		1
1	LAND USE COMMISSION STATE OF HAWAI'I	
2	Hearing held on January 28, 2021	
3	Commencing at 9:00 a.m.	
4	Held via ZOOM by Interactive Conference Technology	
5		
6	I. Call to Order	
7	II. Adoption of Minutes	
8	III. Tentative Meeting Schedule	
9	IV. Legislature Matters Impacting the LUC and Legislative Committee Formation	
10	V. Adjournment	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	BEFORE: Jean Marie McManus, CSR #156	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
4 J		

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha mai kakou and good morning.

This is the January 28, 2021 Land Use

Meeting and it is being held using interactive

conference technology linking videoconference

participants and other interested individuals of the

public via the "ZOOM" internet conferencing program

to comply with State and County official operational

directives during the COVID-19 pandemic. Members of

the public are viewing the meeting via the "ZOOM"

webinar platform.

For all meeting participants, I would like to stress to you to remember to speak slowly, clearly and directly into your microphone. Before speaking, please, it helps if you state your name and identify yourself for the record. Also please be aware that all meeting participants are being recorded on the digital record of this "ZOOM" meeting. Your continued participation is your complied consent to be part of the public record of this event. If you do not wish to be part of the public record, please exit this meeting now.

This "ZOOM" conferencing technology allows the parties and each participating individual Commissioner individual remote access to the

meeting's proceedings via their personal digital devices. Also please note that due to matters entirely out of our control, occasionally disruptions to connectivity may occur for one or more meeting members of the meeting at any given time. If such disruptions occur, please let us know. And be patient as we try to restore the audiovisual signals to effectively conduct business during the pandemic.

For members of the public participating via telephone, please use the *6 function to "mute" and then *6 to "unmute". Use *9 to virtually raise your to virtually lower your hand. And you can also use *6 to indicate to the meeting host that you wish to be unmuted.

My name is Jonathan Likeke Scheuer and I have the pleasure of currently serving as the Land Use Commission Chair. Along with me are Commissioners Dawn Chang, Gary Okuda, and Arnold Wong, the LUC Executive Office Daniel Orodenker, LUC Chief Planner Scott Derrickson, Chief Clerk Riley Hakoda, the LUC's Deputy Attorney General Julie China, and the Court Reporter, Jean McManus are on O'ahu. Commissioner Edmond Aczon is supposed to join us in a couple minutes.

Commissioner Nancy Cabral is on Hawaii

Island, Commissioner Lee Ohigashi is on Maui, and 1 2 Commissioner Dan Giovanni is on Kauai. 3 We currently have eight seated 4 Commissioners of a possible nine. 5 Mr. Hakoda or Mr. Derrickson, has there 6 been any written testimony submitted on our first 7 order of business, the adoption of the December 30th and January 6, 2021 minutes? 8 9 CHIEF CLERK: Chair, this is Riley Hakoda. 10 No public witnesses or comments on the minutes. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to acknowledge the presence of Commissioner Aczon is now 12 13 with us. Welcome. 14 Is there any member of the public who is an 15 attendee who wishes to testify on this matter? so, use the "raise your hand" function or by phone 16 17 *9. I'll take the motions in order, first 18 19 December 30th. Any comments or motion on the 20 adoption of the December 30th minutes? 21 Commissioner Cabral. 22 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I move to adopt. 23 read them very recently and they bring back found

25 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'll second, but

24

memories.

```
I'm against --
1
2
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What are you against?
 3
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: (Indecipherable.)
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there any further
 4
     comments on the December 30th minutes? If not --
5
 6
                Our first order of business, the adoption
7
     of December 30th and January 6, 2021 minutes.
                CHIEF CLERK: This is Riley Hakoda.
8
9
     public witnesses or comments on the minutes.
10
                I'm going to acknowledge the presence of
     Commissioner Aczon now with us as well.
11
12
                Is there any member of the public who is an
13
     attendee who wishes to testify on this matter? If
14
      so, use the "race your hand" function or if connected
     by phone, *9, anybody wishes to testify? If not,
15
      I'll take the motions in order.
16
17
                First, December 30th. Any comments or
     motion on adoption of the December 30th minutes?
18
19
     Commissioner Cabral, moving to adopt?
20
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, they bring back
21
     found memories.
22
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
23
     Ohigashi.
24
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'll second, but
25
      I'm against.
```

