as well as, you know, having more workforce shift over to renewable energy type of job.

We still have high unemployment. In my former life, I worked as tourism executive. So a lot of my friends are still out of work. And so having

an opportunity for, you know, people from tourism 1 2 sector to come into other sectors I think is a great 3 thing, and obviously diversification of the economy 4 and getting more industries, especially growth 5 industries makes a lot of sense. 6 So in summary, I just wanted to submit my 7 oral testimony in support of this project. Thank 8 you. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo nui. 10 Are there questions for the witness from the Petitioner? 11 12 MR. TABATA: No questions. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County? 14 MR. PANG: No questions from the County. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 16 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, any 18 questions? 19 Seeing none. Thank you very much for your 20 testimony, both written and oral. We very much 21 appreciate it. Mahalo nui. 22 I'm going to make you an attendee again, then let in our next testifier. 23 24 Michael Pacheco. Again, when you're

admitted to become a panelist, please enable your

1 audio and video.

2 Aloha.

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

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. So if you could state your name and address and affiliation for the record, then proceed.

# MICHAEL PACHECO

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: Good morning. My name is Michael Pacheco. My address is 1550 Alancaster Street. Zip code is 96816. I live in the Kaimuki area. I am giving testimony on behalf IBEW 1186, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Our membership comprises of about 3500 members ranging from electrical construction, telecommunication, Spectrum, AT&T, Civil Service Workers, Motor & Marine, and a recent Kamehameha and Private School Teachers as well. I thank you for giving me the time to testify.

And if I may, just to start off. This is

my first opportunity in a LUC meeting, and if I may give your thanks for your diligence.

Yesterday as I sat through, I saw the hard work that everybody puts in. Thank you, Chair Scheuer, Vice Chair Aczon and the rest of the Commissioners.

And once again, you know, we are in strong support and in respect of your time, I just want to be nice and brief and to the point.

Here at the IBEW on behalf (indecipherable) our eyes and our perspective in targeting the big thing is our State school of being 100 percent renewal by 2045, and projects like this move us forward, helping us to better serve our community and our members.

I just want to bring up three solid points.

First off, you know, to kind of reiterate brother Pane's sentiment. You know, we definitely at this point of the game with the pandemic need to be really smart about what project we choose to push forward. In this sense, I definitely think that this is one of those.

And the reasons are this. You know, one, their track record. You can see that with AES, their track record is solid, and that's definitely

1 something else.

But more importantly, I think, in my third and final point is the relationship that we've built with them. We have had those eye to eye kind of conversations about making sure that not only is this project done at the hands of capable people, but more importantly, it being safe. You know, we can go on about some of the other points, but for us here at IBEW we really feel that these are some of the three highlight points of why we're in strong support of this Special Use Permit.

So with that being said, I thank you for your time, and leave it in your capable and hands. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Mr. Pacheco. We appreciate it.

Questions for the witness?

MR. TABATA: No questions.

MR. PANG: No questions from the County.

MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes. Thank you, Mr.

23 Chair.

Mr. Pacheco, just a real fast question. You talked about the track record of AES, and also it

seems like the relationship between the union and AES,

Can you comment a little bit about that because in my view sometimes relationships are important too.

So can you comment from about the track record and the relationship between the union and the company, briefly anyway? Thank you.

THE WITNESS: And not a problem at all. Thank you for the question.

You know, I've been lucky enough where Damon Kim, our business manager and secretary, has spearheaded these conversations.

You know, I definitely know if he was here, he could probably give a little bit stronger point of view. I was more of in the background listening as we went to it.

Just to be able to have that open door back and forth where, hey, you know, and much to the point of even their redesign and making sure that we have more agricultural opportunities there as well is some of the topics that kind of came up as we dealt with them.

Unfortunately, for me personally, this is our first, you know, for my boss because he has more

experience, he has more, I guess granular details about exact projects, this and that. But I was there to witness that back and forth banter. And to me, that is super important, because lot of people can say one thing, and then down the road things change. And so far from what we have seen, it's always been that straight line.

So I hope that answers your questions, Commissioner.

very much. I'm glad to hear cooperative nature, because we all in Hawaii have to work together no matter what sectors we come from, because I guess, as the old saying says, we're all in the same boat or the same canoe trying to paddle in the same direction. So thank you for taking time and your testimony.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any furthers questions, Commissioners? Seeing none.

Thank you very much, Mr. Pacheco, for your testimony. I'm going to move you to an attendee again, and call on Nathaniel Kinney, followed by Christopher Delaunay, Cam Black and Jan Gouveia in that order.

1 Aloha. Good morning, Mr. Kinney. 2 THE WITNESS: Good morning. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 4 affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the 5 truth? 6 THE WITNESS: I do. 7 NATHANIEL KINNEY 8 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 9 10 testified as follows: 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 THE WITNESS: I am here representing Hawaii 13 Regional Council of Carpenters, and we wanted to 14 support the Applicant in their project. 15 We believe the project will help Hawaii 16 meet its 100 percent renewable goal by 2045, reduces 17 the need for fossil fuels. The project would produce jobs and economic 18 19 activity in a time when we need it most. The project 20 also to us meaningfully incorporates agriculture 21 through honey and bee production, and provides badly 22 needed revenue to the State and the University of 23 Hawaii, specifically right now with these budget 24 shortfalls, especially with the University.

And we believe that the LUC should move

swiftly to approve this project. I believe there's the coal-fired electrical plant that's going to be ending in 2022, so I believe solar energy is the much better fit for Hawaii, and getting this online as quickly as possible so that we can shutdown the fossil fuel site would be best.

And to the point of one of the other

Commissioner's questions, we do believe AES is a

reputable company. They have shown a desire to pay

living wages.

I mean, in this move from fossil fuel to clean energy, I think it's important that we support developers who come in and want to pay a meaningful living wage to workers in Hawaii; and there's no reason why we can't kill two birds with one stone, transition to green energy while paying a living wage to our local workers. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr.

Kinney. Can you also -- thank you for stating your name and your affiliation. Can you state your address for the record?

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. 1311
Houghtailing Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817.

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{CHEUER: Questions for the} \\ \mbox{witness.}$ 

1 MR. TABATA: No questions, thank you. 2 MR. PANG: No questions. 3 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 4 Commissioner Aczon. 5 6 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 I'm not sure if it's --CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You can disclose if 8 9 you would like to. 10 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Yes, thank you. 11 I just want to disclose that I have prior 12 working relationship with Nathaniel Kinney on his 13 prior positions. I didn't know that he's working for 14 the Regional Council of Carpenters. Having said that, my office, my capacity is 15 16 training carpenters, apprenticeship. But my office 17 and the Regional Council of Carpenters, the two are different entities independent of each other. 18 19 And I can assure you that, you know, I'll 20 be virtual on this. I don't have any financial 21 obligation or from the carpenters. So I just want to 22 kind of disclose that. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much 24 for disclosing your relationship with a witness 25 stated just in abundance of caution.

I will check to see if any of the parties have any objection to Commissioner Aczon's participation.

MR. TABATA: No objections.

MR. PANG: No objections from the City.

MS. KATO: No objections, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner

Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thanks, Chair.

Just a point of clarification. I want to make sure that the remarks by Mr. Kinney are not misinterpreted.

You spoke to the transition in two part from fossil fuel to renewable energy, also to better wage structure. But isn't it true that the loss of jobs from the AES coal plant, those were good paying jobs as well?

THE WITNESS: That's a really good point.

In my previous capacity actually we had some issues with the coal-fired power plant. They did some refracting work, and they brought in guys from the mainland to do it. So I just can't -- I understand that it's a sister company of AES, and that they're all under the same umbrella, but that just really rubbed me the wrong way when they brought in the guys

from the mainland to do -- from I believe Texas -- to do their maintenance on their refractory work, whereas the AES Solar plant is going to be hiring guys locally from here to put the panels, to clear the land, to tie into the grid.

I guess I would have only, actually having dealings with AES the coal-fired power plant -- and then when we want down there to talk to them about using guys from the mainland, they were just kind of like, well, you guys don't have any specialty in this. And we're like we do have. There are contractors that have specifically -- and local guys that are on the bench right now that need this work.

So, again, I just see that as this comparison to the solar power plant, which is like, hey, green energy, and we're willing to take local guys and take them off the bench and put them to work.

That was just a personal experience of mine from previous capacity. But I do think there are some jobs in there, but again, I think the State has made it clear that they want to transition away from this fossil fuel and the need to change our ways, you know, and trying to get to a better greener production of power.

1 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I'm not going to 2 take issue with your personal perspective, but I do 3 believe that the full-time employees of AES coal plant or IBW union workers and those jobs will be 4 5 lost. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 7 Commissioner Giovanni. Are there further questions for the 8 9 witness? 10 I just observe, rather than since we are 11 trying to protect the environment, rather than killing two birds with one stone, we might be saving 12 13 two birds with one action. 14 THE WITNESS: I stand in deference with the 15 Chair on that one. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much 17 for your testimony today. We appreciate it. 18 I'm going to move you to be an attendee. 19 I'm going to admit Cam Black. 20 Again, please enable your audio and video. 21 I will swear you in, state your name, address and 22 affiliation for the record. 23 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 24 you're about to give is the truth? 25 THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

2 CAMERON BLACK

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, Chair.

Good morning, Chair, Commissioners,
everybody else out there. My name is Cameron Black,
Renewal Energy Project Program Manager at the Hawaii
State Energy Office. Our office address is 235 South
Beretania Street in downtown Honolulu.

And my apologies. We did not submit written testimony to the LUC on this SUP, but I'll provide you my oral testimony within three minutes.

In 2010 about 17 percent of the Oahu's electricity came from renewable energy.

In 2020 about 31 percent of Oahu's electricity came from renewable energy. And collectively, the State's electric utility surpassed the state mandate of 30 percent renewable energy by 2020.

However, we still have to replace over 60 percent of Oahu's fossil fuel electricity in the next 23 years for Oahu to reach 100 percent renewable

energy by 2045.

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, in 2019 Hawaii's imported fuel of foreign crude oil came primarily from Libya and Russia, with other refined products, including jet fuel, propane, sulfur, diesel fuel oil imported primarily from Asia, the Caribbean and South America.

Why is crude oil off-loaded in offshore, more important off Campbell Industrial Park, moved inland via a pipeline refined and then redistributed via barge throughout the State with other refined petroleum products.

As was mentioned earlier, Oahu's only coal plant, 180 megawatt coal plant at Campbell Industrial Park, which provides between 12 to 16 percent of Oahu's electricity, but is the second highest stationary source of greenhouse gasses behind the Kahe Power Plant, generating 19 percent of the GHD admitted by Hawaii's power plants.

This coal plant is scheduled to be retired on September 1st, 2022, and is prohibited by State law from operating after December 2020.

We believe the West Oahu Solar project is a critical project for our energy transformation, given its rural related to the ending the use of coal in

1 Hawaii.

Of the nine new utility skills solar plus solar projects now being proposed on Oahu, the West Oahu solar project has the earliest guaranteed operations date of September 7, 2022 -- did I say that number right? I think I did -- which is a week after the scheduled retirement of the coal plant.

We hope this project receives your approval, and we request that the LUC at least make timely decision so all involved can integrate a decision as to how we as an island move forward on the coal plant and other projects involved.

I'm happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Mr. Black, for your testimony.

Questions for the witness?

MR. TABATA: No questions.

MR. PANG: No questions.

MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

If not, we very much appreciate your taking the time to give us oral testimony. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. I look

forward to listening to the rest of it. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to move you 3 to be attendee, and admit Christopher Delaunay. 4 If you can enable your audio and video upon 5 being admitted to be a panelist. Good morning. We can't hear you. Try to 6 7 say something. We're not getting audio. There might be a microphone issue. If you have a head set, you 8 9 can plug in, that might assist. 10 If it's okay, Mr. Delaunay, I'm going to 11 move to Jan Gouveia while you try to work this out. 12 I'm going to move you back to being an attendee for a 13 brief period. I'm going to admit Jan Gouveia. 14 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth? 15 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You know the drill. 18 JAN GOUVEIA 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: All righty. 24 Good morning, Chair Scheuer, Vice Chair 25 Aczon, and Members of the Commission.

I am Jan Gouveia, Vice President

Administration at the University of Hawaii, address

for the record is 2444 Dole Street, Honolulu, Hawaii

96822.

We are the landowner of the property at issue. We want to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of the Application before you today. We thought we actually submitted written testimony on Monday the 7th, but it appears that we were not successful in uploading our testimony. I do apologize for that.

In brief, I would like to share that the University is very excited about working with AES to develop solar PV and storage on our West Oahu property.

This project hits a lot of our strategic goals and objectives, like a sustainability mandate to achieve net zero by 2035, by increasing the productivity of our underutilized land, as well as doing our part to help the State and public decrease its reliance and demand for fossil fuels.

We have been working with AES and HECO for almost five years now on this particular development; and we are finally beginning to see light at the end of a very long tunnel.

We are excited to have reached this 1 2 particular milestone, and we want to thank you, the 3 Commission, for your hopefully favorable consideration of the application before you today. 4 So I'm available to address any questions 5 6 or concerns. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Ms. Gouveia. 8 9 Are there questions for the witness? 10 MR. TABATA: No questions. 11 MR. PANG: No questions. 12 MS. KATO: No questions, thank you. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 14 Commissioner Okuda followed by Ohigashi. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much, 15 16 Mr. Chair; and thank you Ms. Gouveia. 17 Since we normally don't have to disclose 18 conflicts with witnesses, I'll just mention that I've 19 worked with your father Jerry Sekiya, very fine 20 lawyer on other matters. 21 But I have a specific question about this 22 project on West Oahu, or land which was designated 23 part of the University of Hawaii, West Oahu. 24 I know from my a very good friend, Dr. Jan

Javinar, who I think still might be the Vice

Chancellor for Student Affairs, West Oahu does a lot of outreach on the west side, and tries to extend college education towards nontraditional students.

Just for my own information, is West Oahu going to benefit financially in a special way from this project, or this just goes into the big, you know, UH system pot where some people think money goes unfairly to the Manoa campus and not shared with the teaching institutions?

Do you have a comment or response to that?

THE WITNESS: It will absolutely, probably a large portion of it will go to the West Oahu campus. They will be the primary beneficiary of the proceeds, but internally we are working out a formula, but, yeah, the campus will be the primary beneficiary.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Let me just say that I think University does a really -- is a real gem resource, and people like Dr. Javinar should be especially recognized.

I mean, it goes back to his roots at

Farrington High School graduate coming out of Walter

Lane in Kalihi, and he's never forgotten his roots,

and whatever support the system can give to educators

like him and campuses, I'm sure we will all

1 appreciate it very much. Thank you very much for
2 your testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Concern was brought up at the last hearing, not on this matter, but the hearing that we just did that the owner of the property is not a party to these proceedings. And, therefore, the conditions and the requirements may not apply to the owner of the property.

So my question to you is: As the owner of the property, will the University of Hawaii agree at this point to be part, or be subject to the conditions if this matter is passed?

THE WITNESS: Well, let me try to respond this way.

We will absolutely do whatever the law requires us to do. And to the extent any orders have any responsibility of the University of Hawaii, we will absolutely do that.

I will share with you that I think many of the conditions that are placed as part of your order are shared concerns by the University as well. We actually have, I think, very similar concerns about what happens with the land during the project and even after the project.

So I don't think our interests are in conflict, and I think they are actually in more of an alignment in terms of how the land ultimately is treated, again, during and after the project.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not sure that answered my question. However, I will take it as that is the limit of our your authority.

I'm going to say that, because special use permits some day will end, and removal of the fixtures on the property, which in this case not a hole in the ground, but it is aboveground construction, will have some kind of -- will need some kind of remedial action. And if we cannot hold the owner responsible for that kind of remedial action, my question is this:

How do we know that the developer here -- I guess, has some kind of easement or lease on the property -- will be able to fulfill the conditions 25 years hence?

We know the University of Hawaii should be here 25 years.

That's all I have. Just a comment.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

Commissioner Ohigashi.

Commissioners, are there further questions for Ms. Gouveia?

If I may, can you share what exercises or planning was done, if any, to look at the integration of this and the surrounding parcel both during the period of the special permit and afterwards into the teaching and research mission of the University of Hawaii at West Oahu?

question. I think one of the topics that we have been in discussion with AES on is seeing where we can have overlapping programs with what they do and with any kind of either trade or engineering, scientific type of programs at West Oahu, or any of our campuses. We have not fleshed those out in a lot of detail, but it absolutely is a topic of conversation that we are going to probably start to hone in on as the project gets closer to development and operation.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Okuda followed by Chang.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Ms. Gouveia, this is a follow-up question following up on what Commissioner Ohigashi raised.

Along that line, what assurances would the

Land Use Commission have that at the end of this project, when decommissioning is required, that we're not going to end up with like a Mauna Kea situation where there will be things that should have been decommissioned and removed, and the things that should have been decommissioned and removed aren't removed, and now it becomes a community issue?

What assurances would we have that, you know, at the end of this, even though most of us probably going to be dead, that we are not going to be again in a Mauna Kea situation?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE WITNESS: Well, what happens at the end of the lease has been one of our biggest concerns, and when we were working with AES on our documents -- now you're going to test my memory, and I may have to ask somebody from the AES team to help me out here if I get it wrong -- but I believe they will be setting up an escrow-type account where there is enough funding in there to complete the demolition and restoration of the site back to basically original conditions if in the event the AES or the developer does not meet their contractual obligation to do so.

So number one, it is an obligation of the lease of our contractual documents with AES for them

to demolish and remove and restore the site, but because of our same concern, we wanted to make sure that there was actually funding set up.

So if I recall correctly, I believe we set up an escrow type of an account where money would be placed for that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes, very briefly.

You know, along the same lines of the concern that

Commissioner Ohigashi was raising, do you think it's

important for the community that, notwithstanding

these types of lease arrangement, there's a specific

commitment made by the University of Hawaii which

would be binding on the University of Hawaii that if

in fact the decommissioning actions do not take place

as required by the lease or the contract, for

whatever reason, the University of Hawaii will do

that?

And I only raise that question because, you know, there was a Mauna Kea issue that was brought before the Land Use Commission here, and it seemed like commitment from the University are very important to developing, maintaining and extending trust towards the community.

I mean, is it possible for University to

deal with commitment that itself will be committed to whatever decommissioning is required?

THE WITNESS: I will probably have to run this past the leadership team, to be very honest. I don't -- I understand what the concern is, and I do think that we have set up a mechanism with the developer to make sure that particular concern is in fact funded and executed by the developer.

And so I'll just have to look at that arrangement to see what kind of risk will be taken on by the University in the event the developer does not do their part, because I think ultimately we will be expecting the developer to complete that responsibility.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Ms.

Gouveia. You answered the question.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Chang.

20 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good morning, Jan.

Nice to see you. I'm going to followup on

Commissioner Okuda's comment.

I'll tell you, I've got a -- lack of a better word -- "hard-on" for ensuring that developers are complying with their commitment, so I have been

really pushing for like a performance bond. So I'm pleased to hear that you have an escrow account, and you seem to be somewhat confident, but not sure.

Is there any objection if we require, as a condition, a performance bond to ensure that there is adequate funds available by the AES to decommission and, you know, decommission and remove all of the equipment that they put on the site?

THE WITNESS: So I think what this has been a subject of a lot of discussion with the AES team. And in fairness to them, I really would like to see if they can have an opportunity to comment on the arrangement that they would feel the most comfortable with.

We went back and forth on different scenarios and we were trying to see what is the best way to have that financial guarantee without tying up cash, so to speak.

I should also point out that decommissioning is required under State statute as part of any, I think, PV development. So -- but I do want to defer to the AES team as the primary, and then the University can weigh in on what it can do to augment or supplement that.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I appreciate that, and

I would definitely be asking the developer, because we have seen too often -- I mean, there are windmills still standing in Ka'u. There are -- so notwithstanding requirements to decommission or restore sites, especially on State land, that doesn't always occur. So I'll ask the developer as well.

My final question is more like it's a community benefit, and this is sort of following up with Chair Scheuer's comments about, you know, when we're using State land there should be some community benefit, and I understand financial, they will be paying for use of the land.

But even as an educational institution, the thought of having at least an internship or some kind of an educational opportunity that is set aside to a University student, you know, to get experience here, this is an emerging industry.

So I'm not too sure what kind of arrangements have been made, but I think that that's an important community benefit, especially given its educational institution.

So, again, I will leave that up to you, but that is, I think, something for consideration.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Mahalo.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further, Commissioners?

While I'm concerned about time, I'm going to use this opportunity, maybe 45 seconds.

I'm grateful to the University. I owe my existence in Hawaii to the fact that my father became a professor in the territory in 1950 at Manoa.

But I do feel the University of Hawaii process system often uses and used lands as merely sites to place buildings on, rather than things integral to its academic mission, and part of the core identity of the institution.

So I would look forward to the day when the University approaches the land which it occupies with perhaps more contemporary and culturally grounded sense about it.

Thank you very much for your testimony today. I'm going to try and move you back to being an attendee, and Mr. Delaunay has, I believe, called in by phone to address the audio issues also.

This is a first. I'm going to press

"allowed to talk". You are not going to see him as a

panelist, but I'm allowed to -- for somebody calling

in by phone -- allow them to talk.

Mr. Delaunay, are you able to say

something? You might need to press \*6 to unmute 1 2 yourself. 3 THE WITNESS: Hello. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes. 5 THE WITNESS: Okay, great. Sorry for the 6 delays. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: This is, again, is 8 this Chris? 9 THE WITNESS: Yes, this is Christopher 10 Delaunay with Pacific Resource Partnership. Our address is 1100 Alakea Street, fourth floor, 11 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813. 12 13 CHRISTOPHER DELAUNAY 14 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 15 Public, was not sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 16 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 THE WITNESS: And I'm the government 19 relations manager for Pacific Resource Partnership, 20 and we would like to express our strong support of 21 the AES West Oahu Solar project. 22 The AES West Oahu project provides a 23 valuable opportunity to stimulate our economy, both

by creating new jobs and by creating infrastructure

which can help lower energy cost to consumers and

24

businesses.

Construction of this project will support approximately 1800 jobs in the State of Hawaii, and approximately 11.3 million in labor income, with total economic output of 20.2 million.

In addition, the project will generate and store electricity derived from solar resources providing clean renewable energy for Oahu. It will reduce the need for fossil fuel burning power plants in the region.

When completed, this newly proposed solar project will be capable of generating enough energy to power approximately 4,600 homes, which will advance the State closer towards achieving its goals to generate 100 percent clean energy by 2045.

I would also like to add that the project incorporates agriculture in a meaningful way by incorporating honey and bee production.

Again, we would respectfully request your favorable decision on this application.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, because we couldn't hear the audio of it when you raised your hand, I just want to affirm that the testimony you just gave you affirm to be the truth?