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What are you against?
2	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Just used
3	strenuously in the December 30th.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there any further
5	comment on the December 30th minutes? If not, show
6	by voice and raise of hands, all in favor say "aye".
7	Anybody opposed? The minutes are adopted
8	for December 30th.
9	Is there any comment or question about the
10	January 6, 2021 minutes? If not, may I have a motion
11	to adopt? Commissioner Cabral.
12	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I move to adopt.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Seconded by
14	Commissioner Ohigashi. Are you only aghast for
15	December 30th?
16	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Only aghast for
17	December 30th.
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: All in favor, say
19	"aye" and raise your hand for adoption. Anybody
20	opposed? The motion carries unanimously with the
21	Commissioners present.
22	Our next agenda item, tentative meeting
23	schedule. Mr. Orodenker.
24	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25	On February 10, we will be meeting once

again virtually on the U of N Bencorp matter with regard to the certain authority for their EIS, and begin discussion of how the Important Agricultural Land designation by City and County of Honolulu be handled.

On Thursday, the 11th, we will have a meeting specifically dedicated to the discussion of how the important IAL filing by the City and County of Honolulu be handled.

On February 24th, we will need to discuss the Barry Trust Motion matter, and begin work on City and County IAL submittal as well as the 25th.

On March 10th, we will be meeting regarding Hokua Place, and the 11th is also set aside for that matter.

On March 24th we will be adopting the Barry order resulting from the Barry Trust matter. We will also be discussing IAL matters as well on March 25th.

In April we have the Windward Hotel matter to take up, the date for that is probably the 15th instead of the 1st, but I have to check with the Chief Clerk with regard to scheduling on that.

April 14th, we will be taking up a declaratory ruling request from County of Maui. That has not been filed yet, but we expect it will be

1 | filed in a timely manner.

On April 28th we will take up the Kamalani motion to extend time.

On May 12th we will take up the AES West Oahu solar matter, and on the 13th, the Pohakea matter on Maui.

May 26 is also set aside for the Pohakea matter, and that takes us through June, which is as far as our confirmed calendar goes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Orodenker.

Commissioners, any questions for Dan?

Seeing none, our next agenda item is

legislative matters impacting Land Use Commission and

formation of a legislative committee.

Before we take up this matter, I'm going to advise the Commission that we have been advised differently than previous advice from our Deputy Attorney General that it's not advisable to form a separate committee, so we're only going to discuss legislative updates on this matter.

Was there any written testimony submitted on this item, Mr. Derrickson or Mr. Hakoda?

CHIEF CLERK: Chair, this is Riley. There was nothing received by the office.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anybody who is attending the meeting who wishes to testify on this matter? If so, use the "raise your hand" function. Seeing none.

Mr. Orodenker, can you please advise the Commission on what to expect during the next legislative session?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you.

As every year we do, every year we have put together a list of bills that somehow impact or concern the Land Use Commission. And it's an interesting year. It's heavily budget-focused, and there's also attempts to formalize the virtual meeting capabilities of various boards and commissions after the expiration of the Governor's Executive Order, which has been what has allowed us to do virtual meetings in the manner that we have.

I'm not going to go through each individual bill. There are as many as eight bills submitted that would allow for virtual meetings.

There are -- there is one from the administration, and one through community administration, but many of them are duplicative.

We're not sure which ones are going to end up going to hearing.

There are a couple bills that we have problems with that we will be testifying on. One of them would require -- or one set of bills would require that there be a public location available for participants.

This would be extremely problematic for a couple reasons. Number one, if there aren't many State facilities available that would allow for that kind of participation, I think this is one of the few that would, and I'm not sure that the legislature is aware of that.

It would become extremely problematic to try and create ZOOM meeting places on the neighbor islands. It would probably require travel on the part of staff to make sure everything is set up.

Under such circumstances there was also a concern that those individual meeting rooms where a group of people may come to testify could result in a loss of control on the part of the Commissioners. I mean, if 100 people show up at a meeting room -- at one meeting room, it would be difficult to control. Anyway, our testimony will be intent to resolve that issue.

There also are a couple of the bills which would require that the Commissioner's location, each

individual Commissioner's location, and counsel's location, and agencies' location, be published as part of the Notice.