1 THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, it is. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any questions for Mr. 3 Delaunay? 4 MR. TABATA: No questions. 5 MR. PANG: No questions. 6 MS. KATO: No questions. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? Commissioner Aczon. 8 9 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Again, Mr. Chair, I 10 would, over an abundance of caution, I have the same 11 disclosure as before, Pacific Resource Partnership 12 represents contractors signatory to the Hawaii 13 Regional Council of Carpenters, but like I said, we 14 are different organizations, independent from each 15 other. I don't have any financial interest or 16 benefits from this organization, and I can assure the 17 public that I can be fair and impartial in deliberating this regarding this docket. Thank you. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 20 Commissioner Aczon. 21 Any further questions? If not, thank you 22 for your persistence in letting us hear your oral 23

testimony in addition to your written testimony. We appreciate it. I'm going to disable talking now.

And finally, Scott Enright has his hand

24

1 raised and is going to be promoted as a panelist.

2 Mr. Delaunay, you can press \*9 and lower 3 you hand now, I believe.

4 Good morning, Scott. Aloha.

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

7 THE WITNESS: Yes, it will be. Thank you, 8 Chair.

## SCOTT ENRIGHT

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: Good morning, Chair,
Commissioners.

Scott Enright, 64-735 Mamalahoa Highway, Waimea 96743.

I am an agricultural consultant that's been working with AES on their agricultural plan. I just wanted to reemphasize what I put in my written testimony to the Commission, and that is, you know, in the time that I worked for the Department of Agriculture in both the Abercrombie and Ige administration, I reviewed every application for solar on ag land, and this is the first one that I'm

aware of that the original agricultural pursuit,

which is in this case ranching with Buddy Gibson,

will be continued with improved infrastructure. I

thought that significant.

There are limitations to the agricultural pursuits that can be done on this particular site, so keeping the existing agricultural enterprise that has been there since sugar went out almost 40 years ago, I think is significant.

With that, Chair, I'm open to questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Questions for the witness.

MR. TABATA: No questions, thank you.

MR. PANG: No questions.

MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Questions for former Director Enright?

Seeing none, thank you very much for your written and your oral testimony. We really value it.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Chair. Stay well.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You as well.

Last call. Is there anyone who is attending this meeting who wishes to provide oral testimony? If so, either use the

1 raise-the-hand function or \*9 if you're calling into 2 this meeting.

Seeing none, I'm going to close public testimony on this matter. It is 9:54. I will call a recess until 10:05, at which time we will proceed with the presentation from the Petitioner. We're in recess.

(Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are back on the record.

Mr. Tabata.

MR. TABATA: Thank you, Chair.

AES West Oahu Solar, LLC is requesting approval of its application for special permit to allow the construction and operation of a 12.5 megawatt photovoltaic system, plus a 50 megawatt hour battery energy storage system.

The location of the project is in Leeward,
Oahu, and is situated mauka of H-1 Freeway, and
approximately two miles from Village Park in Waipahu,
three miles from the West Loch of Pearl Harbor, and
about a half mile from the northeastern edge of
Makakilo.

The project area, the portion of a 861-acre parcel owned by UH West Oahu, and our project area is

96.353 acres. The project area is comprised of Agricultural District lands that are partially classified B under the LSB ratings. As such, there is the requirement under HRS Chapter 205 that the project area be made available to compatible agricultural uses at rent no more than 50 percent fair market value.

AES is mindful of the goal to promote agriculture and food self-sufficiency in Hawaii and is prepared to go beyond just making the land available at 50 percent rent.

AES has collaborated with Aloha Bee, LLC for honey production and Rocker G Livestock for cattle grazing in the project area rent free to ensure that there will be food production on the project site.

If approved, the agricultural operations will become a legal requirement pursuant to the Planning Commission's Condition No. 2 which requires notification to the Planning Commission if AES fails to have agricultural operations for a six-month period.

If that happens, the Planning Commission will then have the option to re-evaluate the special permit.

The life of the project is 25 years pursuant to the power purchase agreement and we are asking for a 29-year term for this special permit to allow additional time for permitting and construction.

Pursuant to the PPA, the project needs to be operational by September 2022, and construction is expected to take up to a year, and permitting following the special permit will require approximately four months.

The project is expected to generate a clean electricity that will power 4,600 homes, replace 545,000 barrels of oil, 100,000 barrels of oil, create 118 jobs, and 20 million dollars of economic activity, and provide revenue to the University of Hawaii and further our State's goal to reach 100 percent renewable energy.

Our Archeology Inventory Survey was accepted by the State Historic Preservation Division by letter dated January 4th, 2021, just two days before our Planning Commission's action hearing on January 6, 2021, which gave us enough time to file the letter as an exhibit.

This critical requirement of the project was accomplished because of the extraordinary efforts

of Dr. Susan Lebo at SHPD and David Shideler at Cultural Surveys Hawaii.

Our Cultural Impact Assessment includes a contribution of Cultural Practitioner Lynette

Paglinawan who informed the Petitioner on the need to cultivate native Hawaiian plants in order to make restitution to the wandering spirits for the benefit of both the land and the people.

AES has continued its discussions with Ms.

Paglinawan and with her guidance have taken steps to

promote native Hawaiian plants in the ahupua'a and in

forming our landscape plan in the Project Area.

Our obligation to follow her recommendations are memorialized in the Planning Commission's Condition No. 5.

No endangered or threatened species of flora or fauna were observed on the property, but the Hawaiian hoary bat, pueo and Hawaiian seabirds are known to travel in the area.

In order to mitigate against potential impacts, mitigation measures have been identified in the Application, which the Office of Planning is proposing to include as conditions of approval for wildlife and historical resource mitigation.

AES, as mentioned by the Chair, has no

1 | objections to OP's proposed conditions.

The proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order that we filed is identical to the Planning Commission's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order, except for one additional procedural paragraph and other changes specific to the Land Use Commission, versus the Planning Commission.

The conditions in the Planning Commission's D&O are identical to the conditions recommended in the Director's Report.

Therefore, we respectfully request that the Commission approve the Planning Commission's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decisions and Order with modifications to accommodate OP's new proposed conditions, and approve our proposed D&O with the addition of OP's proposed conditions.

Thank you.

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

Are there questions for the Petitioner?

MR. PANG: City has no questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

OP?

MS. KATO: No questions, thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
2 Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, thank you, Chair and Mr. Tabata.

Questions that came up, I heard it a little bit earlier, and was trying to save time. They're saying they're going to put cattle on that land around the solar panels. That came up when we were looking for the solar project I think for the Robinson land on Kaua'i.

And I questioned it then, and they said, oh, no, we changed that to sheep. I raise cattle, and they're very large, and they rub against things.

I would think that you may, unless they're going to have some kind of fencing to isolate from being under and around the panels, you may want to reconsider cattle raising.

I don't know what bees would do to what

they'll do on top of your -- you know, they all cluster up there or something -- but I would highly ask you to investigate -- you know, you said cattle. I should make a question, but anyway, my question is: Are they sure they want to do cattle?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  TABATA: Yes. Thank you for the question.

The size of the cattle in relation to the 1 2 panels is an issue that has come up, and working with 3 Rocker G Livestock, what we determined was that they 4 can graze smaller cattle in the area. That's what they believe. And, of course, we will continue 5 6 working with them to make sure that there is 7 compatibility. If fencing is required, or other devices, 8 9 then that will be explored. But, yes, we do. We are 10 aware of the issue of the size of the cattle, and we 11 have a plan. And we're still working on it. 12 Thank you. 13 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much. 14 just want to not have a problem for you. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 17 Commissioner Cabral. 18 Any other questions for the Petitioner at 19 this time? 20 Commissioner Dawn Chang. 2.1 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Maybe, Mr. Chair, I 22 should ask you. 23 Is the Petitioner going to put on evidence

and witnesses, or is this our opportunity to ask

about specific, for example, the Cultural Impact

24

Assessment, or do we wait?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Tabata.

MR. TABATA: My understanding is that we are working off the record here. And I am prepared to attempt to answer your questions. And if cannot, if I'm unable to do so, then I believe our expert witnesses, some of them may be available, and they may be able to answer questions.

But if you have any questions for me, I will do my best to try to answer them.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Very good, thank you for clarifying that.

Assessment. I thought they did a good job. However,
I disagree with the Ka Pa'akai analysis. I believe
they've identified resources. But with respect to
the impact of the project, in reviewing Ms. Lynette
Paglinawan's, her comments as part of the Cultural
Impact Assessment, she does talk about the uhane and
the spirits who do continue to traverse the trails.

And she expressed concerns about psychological trauma or harm that that may cause.

And she shared experiences, that she's heard stories about with respect to what was West Oahu, as well as her own family's personal experiences, not

necessarily in this area.

So -- and I know she recommends for ho'oponopono, the planting of the wall of trees.

However, I would -- I think as additional mitigation, you have this valuable resource of Lynette

Paglinawan, who is at West O'ahu, and you do seem to be working -- AES seems to be working with her.

It really may be something to consider as mitigation for the spiritual harm, that there be some kind of cultural orientation for all of the workers at AIS, that they go through a cultural orientation if Ms. Paglinawan is willing to do so with respect to those resources, and what they should do, or just so that they are aware of, because I don't think the analysis in Ka Pa'akai, you can just say that there are no cultural resources.

I think the spiritual is as significant as something you can touch. So I would -- that's my comments about the CIA. I thought they reached out to a lot of people, good comments. You had a lot of the people that I think who know that area, but I found Lynette's comments to be particularly significant.

So I would have you consider that, any comments to that, if we included something like that

cultural orientation for all the AIS? Anyone who works on this project, they work in coordination with West O'ahu and Ms. Paglinawan on some kind of cultural orientation.

MR. TABATA: I think that's an excellent suggestion, Commissioner. We appreciate those thoughts. Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Very good. I'm glad you're open to that, because you seem to -- I mean, I thought this was a well-done documentation.

The other thing, and you know, Mr. Tabata,
I've got this real issue with performance bonds and
ensuring that the developer is going to adhere by
their commitment. And this developer does seem to be
willing to do that. And even the proposed D&O, the
proof of financial security to decommission.

But let me first ask you. What is the estimated cost for decommissioning?

MR. TABATA: I don't believe we have calculated that yet. We may have. I have people more knowledgeable than me feeding me information, 2.5 million is the initial estimate, which will be updated.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: That's probably at today's value not necessarily at year 25 or 26?

1 MR. TABATA: Right.

I believe they would factor that in to their calculations. That would be reasonable, I think.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So it does say that they are going to show proof of their commitment.

What does that mean?

MR. TABATA: They're going to need to satisfy the City basically, according to statute, with a form of financial security. So performance bond you mentioned is, I think that is one option. And if that could be included in a condition as an option for the City to continue.

What we don't want to do is hinder the City's ability to manage this responsibility. I think your excellent suggestion of including a performance bond, if that could be included as an option for the City to consider, then I think that may facilitate their responsibility to ensure financial security is provided.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And I appreciate you being open to that. And I think maybe as we continue on, you might suggest the appropriate place to insert that in the proposed D&O.

Let me also ask you. In your Condition 2,

if at any time during the term of the SUP, no compatible agricultural operations exist on the usable lands of the Petition Area for six months after the initial six months, then the Applicant shall notify Planning Commission.

Does that mean year 25 or year 24, they don't have -- you know, there's no ag use, so Planning Commission reopens this?

How does that work as a practical matter with such an open-ended term?

MR. TABATA: The way I read Condition 2 is if at any time there are six months where there's no active ag operating, we have to report that to the Planning Commission. At any time.

So and then once, if that happens, and once that is done, if it's done, if there is a six-month period of inactivity, then the Planning Commission will then have the power to call us back in front of them and conduct an inquiry.

And the language of the condition provides for the Planning Commission to re-evaluate the SUP.

Re-evaluate, it's a broad term. We want to avoid that at all cost. So the way we're looking at Condition 2 is a requirement. We have active agricultural operations on our property, and that's

what we're striving for.

and reading it, I guess it's reasonable to assume that the Planning Commission has a discretion to take into consideration at what point in time during the lease or during the operations does that occur, what may be reasonable appropriate actions, but essentially that's being left up to the Planning Commission to determine an appropriate course of action should for six months there be no agricultural activity. Is that correct?

MR. TABATA: That's correct.

Again, our reading of Condition 2 is that, having active -- having agricultural operations on the property, actually having it, is a requirement which the Planning Commission will have the power to enforce, and this goes beyond the statute which only requires that we just make it available at 50 percent rent.

So we said we're going to have active agricultural operations in the form of honey and cattle, and the Planning Commission took that and is now making us live up to our words. And we're prepared to do that, yes.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: All right, okay. I

understand the intention, and the intentional 1 2 drafting of the language to get the Planning 3 Commission that discretion. 4 Mr. Chair, I have no other questions at 5 this time. Thank you. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 7 Commissioner Chang. Commissioner Ohigashi. 8 9 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Good morning, 10 Curtis. I wanted to ask you about page 49. I gather 11 that the decommission, for financial security, is the 12 sole province of the Planning Commission; is that 13 correct? 14 MR. TABATA: I'm flipping to the page. 15 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Also 205A-45. 16 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Could you repeat 17 the question? I could not understand the question. 18 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The question was, 19 proof of financial security to decommission the 20 facility is prior to the satisfaction of appropriate 21 County Planning Commission, so I'm just asking that 22 proof of satisfaction of appropriate -- proof of 23 financial security is the sole province of the 24 Planning Commission?

MR. TABATA: Well, it may be DPP.

1 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just wondering 2 who. 3 MR. TABATA: We are required to submit that proof to DPP, proof of financial security. I believe 4 5 it's their discretion. 6 I think the way it works is we provide it 7 to DPP, and they approve it. And it they don't 8 approve it, and for some reason there's an issue, they can call haul us back in front of the Planning 9 10 Commission, and I think that's -- that may be the mechanism. 11 12 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'll ask the County 13 about that mechanism if that comes up. I just wanted 14 to make sure that it is in the County Planning 15 Commission's jurisdiction to deal with financial. MR. TABATA: I believe the Planning 16 17 Commission has authority to enforce its conditions. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The second thing I 18 wanted to ask you --19 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner 21 Ohigashi, when you turn away to read your screen, 22 it's hard to hear you. 23 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Under C (i) it says 24 that: 25 Removal of all equipment within 12 months

of the conclusion of operation or useful life.

The useful life is 25 years. Does that mean it's 25 years whether or not it has concluded operation, or would that conclusion have to be somewhat modified so that it's clear or less clear?

MR. TABATA: Commissioner, I'm sorry, I'm not sure I caught all of that question.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: It just says that you're going to stop, remove all the equipment within 12 months, conclusion of operation, or useful life.

The useful life, according to your presentation is 25 years. Does that mean irrespective of conclusion of operation, that the useful life, 25 years is a drop-dead clause?

MR. TABATA: You know, if there's -- I'm getting a text. It's whichever comes first.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So you want to modify that proposed conclusion to say whichever comes first?

MR. TABATA: That would be helpful, I think.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I was just curious} \\ \mbox{when I read it. I'll let you let us know before the} \\ \mbox{end.}$ 

MR. TABATA: We don't have an objection to

that.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just trying to clarify what you mean by that, because it can be read that, hey, if you're still operating, but the life expectancy has been reached, then you got to stop anyway, or it could be read that whichever is first, that means if you finish before the 24 years, then be stopped. To me I'm just curious how it works on that.

MR. TABATA: I think -- so I think the way the language works is the conclusion of the project is based on the 25 years, right? But the useful life, if for some reason the useful life is shortened for some reason, then we would need to decommission earlier.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: This project is no longer than 25 years?

MR. TABATA: As of right now, that's the limits of our PPA. Maybe in the future we might seek an extension of the PPA, but then I guess we will have to come back to you, or to this body. If that's, you know, in the cards.

But right now, I believe that's the intent of this language is to ensure that we decommission at the appropriate time, you know, which that useful

1 life, I believe, is a catchall, which makes sure that 2 we decommission at the appropriate time. 3 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just want to avoid the confusion, 25 years from now you. 4 5 MR. TABATA: Absolutely. Thank you, 6 Commissioner, appreciate it. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi. 8 Commissioner Giovanni. 9 10 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair. 11 I want to followup on a number of items 12 that Commissioner Ohigashi has brought before us, and 13 let me start by my concurrence with his view that 14 it's very troublesome to have these permits come 15 before us represented by petitioners that are lessees 16 and not the landowner. That just gives me trouble. 17 That's just a comment. Mr. Tabata, we heard from Ms. Gouveia at UH 18 19 about a so-called escrow fund that would accumulate 20 funds to assure that could be used for remediation 2.1 and restoration of the land at the conclusion of the 22 lease. 23 Could you explain what that is all about 24 for us from your point of view, please?

MR. TABATA: Right. I think an escrow

account would be an option, that that could be one way of providing financial security. I don't believe that the exact method has been determined yet. I think that's, you know, in the works.

I know they've already calculated \$2.5 million that will be required, which includes its been factored in for inflation. So I think an escrow account is an option, and along with Commissioner Chang's suggestion about the performance bond, my only caution is this, is that I don't think we want to limit the City's ability to manage this responsibility that it has by statute.

They may suggest or require an escrow account or performance bond. I think they're all excellent suggestions. It's just I would hope that we don't handcuff the City in being able to exercise their discretion and manage their responsibility effectively.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I think I have a "yes" or "no" question for you.

My take away from Ms. Gouveia's testimony was that there was an agreement between the lessee and the landowner that you would establish an escrow account. Is that true, "yes" or "no"?

MR. TABATA: I don't have the answer to

that right now, but the people who may have an answer to that is listening, and they can get it to me.

But what I will say is this, even if we did have an agreement with the landowner that we are going to set up an escrow account, and that's going to suffice for financial security, we believe it will suffice for financial security of decommissioning of project. The final say is with the City, with the Planning Commission, whether or not that's sufficient or whether that's acceptable.

So if there is such an agreement, I hope to get you an answer soon, whether or not there is an agreement between AES and UH to set up that escrow account. If so, then I should have that answer to you shortly.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I appreciate that.

I think it's a simple question, "yes" or "no" whether it already exists.

Hypothetically -- and I do not expect this,
I'm very familiar with AES as a company -- but
hypothetically, if they were in distress, and there
was a breach in the lease, and they disappeared
midway through this, or towards the end of this term
of the permit, what assurances does this Commission
have that the owner would do the remediation?

MR. TABATA: Could you repeat that question again, please?

2.1

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: In the event that

AES -- and I'm not suggesting they will, just purely
hypothetical -- breach the lease, and they disappear
and they walk away, what assurances does this

Commission have that the landowner will remediate the
land to its preexisting condition?

MR. TABATA: I can't speak for the landowner, but I'm sure University of Hawaii will continue to be good stewards of its land, and do what is necessary to maintain its lands.

And as far as their ability to do so, the requirement that we provide financial security for the decommissioning of this property, which decommissioning is to restore it to its original state, that is the purpose for decommissioning, that's what it is.

So there will be monies available for that work regardless of the fate of AES. And as far as AES itself, just, you know, just for your information, it is a large company.

It's publicly held. It has \$32 billion in assets. It operates in 14 different companies, and has over 8000 employees. So we are hopeful that they

will be around to do what they're responsible to do.

And if not, there will be funds available. There

will be financial security provided to ensure that

decommissioning takes place as promised.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Is it not true that within that \$32 billion portfolio that it, from time to time, that AES will sell and acquire other assets, as such that this particular project might be owned by somebody else by the end of the term of the special permit?

MR. TABATA: That may be a possibility.

But all of these responsibilities will run with the project, run with the land, so successors and assigns will be bound by all obligations.

If that were to happen, if that's a possibility, that would be the case.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Let me shift gears on you a little bit and go to the second point that Commissioner Ohigashi brought up, which is about the term of the project and its useful life.

As you can imagine there have been a number of different utility scale solar projects that have come before this Commission for approval for permits.

And the testimony on record is that a 25-year term in many cases is inadequate to secure

the long-term profitability of a project. So these things are operated in a manner in which they continue to invest and replace components of the project, and do seek an extension of the PPA for an order to make the overall project profitable and to be able to win the competitive bids that awarded this project from HECO.

What that really means, what I'm really saying is it's very common that you would be coming back -- or somebody would be coming back before

Commission in 20 to 25 years and asking for an extension of this project or extension of the permit for this project.

So I caution you to be very careful about your useful life language that you would accept for -- that might trigger immediate decommissioning of this project.

MR. TABATA: Excellent point, Commissioner, and I would hope to be around and still retained by AES to bring that extension later, and hopefully also that the useful life of this project would be extended beyond the 25 years to justify a future request for an extension, if the Public Utilities Commission were to grant such an extension of the PPA, but, yes, that's an excellent observation, and I

believe people may be thinking about that.

actually put in some of its permits, a condition by which the term of the permit is automatically extended, if and when HECO executes a new PPA and it's approved by the PUC. So it might be a vehicle that would allow you to not have to come back and go through the full process again. Just something to look at.

MR. TABATA: That sounds very attractive, although, I would love to come back to you later -- COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: That's okay.

MR. TABATA: -- but I'm sure the client would appreciate having a condition like that. Maybe we can offer a draft of that language.

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You only say that,} \\ \mbox{Mr. Tabata.}$ 

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Just making an observation.

Thank you.

No other questions or comments, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,
Commissioner Giovanni.

You're only happy to come back in 25 years knowing that none of these Commissioners will be

1 here, I'm sure, Mr. Tabata. 2 Commissioner Aczon. 3 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, Mr. Tabata. 4 5 Just to followup on the discussion about 6 the decommissioning, also who's responsible. 7 Condition 4, it says the Applicant, assignees, or the landowner is responsible. 8 9 So whether -- so then the order is part of 10 the condition, correct? 11 MR. TABATA: I believe you're right, 12 Commissioner. 13 VICE CHAIR ACZON: So if Applicant or 14 assigns didn't do it, then the landowner end up 15 responsible, correct? 16 MR. TABATA: Correct. Thank you. 17 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Condition 3, it's valid, 18 the permit is 29 years. Within that 29 years, is the 19 decommissioning timelines embedded to these 29 years? 20 MR. TABATA: I believe so. 21 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Within the 29 years, 22 then the decommissioning, restoration, everything is 23 done by the 29 years? 24 MR. TABATA: That's correct. 25 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Let me just -- the

project operation and useful life. I can understand
with the project operation, it's done, it's done. So
just trying to figure out what is the legal
expiration of 29 years or useful life.

MR. TABATA: The 25 years is the

operational period for the project generating electricity. The 29 years includes the 25 years of generating electricity, and also additional time of four more years to decommissioning, that you point out, along with additional permitting yet to be done, and the construction of the project.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Regardless, 29 years is the drop-dead unless it's extended?

MR. TABATA: That's correct, Commissioner.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Then with all these conditions -- I don't know if you can answer -- all these conditions are enforced by the County or the Planning Commission?

MR. TABATA: Yes.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: But they have the enforcement powers for all these conditions?

MR. TABATA: That's my understanding, yes.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Change the subject.

What is the current activity for this land right now?