Now, as you may imagine, that could be quite problematic. I'm sure Nancy wouldn't like to host 100 people in her office, looking over her shoulder, for instance. So we will also be testifying with regard to those bills, those provisions, to get those provisions removed.

Also a number of bills that I won't be talking about that adjust what is or is not allowed in the Agricultural District, and further defines things like, you know, what is agricultural activity or increases the requirements or burden of proof on an agricultural lot homeowner with regard to whether or not a structure or a home or a residence is built in conjunction with agricultural activity.

Those bills we usually stay out of because we feel we are the implementer of legislative policy and not the creator of legislative policy when it comes to uses.

That being said, I can run through a number of bills that are also impacting us. There is one bill that I should mention right up-front, and that is House Bill 1149.

The Chair and Staff have been in discussion with leadership in the House, in particular with regard to the House's representatives feelings that the government needs to be streamlined and consolidated in general. This has resulted in a number of bills all coming from the subject matter "committee chairs" that seek to consolidate various departments, programs, whatever, into similar areas.

The HB 1149 reorganizes and integrates the
Land Use Commission within a modified and renamed
Office of Planning. The office name would be changed
to Office of Planning and Sustainable Development.
It also reclassifies some of the programs within the
Office of Planning, the newly created Office of
Planning and Sustainable Development.

There was an attempt made, and we have been involved with advising Representative Tarnas with regard to how that could happen. Our focus has been on maintaining the integrity of the Land Use Commission as an independent entity within OP. HB 1149 would integrate OP into the Office of Planning and elevate the Office of Planning's Executive -- I mean, Office of Planning's Director to a Cabinet level position. The theory being that by doing that, the Office Planning Director and the Commission, all

you Commissioners, would be at the same level from an organizational standpoint, because you Commissioners are obviously appointed by the Governor as well as the Director of the Office of Planning.

We also attach the Land Use Commission to the Office of Planning rather than the Department of Business and Economic Development for administrative purposes.

I have to say that we spent a lot of time talking with OP about this bill, Mary Alice and myself and a couple of other staff members, and we think that the biggest problem facing the bill is an attempt to figure out how we would operate, or on a problem associated here, how we would operate once the merger occurs.

Office of Planning right now is a participant in all of our hearings. We would need Office of Planning to or somehow continue to participate. That would mean internally we would have to create walls between the planners, similar to the walls that are put in law firms sometimes with regard to cases in front of us. It's problematic.

I think that my personal opinion is that the legislatures are not going to be overly concerned about this. They're going to be looking at

cost savings and streamlining and then tell us to go figure it out.

In discussions with the Office of Planning,
Mary Alice, we recognize that issue. There's an
attempt to codify that requirement so that if we run
into problems, then we can handle it under the
umbrella of the legislative authorization.

I believe that this bill is going to at least move its way through the house, because, folks, Representative Tarnas, who drafted it, and Chair Luke have been involved in pushing for it.

Our Representative Chair Luke took the initiative and actually had discussions with our Chair. If you don't mind me relating that, Chair, with regard to this. So I think there's some actual traction on this bill.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: To discuss -- I'll be more than happy to share with the Commissioners how I was contacted by Chair Luke.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: There is another component to that bill that was originally being discussed that is currently in flux, and that is the bringing in the Office of Environmental Quality Control into the Office of Planning and the Land Use Commission. That is done through House Bill 1318.

Representative Lowen introduced that bill. She is

Chair of the Environmental Committee. We didn't have

much input into that.

I'm not sure how it's going to lay out, so we will be watching that closely to see how it is handled by the legislature, and in particular by House Finance.

Moving on. Unless there are any questions on that right now?

Chair Scheuer, you're muted.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry about that. I rearranged my dual display.

I want to sort of summarize where we are at so we can have useful discussion. I want to say what I think the four categories of bills are that we are talking about, and maybe we can talk about. One is this idea of reorganization of State agencies that would include the LUC.

The second is the ongoing issue over County versus State jurisdiction on rezoning.

The third is activity in the Agricultural District;

And four, how we conduct our meetings remotely.

Is there another category of bills we're

concerned about?

most of it. There are a few outliers. The next category that I was going to go into was the bills with regard to jurisdiction over district boundary amendments.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So sorry to interrupt. Why don't we finish your summary, then we can talk about in turn those four categories.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: There are a couple bills introduced from both House and Senate side that increase the amount of land that the County has jurisdiction over in granting district boundary amendment. House Bill 260 is one of them. There are a couple of others.