MR. TABATA: They're raising they're 1 2 cattle. 3 VICE CHAIR ACZON: So my understanding is now currently raising cattle, and with this project 4 5 solar is going to be continued, right? 6 MR. TABATA: Yes, the existing use will be 7 continued, yes. VICE CHAIR ACZON: So whether this permit 8 9 is approved or not, it's going to be continuing with 10 the raising of cattle, right? MR. TABATA: That's correct. 11 12 VICE CHAIR ACZON: So there's no really 13 loss on that portion, right, on the production of 14 cattle or raising cattle? 15 MR. TABATA: There will be equipment and facilities constructed which will displace all the 16 17 land, but the remaining land will be made available for cattle, continue to be made available for cattle. 18 19 VICE CHAIR ACZON: You've seen Senator 20 Favella's testimony and also other testimony opposing 21 the project. One is lack of community outreach and 22 loss of production. 23 What can you say about those? 24 MR. TABATA: As far as public outreach,

there was an Environmental Assessment that was

25

accepted by the City, and in that process there was consultation and outreach with all federal, state county agencies, stakeholders, organizations, the normal course in complying with Chapter 343. So numerous meetings, numerous communications. Comments were received, and that all took place during the EA process.

And then a public notice was issued, when the Application was filed in August of 2020. The City issued a Notice of Application for Special Use Permit, which was mailed to everybody as far as federal, state and county government. And then there was a hearing, and again, notice was published.

So I believe there was adequate consultation, community outreach extensively done, and, you know, I believe that that took care of it.

I regret having the Senator feel otherwise. Perhaps if he were to contact AES we could have some discussions, perhaps alleviate some of his concerns.

As far as food production, we believe we have an agricultural project. Our project is agricultural. And we're going to make food production. We're going to enhance it and make it possible.

Honey production is not currently on the

property. We've gone out and had discussions and are working with the honey producer, Steve Montgomery, as you folks know, and we will make the land free rent, subsidize the operations in that respect, along with cattle, free rent, and make the land more productive for food production.

So, you know, we do take exception to any accusation that we are decreasing the food production on the land. We believe we will be increasing it and we're proud of it.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Thank you, Mr. Tabata, for those clarification.

Also addressing the community concerns, I just wanted to kind of have you the opportunity to address those concerns.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't have any more questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you Commissioner Aczon.

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chair. I had two questions, but Commissioner
Aczon's question took care of question number one.

Mr. Tabata, if I can ask you regarding question No. 2, and the reason why I'm asking this is

just so that, even though -- and it's not to prejudge anything, even though your presentation has clearly addressed Article XI, Section 1 of the Constitution regarding the direction that we seek self-sufficiency.

Can I ask you this question. I notice in your presentation, and including the Planning Commission's findings, that the cost of generation of electricity is actually going to be less costly to the consumer with this project as compared with a traditional oil burning fossil fuel power plant.

What is the cost savings, and percentage or however you want to describe it, would be fine, just so that we get some idea of that.

MR. TABATA: Thank you, Commissioner.

There was an excellent presentation prepared by the

AES team in front of the Planning Commission. I have
their outline.

So it says here there will be .106 kilowatt hour low and stable cost in dollars.

I'm not sure how that translates to dollar amount like per rate there, or for the island in total. Perhaps somebody will provide me that information from the team.

But my understanding is this. As was

discussed during public testimony, our solar project in West O'ahu will be one of the first Stage 1 projects that is intended to replace the coal-fired plant in September 2022, and the alternative or the risk of our solar plant and also other solar facilities, if they don't come online in time, my understanding is that Hawaiian Electric may be required to generate electricity at its other oil-fueled power plants.

And we don't know what the price of oil will be at that time, but I believe there is a possibility that may be considerably higher than the cost of solar.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Well, if we look at current pricing, is it true or not true that the cost of production from solar, even taking into the infrastructure cost, however you amortize it over time, is cheaper or lower to the consumer compared with the consumer being charged for electricity being generated by fossil-fuel types of plants here in Hawaii?

MR. TABATA: I believe that's correct, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I understand that corporations have a right to make a profit and take

money out of State and, you know, there's nothing intrinsically wrong with that. But is it true or not true that by generating electricity using solar, it's one way of stopping the export of our local money, which would otherwise be exported to pay for oil or fossil fuels being imported into the State?

MR. TABATA: Yes, I believe that's true.

with the agricultural idea that to the extent we can grow more food locally, it would mean that we would keep the money within the community and not export it out, for example, to buy items which we could actually grow here, kind of consistent with that, right?

MR. TABATA: Correct, that's what we're hoping for.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much.

My usual tag line, I'm not hypnotized necessarily by
your presence or anything like that. I think two
dockets ago I was a sole vote against what you were
advocating, so these are -- I'm not trying to ask
questions just to give you a pass or anything, but I
thought it's important that we bring out the cost
structure and the fact that there's nothing wrong
with having an environmentally conscious project that

actually can make money or savings for the local community.

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Chair. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Giovanni, followed by

Commissioner Chang. My hope is we might be able to
get through the questioning of the presenter before
our next -- with the Petitioner before our next
break.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Quickly. I just want to share my perspective on the financial issue that Commissioner Okuda brought up in an attempt to avoid, mitigate any confusion on this matter.

As the evidence in this case already shows, the existing coal-fired power plant, its power purchase agreement is going to terminate in September, and it's going to go away.

In the absence of any projects like the West O'ahu Solar, AES Solar project, that power will have to be replaced by oil-fired, just as Mr. Tabata said. And that's much more expensive than the coal, because coal is the cheapest.

Now, whether or not the solar is less expensive than the coal that's going away, that

depends on the price of coal at the time, and some
projects are, and some solar projects are, and some
are not, but the key is that the coal is going away,
and you've got to replace it with something, and the
solar project is far preferred option as compared to
using existing oil plants and importing oil to do
that.

Is that consistent with your understanding

Is that consistent with your understanding, Mr. Tabata?

MR. TABATA: Yes, it is, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you. Nothing further.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,
Commissioner Giovanni.

Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: One question.

Mr. Tabata, did AES present this to the neighborhood board, this project? And if so, what was the neighborhood board's -- did they take any action?

MR. TABATA: You know, I believe they attempted to. You know, when this -- we filed the Application in August 2020. And I believe a few months later COVID hit. And it was -- so at the beginning of the process, after the Application was

accepted for processing by DPP, COVID was in full swing. And I don't think we were successful in actually having a presentation before the neighborhood board.

I believe there were no neighborhood board meetings at the time, you know, prior to our action meeting in front of the Planning Commission.

But there were contacts made with the Chair of the neighborhood board, who was briefed and informed and kept up-to-date. So that was the best we could do. That's my understanding.

I've done presentations to various neighborhood boards. So even after the -- or prior to the Planning Commission, AES did not go before, try again to go before the neighborhood board; is that what you're saying?

MR. TABATA: I believe they were planning to, but by the time the pandemic hit, it just wasn't possible. And so they did the best they could, because the alternative was to make contact and have discussions with the chair.

But to answer your question, no, there was no presentation made to the neighborhood board.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Are they planning to

go before the neighborhood board to do any kind of 1 2 presentation to the community, even though it's 3 already been approved by the Planning Commission? 4 MR. TABATA: I'm not sure. 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Because this community 6 is really actively involved, so I was just wondering. 7 Because the consultation under the EA is not as -- I mean, there are proscribed agencies that you consult 8 There is not --9 with? 10 MR. TABATA: Commissioner, I need to 11 correct myself. There was a presentation made in 12 August of 2020 to the neighborhood board. Yes, there 13 was a presentation made. 14 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Was any action taken by the neighborhood board? 15 MR. TABATA: No action was taken. 16 COMMISSIONER CHANG: All right. 17 What neighborhood board was that? 18 19 MR. TABATA: No. 34. 20 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Which is -- is that 2.1 the Kapolei --22 MR. TABATA: Makakilo/Kapolei. 23 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, very much. 24 I have no other questions. 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,

1 Commissioner Chang.

2 Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Tabata for coming up -- I just have a couple questions regarding this issues.

The first one is more because Makakilo is kind of hilly in terms of, you know, when it rains there wasn't any erosion or anything to stop this erosion.

MR. TABATA: The level of ground disturbance that will be required for the project is not expected to increase any runoff. There will be an increase in impermeable surface, so there will be trenching. Trenching will be done to capture the runoff. And that is anticipated to be sufficient for management of water runoff.

COMMISSIONER WONG: I guess, just because, you know, not during this period, but previously we have been having some heavy rain. And I have some friends that live up there, they said the area, the rain was so bad in Makakilo area that there was runoff from neighbors up the hill coming down the street.

Just wondering if you're going to use best management practices for this issue?

1 MR. TABATA: Best management practices will 2 be used, that's correct. 3 COMMISSIONER WONG: I just wanted to make sure that it will be used. 4 5 Thank you, Chair. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 7 Commissioner. Commissioners, anything further for Mr. 8 9 Tabata? If not, I would like to suggest -- it's 10 11:01 -- we take a nine-minute recess until 11:10, 11 hear any comments from the County and the Office of Planning, any final comments from any of the parties, 12 13 and move on to deliberation following that. 14 Is that acceptable? Okay, it's 11:01, 15 recess until 11:10. 16 (Recess taken.) 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are back on the record. It's 11:10 A.M. 18 19 During the break I was forwarded -- our 20 Executive Officer was contacted by the Intervenor's 21 counsel for the subsequent docket, who believes that 22 the closure of the HoKua Place matter, being that 23 there's unobjected to Motion to Withdraw might be a

quick formality, and the Intervenor's concerned about

the impact on his client, by the Intervenor's

24

25

1 | counsel, having to sit through this docket.

That said, I don't also have the impression that this particular proceeding, which is going to go into presentations from the County and the Office of Planning, is going to take particularly long in deliberation.

So I have a few questions related to that. First of all, County and OP, how long do you intend to take for your presentations on this matter?

MR. PANG: Duane Pang for County. We just have a statement of support regarding the proposed Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and will be available for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay.

Ms. Kato?

MS. KATO: I expect only about five minutes or so.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do the

Commissioners -- maybe show of hands. Do you

participate significant questions for either the

County or Office of Planning?

My preference for the -- it is an inexact art at best to be the Chair of this Commission, and I often am horribly wrong at guessing how long things will take. I do my best to prioritize really the

- time of the public, and then our Commissioners who
  are volunteers, as well as unpaid Intervenors.
- 3 Unfortunately, sometimes there is just an impact. We
- 4 have a number of things in our dockets.

I would like to proceed with continuing matters before our next break and taking up the final matter on our agenda.

With that, let's hear from the County.

MR. PANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair,

10 Commissioners.

Again, Duane Pang, Deputy Corporation

Counsel on behalf of City and County of Honolulu.

As you know, this matter when presented to the City's Planning Commission, they made -- adopted some proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law.

They are very consistent with Applicant's proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law that are before you. We support those.

We also support the State Office of Planning's additional conditions with respect to revisions of Condition 7, and the addition of Conditions 13, 14 and 15.

As the Commissioners had inquired, the Planning Commission, more specifically Department of Planning and Permitting, will continue jurisdiction

over the enforcement of this permit, and we are open to any questions that the Commissioners have.

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

Are there questions for the County?

Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Pang.

Do you have any objections to amending Condition No. 6 to add "performance bond" as an option?

MR. PANG: We have no objections with respect to an option. As Mr. Tabata said, we don't want to interfere with the agreements between his client and UH, and I guess the Department of Planning and Permitting. If that's one of the options, yes, we would be glad to look into that.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I appreciate that, Mr. Pang, because ultimately, should the University be held holding the bag, it's not the University, it's on the taxpayers. So I just want to make sure that there's some kind of source of funds for the decommissioning and the removal.

But if you have no objections, I'll appreciate that and note that. So no other questions.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

2 Commissioner Chang.

Other questions for the City and County of Honolulu? Seeing none.

Ms. Kato.

MS. KATO: Thank you, Chair.

The Office of Planning recommends approval of the State Special Use Permit for this project subject to the additional conditions as described in our statement.

That will address the State's concerns with respect to impacts to wildlife, archeological and historic resources.

The Office of Planning agrees that the proposed project meets the criteria for unusual and reasonable use within the State Agricultural Land Use District. And based on the Land Use State classification, solar facilities are allowed outright on half of the project site, and allowed with the special permit on the other half, subject to certain requirements related to decommissioning and used in conjunction with compatible agricultural uses.

The proposed project meets those requirements as described.

Any adverse impacts from proposed project

can be mitigated with appropriate conditions.

Additionally, the Office of Planning recognizes the important State interest in reducing dependence on fossil fuels.

With respect to the conditions that we proposed, our written submission contains the specific language of the conditions recommended.

The first revision is original Condition 7 of the D&O to include the Petitioner's proposed mitigation measures indicated in the Application on pages 45 and 46, and those incorporate, I think I mentioned, those recommendations provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Division of Forestry and Wildlife through communications that are in Attachment O to the Application.

These mitigation measures are to adjust the finding that several certain and endangered wildlife species could occur in the Project Area such as the Hawaiian hoary bat, the Hawaiian short-eared owl, and Hawaiian shorebird and waterbird species.

The other recommended conditions are conditions to address the State Historic Division's concerns and recommended mitigation measures that are included in the letter date the January 4th, 2021 with SHPD's review and approval of the revised

1 archeological inventory survey.

The mitigation measures are intended to mitigate adverse impacts to identify historic properties in the project area.

These mitigation measures were not included as conditions in the Planning Commission's D&O,

Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, and that's why Office of Planning is recommending that these mitigation measures be added as new Conditions 13 through 15.

Again, the Office of Planning recommends approval of the Special Use Permit for this project provided that the additional conditions cited in OP's memorandum of June 7th, 2021, are included as conditions of LUC approval.

Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Ms. Kato.

Questions for the Office of Planning?

Commissioners? Seeing none.

Mr. Tabata, final statements, if any?

We cannot hear you for some reason.

MR. TABATA: I'm sorry, I had my microphone

23 on off.

We do have additional language for the conditions to address the Commissioners' statements.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Would you be able to 2 go over those? 3 MR. TABATA: Yes, I am. With respect to the performance bond, we 4 5 can make a change to proposed Condition No. 6, and 6 looking at the second sentence, it reads: 7 Such's proof may include, but not be limited to, a posted letter of credit's, and then 8 insert, comma, "letter of credit", insert 9 10 "performance bond". And then continue on, "or similar mechanism from a credit-worthy financial 11 12 institution." 13 So there would be, "performance bond" would 14 be inserted as an option after the letter of credit. 15 That's one proposed change. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm just going to 17 pause right there. Just want -- Commissioner Chang, 18 does that address your --19 COMMISSIONER CHANG: That's perfect. 20 That's exactly where I would have inserted that as 21 well. Thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please continue, Mr. 23 Tabata. 24 MR. TABATA: Also with respect to the 25 cultural orientation and education suggested by

Commissioner Chang, a new condition can be included
which would read:

"Petitioner shall ensure project staff and
crew undergo a cultural orientation and training

crew undergo a cultural orientation and training prior to the start of the construction. Cultural orientation shall be conducted by practitioners, such as Ms. Lynette Paglinawan or other recognized cultural petitioners from the area."

And I believe those are the two additional changes that was suggested by the Commissioners. If I missed something, please correct me.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
13 Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Did we get a response about the issue of whether an escrow account had been negotiated?

MR. TABATA: I don't believe there was an escrow account agreed upon or negotiated.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Did you have anything further, Mr. Tabata?

MR. TABATA: No, just those two proposed changes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: In the absence of a

preexisting agreement for an escrow account, would it 1 2 be agreeable to add to that condition where you 3 inserted "performance bond" to insert another option 4 for an escrow account? 5 MR. TABATA: We could, yes. 6 So the insertion in that part of the second 7 sentence of Condition 6 would read comma: "Performance bond, escrow account", and 8 9 then go onto read "or similar mechanism". 10 That way we would have the two as options. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner 12 Giovanni? 13 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: That's about as 14 good as we can do today, I think. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Chang. 16 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Tabata. 17 I would just ask you consider -- and I 18 appreciate the cultural orientation and education --19 I had drafted this language. Think about it. 20 As mitigation for impacts to cultural 21 resources, Petitioner shall coordinate with West 22 O'ahu University to provide cultural orientation and 23 education to AES and its contractors associated with 24 this project prior to construction.

Did you have a construction -- because I

25

```
want -- I mean, who are going to be the cultural
1
2
     practitioners? So I think it is easier for AES, if
3
     they're dealing with West O'ahu University. There
4
     are many, many cultural practitioners, but I think
5
     West O'ahu is where Lynette is from. In my view, I
6
     think it's important to acknowledge that this
7
     mitigation is really for purposes -- is for
8
     mitigation to the impacts to cultural resources.
9
               MR. TABATA: Yes, I think your language is
10
     better.
              We agree to that absolutely.
11
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.
12
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I would note at this
13
     time, I believe the proper name for the institution
14
     is UH West O'ahu, but the intention being we're
     trying to refer to that institution, even if it's
15
     not -- Commissioner Aczon.
16
17
                VICE CHAIR ACZON: Mr. Chair, I'm not sure
     if it was covered earlier on the Condition No. 3, if
18
19
     we can insert:
20
                "Approval of time extension shall be
21
     required from the Land Use Commission."
22
                I don't think it was addressed.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I don't believe it
23
24
           I'm familiar with this.
     was.
```

Commissioner Aczon, is your request to the

25

Applicant that it be clarified in Condition 3 that 1 2 the Land Use Commission is the authority that has to 3 approve any time extension? 4 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Yes, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Tabata. 5 6 MR. TABATA: Yes, I believe that is the 7 case, and we would be agreeable to changing it to reflect that. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Anything 10 further, Commissioner Aczon? 11 Commissioner Wong. 12 COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair. 13 First, I don't know, we just changed two 14 conditions. Is the City agreeable and also OP agreeable about these two conditions? 15 16 MR. PANG: Thank you, Commissioner Chang. 17 The City does not have any opposition to the proposed 18 changes from Commissioner Chang or anything else that 19 was submitted by Mr. Tabata. 20 COMMISSIONER WONG: Does OP have any 21 comment? 22 MR. PANG: Excuse me, I did not hear the --23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We thank you for your 24 response, Mr. Pang, and the question was then posed 25 to Ms. Kato.

MS. KATO: The Office of Planning has no objection to the conditions. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WONG: The other thing I wanted to add is this, add several other conditions -- one more condition.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Mr. Tabata, as you know, my question was about, you know, erosion and water runoff. So I wrote something down that says this:

"The Applicant shall develop and operate the facility, including the implementation of measures to mitigate potential impacts of the project in substantial compliance with representations made to the Planning Commission and the LUC, as reflected in the Decision and Order. Such mitigation measures include, but not limited to, the use of temporary permit, best management practices to ensure the development and operation of the facility does not result in increase in stormwater runoff that expressly impacts downstream properties. Failure to so develop the Petition Area may result in the revocation of the SUP, special permit."

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Tabata?

MR. TABATA: That sounds acceptable.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me check. 2 objections from the County or OP? 3 MR. PANG: No objections from the County. MS. KATO: No objections from OP. 4 5 you. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further, 7 Commissioner Wong? 8 COMMISSIONER WONG: Yeah. 9 So, you know, I was reviewing the 10 conditions that was drafted, so, you know, Condition 11 1, I was wondering. There is a question in there 12 that says: 13 "Extension to this deadline may be granted 14 to the Director of the Department of Planning and 15 Permitting from unforeseen extenuating circumstances." 16 17 Can we take out the word "for unforeseen 18 extenuating circumstances" and replace it with: "Due 19 to unforeseen circumstances that were beyond the 20 control of the Applicant"? 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Tabata. 22 MR. TABATA: That sounds okay. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County, OP? 24 MR. PANG: No objections from the County. 25 MS. KATO: No objections.

1 COMMISSIONER WONG: I'll continue on if you 2 don't mind. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 4 COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you. Looking at Condition 8 regarding the 5 6 project due to the to unforeseen circumstances that 7 were beyond the control of the Applicant"? So there is a sentence in there says: 8 9 "Planning Commission may grant an extension 10 to the deadline to establish the Project due to unforeseen circumstances." 11 12 Can I put -- I'm still debating. I wanted 13 to put the Land Use Commission in there also, so --14 because this -- so can we say, Planning Commission 15 and Land Use Commission, or just Land Use Commission? 16 I'm not sure on this one, Chair, so I need 17 your --18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe, since it's 19 a condition on the Special Permit from the LUC, that 20 the LUC is approving, it would be the LUC. 21 Mr. Tabata, do you have, I guess, reaction 22 to the overall concept as well as any preferred 23 language? 24 MR. TABATA: We have no objection to 25 Commissioner Wong's suggestion.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have a 2 suggestion as to whether it should simply replace the 3 reference? 4 Right now the sentence reads: 5 "Planning Commission may grant extension to 6 the deadline to establish the Project due to 7 unforeseen circumstances that were beyond the control 8 of the Applicant." It would now read: 9 10 "The Land Use Commission may grant an extension to the deadline." 11 12 MR. TABATA: That's okay with us, but Mr. 13 Pang should give an opportunity to comment. MR. PANG: This is Duane Pang from the 14 City. I just want to clarify. 15 The extension, if requested, would go 16 17 directly to the Land Use Commission rather than to the Department of Planning and Permitting, Planning 18 19 Commission, and then to the Land Use Commission? 20 I just wanted to clarify because if there 21 is an extension, you know --22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What the process 23 would be? 24 MR. PANG: Yeah, what the process would be. 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, as you said that this is a LUC, so I wanted to make sure that the LUC is also in the loop somehow, because this is coming back -- let's say there is an extension.

I mean, I'm not -- I just wanted to put that the Land Use Commission also has a bite at this apple.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to recognize Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: The keyword in that condition is "establishment" which means "commencement" or the commissioning or construction of activities, not the extension of the term of the use permit. I think that's the province of DPP, not the Land Use Commission.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So, Commissioner Giovanni, you're speaking against having the LUC having an approving role?

commissioner GIOVANNI: If there is a delay in the establishment, I don't want it coming back to us. Our role is to give a permit of 29 years to do their permitting, their construction, their operation and their decommissioning, and not get involved in between each of the steps.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

1 Commissioner Giovanni. The concern might be -- I'm just guessing here -- is that if there is a delay, 3 how would it affect the 29-year year timeframe?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Would it be acceptable that the concept here is that the LUC has some role in the approval extension of deadlines, and that staff would be authorized to develop acceptable language work?

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: For me, if there's a consequential unforeseen element that threatens or otherwise requires extension of the 29 years, then I think it comes backs to the LUC, but projects of this sort have a lot -- always unfold differently than originally planned. And I don't want changes in the timeline to always require the developer to come back to the LUC. That's a nightmare that's unnecessary, in my view.

If (indecipherable) -- and they know that they're going to need more than 29 years, for whatever reason, then they have to come back to us.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So I believe -- first clarify Commissioner Wong. Is that generally the intent of the language you were proposing?

COMMISSIONER WONG: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So I recognize that Commissioner Aczon has had his hand up patiently, and 1 Commissioner Okuda.

Are you trying to speak on this particular issue?

Commissioner Aczon followed by Commissioner Okuda.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Yeah, I agree with

Commissioner Wong. I would prefer striking the word

"planning" and insert "Land Use Commission". The

reason why is this will be consistent with Condition

No. 3, which I believe the Petitioner agreed to

insert "approval of time extension shall be required

from the Land Use Commission", so it will kind of

pretty much be in line with the Condition No. 3.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

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

I would ask that the condition actually be left as-is. This is the reason why.

If it's a really serious type of breach of representations or a serious breach or significant breach of timeline, then it would be a violation of the representations made by the Petitioner, and an order to show cause could be issued at that point in time.

On the other hand, if it's something that a

breach, which probably can be quickly satisfied or
fixed, I'm not sure if it's really worth using up the
resources of the Land Use Commission, and so in that
case, an Order to Show Cause doesn't have to be
issued.

So I would just ask that we kind of kick this can down the road, and use the Order to Show Cause procedure, so that if it's an important thing, we can raise it through an Order to Show Cause. If it's not, then we don't.

So I urge we just leave the condition as-is. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: However, I would urge that -- I would also include into that condition, Condition A, requirement of informing the Land Use Commission of any type of delay in the establishment.

The other thing too is I'm not even sure about what "established" means. Does it mean start? That's what I'm -- I think we should at least be notified if there is any delay in the start of the construction.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

1 Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I agree with the point that Commissioner Okuda suggested that we leave it as-is, although I do think that Commissioner Ohigashi raises a good point, and I would like to be informed. So if a modification to that condition is done, I would limit it to just informing us that we can take action if necessary.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:} \ \ \, \text{Let me assess where I}$  think we are at.

The Petitioner has agreed to proposed conditions originating from comments from Commissioner Chang regarding the use of a performance bond is one objection; and Commissioner Giovanni regarding the use of an escrow account as one option for project infrastructure removal and restoration of the lands.

Petitioner has accepted a condition related to cultural impact mitigation and training for personnel offered by Commissioner Chang.

I believe the Petitioner has agreed, at least in concept, to the proposed conditions from Office of Planning, and I think they affirmatively agreed to the findings.

There is not an agreement or consensus on

this particular condition, so I want to put it aside
for the moment.

Are there any further conditions that the Commission is concerned with, and I would urge my fellow Commissioners to run the specific language off of concepts that we can agree on and authorize the staff in the motion to draft language that is appropriate.

Are there any further conditions?

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Just two more. The one just talking about, I just would retract that and say just inform us.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WONG: And then there's two more issues, sorry.

Just to ensure that we get reports on this issue, like all other projects we have.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WONG: And the only other thing that I know -- sorry, Commissioner Chang, I might be going into your area -- but just to me somehow talking about just anything, any cultural issues that are following or taken up in construction, that there is something in there to

say, should be, or burial council will be informed. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Standard language 3 about inadvertent discovery of remains? 4 COMMISSIONER WONG: That's about it. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to go 6 through Mr. Tabata, County, and the Office of 7 Planning. There are three proposed changes, one, 8 9 which would change the earlier discussed condition 10 simply require informing Land Use Commission of any 11 delays that would be approved by the County Planning 12 Commission. 13 The second would be to include a provision 14 just mentioned regarding the discovery of inadvertent 15 remains. 16 And the final one would be the requirement 17 of annual reports as is common on these dockets. Are there any concerns with these three 18 19 proposed changes to the Decision and Order, in addition to all of the other ones that I have 20 21 summarized to this point? 22 MR. TABATA: AES has no objection, Chair. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 24 Mr. Pang? 25 MR. PANG: The City doesn't have objections to those conditions. I just want to point out that
one of the proposed condition is in No. 10. Says:

"Any major modification which, including

"Any major modification which, including establishing the project, which may push the 29 years further down, does have to be approved by the Land Use Commission.

So all of that major modifications should be going to the Land Use Commission. Minor modifications, maybe a tweak in the establishment within a month or two which may not affect the 29 years that would be approved by DPP and the Planning Commission.

But otherwise, we don't have any further objections to the additional conditions.

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

Ms. Kato?

MS. KATO: Sorry, I think one of those conditions is already in our proposed -- Office of Planning's proposed conditions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay, so it was duplicative?

MS. KATO: Yes, Condition 13 related to inadvertent finds.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So you don't object

1 | to it?

2 MS. KATO: I don't object to it or the 3 others.

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Orodenker.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just wanted to find out, kind of a point of order, the kind of -- are we in deliberations with that motion?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yeah, I was recognizing that myself. I decided to let it go because it required some discussion with the parties, but I think we are close to being done.

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, I apologize, I should have done that. I would like to make that motion so we can start on --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me just see if there is any further questions for any of the parties from any of the Commissioners. Seeing none, is there a motion that somebody wishes to make?

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, I'll make that motion. And I don't know how to state it, because we went through all these conditions, so I just want to say everything that we talked about, put in that

motion, the one with Mr. Tabata, Commissioner Chang 1 2 and myself and staff work on it. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me suggest or perhaps memorialize slightly better for the 4 5 transcript. 6 It would be to approve the project with the 7 conditions proposed in the Decision and Order by the Applicant with the following modifications: 8 9 Modification to cultural impact, as 10 suggested by Commissioner Chang. Modifications to guarantees of funding as 11 12 suggested by Commissioner Chang and Giovanni. 13 Modifications to require substantial 14 compliance, and including specifically compliance 15 with best management practices, as suggested by 16 Commissioner Wong. 17 Notification of major changes that would 18 delay the project, as suggested by Commissioner Wong. 19 The changes suggested by the Office of 20 Planning. 21 And the change -- there's one last one, 22 second to last one from Commissioner Wong. 23 COMMISSIONER WONG: Annual report, Chair. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Annual report, is

25

that your motion?

1 COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you for saying it 2 so succinctly. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon. VICE CHAIR ACZON: Mr. Chair, I believe I 4 5 made some changes on the Condition No. 3, which was 6 okay'd by the Petitioner. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. And specifically --8 9 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Approval of time 10 extension be required from the Land Use Commission. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Including those changes as well. Is that included in your motion, 12 13 Commissioner Wong? 14 COMMISSIONER WONG: Yes, Chair. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We have a motion before us. Is there a second? Commissioner Cabral. 16 17 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'll support my fellow Commissioner Wong in his motion, and appreciate our 18 19 Chair for clarifying it. I'll make a second to that motion. 20 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are -- I would 22 also sort of suggest that based on the discussion, 23 the motion includes the stipulation that the staff 24 are empowered to do the specific wordsmithing of 25 these conditions where that wordsmithing wasn't fully 1 determined.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, can I ask to add one more statement, to have the Chair sign the motion.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That the Chair be authorized to execute. Okay.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you okay with that clarification, Commissioner Cabral?

Sorry to everyone for witnessing this sausage making. We do now have a motion in front of us. Since we have, in many ways discussed the merits of all these various amendments, does anyone wish to speak to the motion?

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm going to support the motion, and the reason why is this.

I believe that with the deliberations, that we have made it a better project. However, I'm still in concern about the fact that we do not have the owner online.

I know that, and I read that part of the proposed Decision and Order number, which is No. 4, that identifies the landowner. That's why I asked the landowner if they agreed to the conditions, and

1 they said they cannot agree essentially.

So I just took it at that, and figured that we're going to have to move on from there.

The issue here though is that, the blessing here is that the landowner is the State of Hawaii.

The person -- if the person doesn't do the required condition, required work on the property, then it will be up to us as taxpayers, since we own the land. And if it was a private ownership of land, I may have voted differently. But since we know that we can beat ourselves up and require ourselves to pay for it.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi.

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will be voting in favor of this motion, but I join in the concern raised by Commissioner Ohigashi, also for a slightly different reason.

I believe that not only in this case, but other matters, the University of Hawaii should affirmatively demonstrate to the community that it stands behind good stewardship of its land.

Now, I'm not saying that as a matter of fact sometimes stewardship might not be good or bad,

but whenever there is a perception, a perception that stewardship is not being properly done by the University, it starts becoming its own reality in the community.

So I hope that there would be affirmative actions taken by the University to start chipping away at the perception by those in the community that believe that the University is not necessarily being a good steward of certain of its resources.

Very quickly, Chair, this project satisfies

Article XI, Section 1 of the Hawaii State

Constitution, which requires us -- and let me quote
this:

"To promote" -- and that's a quote -- "the development and utilization of these resources in a manner consistent with their conservation, and in furtherance of the self-sufficiency of the State" close quote.

The constitution directs us to seek self-sufficiency, and I believe that this project satisfies that directive.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. Tabata for a comprehensive and very good legal presentation which actually shortens a lot of the time we have to spend on this.

1 So thank you, Mr. Chair. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, 3 Commissioner Okuda. Commissioner Aczon followed by Giovanni. 4 VICE CHAIR ACZON: I believe Commissioner 5 6 Giovanni raised his hand first. I can go after. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Giovanni. 8 9 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Am I to proceed? 10 I'm happy to let Commissioner Aczon go first. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please go ahead. COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I'm going to be 12 13 voting in favor of this motion. I think it's a very 14 important and timely project. I think the developer 15 that will be executing the project is credible and has demonstrated in the industry that it's capable of 16 17 doing so. And I have -- it's consistent with the 18 19 energy policy of the State, and the needs of the 20 electric power industry. And everything is going in 21 the right direction. 22 So I'm going to be supporting it, and I 23 appreciate the willingness of the parties to accept

the conditions as revised by the suggestion of the

24

25

Commissioners.

However, I am very disturbed, as my fellow Commissioners are, Ohigashi and Okuda, with the role that's being played by the landowner in this process.

I thought it was remarkable in a negative way that an officer of the University of Hawaii couldn't commit to abide by a condition to remediate the land back to agriculture under any circumstance. They had to go refer it to some legal review or such.

I am very disturbed by that, and I just wanted to put that on the record. But I'll be supporting the motion.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Commissioner Giovanni.

Commissioner Aczon.

VICE CHAIR ACZON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With my fellow Commissioners, I will be happy to support the motion, and hopefully this is a good project which will enable the State of Hawaii to reach its goal on renewable energy, and also continuing the current operation of grazing, you know, agricultural use of the project. And hoping -- and I'm hoping it will help also UH West O'ahu with their self-sufficiency.

Also with all the conditions that Commissioners and the Petitioner agree upon, I'm very

comfortable that, you know, all those conditions addresses the Commissioners' and also the public's concern.

So I will be voting "yes" for this motion.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Sorry, if I was unmuted earlier.

I'm going to support this. I've been trying to stay quiet, but obviously the project and the need for the project -- I mean, of the other power plants going down in like 14, 16 months, there is critical need, and I've overseen six large, for the Big Island, large solar projects, and it takes a long time to get them -- not just up, takes longer to get HECO to finally turn them on, so God willing, you can meet deadlines.

I'm in favor of the project and I appreciate my fellow Commissioners, because it feels like we, due to historically bad problems, with particularly energy projects leaving the citizens around to clean up the mess. I appreciate the enormous amount of evidence to try and put in safeguards, and God willing, and we can, you know,

1 save problems down the road.

So appreciate that. And support the project and appreciate all the conditions that have been developed to do that. I feel like we have had to write-up a prenup or something before we get married.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

Commissioner Cabral.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

11 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm willing to
12 write-up the prenup.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there other comments from the Commissioners?

I'm going to join in stating my support for the project. My appreciation for counsel for the Petitioner. The work of the City and Office of Planning, and particularly the comments of reservation regarding the landowner's statements assured by Commissioner Giovanni and the concern over the exit from special permit conditions as expressed by Commissioners Ohigashi and Okuda.

Is there anything further? If not, Mr. Orodenker, please poll the Commission.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 The Motion is to (indecipherable) --2 special permit all the conditions as set forth in and 3 proposed by the Petitioner, the conditions suggested 4 by Office Planning, as suggested by the 5 Commissioners, including Petitioner, performance 6 bond, that's an option, Condition 6 for the County, 7 add a new condition of agricultural orientation and training requirements as suggested by Commissioner 8 9 Chang. Add a condition to amend condition regarding 10 approvals of extension to Land Use Commission; add 11 additional condition regarding erosion for Commissioner Wong, add clarification setting forth 12 13 circumstances as proposed by Commissioner Wong; add a 14 condition regarding inadvertent discovery of remains 15 of archaeological sites per Commissioner Wong; 16 Commissioner Aczon's change regarding extensions, and 17 have the staff be empowered to draft specific 18 language with regard to those conditions, and that 19 the Chair be authorized to sign. 20 I believe that covered everything. 21 Commissioner Wong? 22 COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye. 23 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral? 24 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes. 25 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?

1	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
2	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Ohigashi?
3	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes.
4	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Giovanni?
5	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye.
6	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Chang?
7	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aye.
8	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
9	VICE CHAIR ACZON: Yes.
10	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
12	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
13	The motion passes unanimously.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
15	Thank you very much, Mr. Tabata.
16	MR. TABATA: Chair, if I may, am I correct
17	in understanding that an additional adoption hearing
18	will not be required for this docket, since the
19	Commission has all the language necessary to complete
20	the Decision and Order, and that the Chair has been
21	authorized to sign the document?
22	I ask this point of clarification only
23	because our back's to the wall.
24	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe that is the
25	case.

1 Mr. Orodenker. 2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Mr. Chair, I believe we 3 can do that authorization for the Chair to sign. 4 MR. TABATA: Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. 6 Tabata. 7 I would like to, in the interest of time, and in the hopes that unlike our previous two docket 8 9 items, the Kaua'i docket would go quickly, take a 10 one-minute recess, allow the parties who are on the 11 current docket to leave the meeting, and we will 12 begin with HoKua Place. 13 It's 11:58. We will begin at noon. Brief 14 recess. 15 (Recess taken.) 16 A11-791 HG Kaua'i Joint Venture, LLC 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It is 12:00. We are 18 going to proceed (indecipherable). 19 This is Continued Action on Docket A11-791, 20 HG Kaua'i Joint Venture Kaua'i Petition to Amend the 21 Land Use District Boundary of Certain Lands Situated 22 at Kapa'a, Island of Kaua'i, State of Hawai'i, 23 Consisting of 97 Acres from the Agricultural District

to the Urban District, Tax Map Key No. (4) 4-3-003:

24

25

a Portion of Lot 1.

On our agenda is To Consider Petitioner's 1 2 Motion to Withdraw, and To Consider a Motion to 3 Dismiss. The first of which will be dipositive 4 5 potentially on the second. 6 Will the parties please identify yourselves 7 for the record, beginning with Petitioner. MR. YUEN: Good morning, Mr. Chair, William 8 Yuen and Janna Ahu on behalf of Petitioner HG Kaua'i 9 10 Joint Venture, LLC. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Yuen. MR. DONOHOE: Good morning, Mr. Chair and 12 13 Commission -- or, good afternoon actually. 14 Deputy County Attorney Chris Donohoe on behalf of County of Kauai. Also present is Deputy 15 Director of Planning, Jodi Higuchi-Sayegushi. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. 18 Ms. Kato. 19 MS. KATO: Deputy Attorney General Alison 20 Kato for the Office of Planning. Also here with me 21 is Rodney Funakoshi from Office of Planning. 22 MS. ISAKI: Good afternoon, Bianca Isaki, 23 joined here with Liko Martin, and I believe Lance had 24 another engagement, so I'll be representing 25 Intervenor.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me briefly update the record.

On May 12th and 13th, the Commission met via ZOOM virtual conference technology to hear continued action on this matter.

On May 27th, the Commission received

Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw Amended Petition for

DBA.

Also on the 27th the Commission received an email from the Intervenor stating that they were not filing their own motion nor a brief responsive to the Commission's oral motion in light of the Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw.

On May 28, the Commission received the County of Kauai's Statement of No Opposition to Petitioner's Motion for Withdrawal of Amended Petition for Land Use District Boundary Amendment.

On June 1st, the Commission mailed and emailed the LUC Agenda to the Parties in this docket, and to the Statewide and County mailing lists.

On June 3rd, the Commission received Office of Planning's Statement of No Objection to the Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw.

On June 4th, the Commission received Intervenor's Statement of No Position to the

Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw.

2.4

There has been no additional written testimony that I have record of that's been submitted on this docket. Am I correct in that, Mr. Hakoda?

CHIEF CLERK: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are actually still in the evidentiary portion of this docket considering a Motion to Withdraw, therefore, I will not be considering any additional oral testimony at this time from the public. We will simply be moving onto presentation from the Petitioner, if any, on their Motion to Withdraw, any further comments from the County, Office of Planning and the Intervenor with

Following that the Commission may take up the Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw. If so, the matter will be dismissed, and we will not take up the Commission's motion that had been considered at the end of the last meeting.

Mr. Yuen.

questions from the Commission.

MR. YUEN: I believe our Motion to Withdraw speaks for itself. We desire to withdraw the Motion, withdraw the Petition to request by the property and re-evaluate what the Petition.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

1 Are there any responses or statements from 2 the County of Kauai? 3 MR. DONOHOE: Chair, the County will stand by its submitted statement May 28th of No Opposition. 4 5 Thank you. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Kato for Office 7 of Planning. MS. KATO: Office of Planning has no 8 9 objection to this Motion to Withdraw. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Intervenor, Ms. 11 Isaki. 12 MS. ISAKI: Thank you. 13 No more comments and no objections to the 14 motion. Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are 16 there questions for any of the parties on this 17 motion? Seeing none, it's time for us to enter deliberation, as we do on these dockets. 18 19 I would note for the parties and public, 20 during the Commission's deliberation we will not 21 entertain any additional input from the parties or 22 the public unless specifically requested to do so by 23 me. 24 If called upon, I will ask any comments be

limited to the question at hand.

25

1	Before we entertain a motion, let me confer
2	with each Commissioner that you have reviewed the
3	record, and are prepared to deliberate on the subject
4	docket.
5	Please signify with either "aye" or "nay"
6	that you are prepared to deliberate on this matter.
7	Commissioner Chang?
8	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aye.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Cabral?
10	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Giovanni?
12	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
14	Ohigashi?
15	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okuda?
17	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Wong?
19	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aczon?
21	VICE CHAIR ACZON: Aye.
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The Chair is also
23	prepared to deliberate on the matter.
24	Commissioners, I will entertain a motion
25	that the LUC accepts or does not accept the Motion

for Withdrawal. The motion should state the reasons 1 2 for acceptance or nonacceptance, and be clear as to 3 those reasons. Commissioner Giovanni. 4 5 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair. 6 I move that we accept the Petitioner's 7 Motion to Withdraw. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there a second? 8 9 COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, I second. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner 11 Giovanni, can I ask you to speak to your motion? 12 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: As stated in my 13 remarks with the second to the motion that was made 14 by Commissioner Okuda at the last hearing on this 15 docket, I did not feel that the Petitioner met the 16 burden of proof to support the original intent of the 17 intent of the Petition to redistrict this area, the 18 subject property. 19 Therefore, I think it's a wise and a 20 considered move, and I appreciate it very much that 2.1 the Petitioner is willing to withdraw his Application 22 for redistricting. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to call on

each of the Commissioners to offer comments,

beginning now with Commissioner Wong as seconder.

24

25

1	COMMISSIONER WONG: I concur with
2	Commissioner Giovanni, Chair.
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon.
4	VICE CHAIR ACZON: No further comment.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Chang.
6	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7	The only thing I would have is I appreciate
8	the Petitioner's Motion, and their wisdom in
9	withdrawing, in light of Commissioners' comments.
10	I would urge them to work with the
11	community and the government agencies if they are
12	interested in pursuing this.
13	Thank you. I have no other comments.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.
15	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Nothing to add. Thank
16	you.
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
18	Ohigashi.
19	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Nothing to add.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral.
21	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. I agree
22	with the motion, and I would want to just concur with
23	Commissioner Chang.
24	I'm very much into housing, I make a living
25	with housing, and I see how desperately that Kaua'i

community needs housing, and I would really urge them to work with the community, work with the government, and perhaps additional developers of some sort in order to package this in such a way that they could do this in perhaps incremental method or something in order to, in a proper manner, provide housing.

I think no longer everybody is going to be able to rubber stamp things that might cause horrible problems for traffic and for sewer and water, all those considerations have to be really seriously and completely addressed before any agency can move forward.

So I appreciate their withdrawal at this time, and hope they can repackage this in some manner to satisfy all the needs of the community.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

I would like to echo my fellow

Commissioners. Thanks to Mr. Yuen and Ms. Ahu, and also like to thank the really thoughtful cross-examinations that were offered by Mr. Donahoe, Ms. Kato, Mr. Yee, Mr. Collins, and Ms. Isaki that I believe contributed to this point, and also thank the Intervenor who, of course, alone except with the Commissioners is unpaid in these matters, but is participating for what he believes is the best for

1	Hawaii, and I believe the action of withdrawal is
2	done in the best interest of the Island of Kaua'i by
3	the Petitioner, so we're very grateful.
4	Anything further, Commissioners? Seeing
5	none, Mr. Orodenker, will you please poll the
6	Commission?
7	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: The motion is to accept
8	Petitioner's Motion to Withdraw.
9	Commissioner Giovanni?
10	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye.
11	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
12	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
13	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
14	VICE CHAIR ACZON: Aye.
15	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
16	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
17	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Chang?
18	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Aye.
19	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Ohigashi?
20	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes.
21	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
22	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
23	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
24	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
25	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

```
The motion passes unanimously.
1
2
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you to all the
 3
     parties. I also neglected to thank the many public
 4
     testifiers, including I think the first time someone
     has testified while trimming a tree from the Island
5
 6
     of Kaua'i. The public testimony was also very
7
     helpful to this Commission.
8
                With that, is there any further business,
     Commissioners?
9
10
                Commissioner Chang.
11
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: So, Mr. Chair, Mr.
12
     Orodenker, I just want to confirm in light of Mr.
13
     Tabata's clarification, is the hearing scheduled for
14
      the 22nd, is that no longer necessary?
15
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Actually, we do have to
16
      adopt the order on the other matter that was
17
     discussed yesterday.
18
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: I see.
19
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
                Further clarifications or questions?
20
21
      Seeing none.
22
                Thank you to everyone, and I declare this
23
     meeting adjourned.
24
                (The proceedings adjourned at 12:12 p.m.)
```

25

1	CERTIFICATE STATE OF HAWAII )
2	) SS. COUNTY OF HONOLULU )
3	,
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on June 10th, 2012, at 9:00 a.m., the
6	proceedings contained herein was taken down by me in
7	machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
8	typewriting under my supervision; that the foregoing
9	represents, to the best of my ability, a true and
10	correct copy of the proceedings had in the foregoing
11	matter.
12	I further certify that I am not of counsel for
13	any of the parties hereto, nor in any way interested
14	in the outcome of the cause named in this caption.
15	Dated this 10th day of June, 2021, in Honolulu,
16	Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	/s/ Jean Marie McManus
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	