The House Bill 260, and its contend bill on the Senate side both seek to raise the County's jurisdiction from 15 acres to 100 acres, to grant district boundary amendment where 50 percent of the housing units are set aside for families with income below 140 percent of median.

The justification for this bill seems to be that there would be more control and more equitable responsibilities for infrastructure. That's a house responsibility for infrastructure with small and

median projects. This justification is severely flawed.

And also we have some serious concerns about whether or not this is good planning. I mean, there are a lot of competing uses out there right now for Agricultural land. Food sustainability, energy. There is climate change issues. There's water issues. Allowing the counties to rezone up to 100 acres in a piecemeal fashion could result in severe impacts on those other initiatives.

So we will be testifying in opposition to those.

There is also a bill that raises the County's jurisdiction from 15 acres to 25 acres in the case where affordable housing is going to be built, 60 percent affordable housing is going to be built.

That is actually interesting, because the language is almost word for word taken out of the larger bill that was submitted last year that was an attempt to stimulate the construction of affordable housing. That was many pages long and impacted various statutes, various levels, and created a fund -- (indecipherable). That bill was actually hard fought and negotiated between all of the

parties. And it -- there were trade-offs and there were balances. And that bill, the Land Use Commission's position was, okay, if you're going to do that, then you kind of need to give us our enforcement powers which we have been trying to get for some time.

So the trade-off was there. This bill just lifts the 25 acre language out of that bill and submits it as a separate bill without all those trade-offs, the checks and balances that were occurring in that larger bill.

So we have concerns about that one as well.

There are a number of bills, and this is more in the ambit of, you know, outliers, talking about contested case hearings. There is one in particular that requires all our contested case hearings to be -- the way it's written, it would require all our contested case hearings to be handled by a hearings officer designated by Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs, and we would have to reimburse DCCA for that work.

Obviously, I think this bill was aimed at a lot of agencies that don't regularly do contested case hearings. And our concern is that we were swept up in an attempt to handle a problem that doesn't

exist for us. It would usurp the powers of this Commission to render decisions and hold hearings and render decisions on contested case hearings.

Hearings officers would be required to handle all contested case hearings and then report back to the Commissioners.

There is also a bill out there to change the allowable uses on Agricultural land so that solar facilities would no longer under any circumstances be allowed on B lands.

There is also a bill with regard to Native

Hawaiian rights training that would -- that's a

little bit Draconian that we have concerns about that

would require Commission members to complete the

course within a certain amount of time, and if they

don't, they can't serve or render decisions.

That's problematic, given that we are not in control of when those classes are given and, you know, can't make a class and then they are not given again for six months. It may cause significant forum problems.

That's pretty much all the different categories of bills that there are out there.

One other bill, SB41 which is well-intended, but I mean, it's not aimed for us but

it sweeps us up, that would require that land -discretionary permits for housing developments, and
the way I read it, also district boundary amendments,
or anything associated the with the development
permit would have to be decided within 60 days or
it's automatically approved.

Obviously, this creates a lot of problems for us, especially since after a petition seems complete, we're usually giving the parties 30 to 60 days to file their position statements, and all the rest. It's just not workable, so we will be opposing that one as well.

And I believe that covers just about everything.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thanks, Dan. So there's six sort of broad categories. In no order of importance, LUC versus County level of jurisdiction over rezoning.

Bills that describe the kinds of activities allowed in the Ag District.

Bills that cover how meetings are run, particularly during the pandemic.

Bills on the potential reorganization of State government that would affect the LUC, obviously the budget bill, and then bills that affect sort of

contested case and other administrative and quasi-judicial procedures.

There's so much to potentially talk about,

I'm just going to throw open the floor and see if

there are particular questions the Commissioners have

at this time.

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'll start it off.

On the meetings, we definitely want to be able to at least have that option to have ZOOM meetings, and/or I see, because I do hundreds of condominium meetings. Right now I'm in the middle of 100 of them. But I see the future as having a combination of where you would have participants potentially on ZOOM and live.

So i.e., like Arnold is doing right now.

He went to the location. If I was in Honolulu and I wanted to go be there, I would have that ability, you know, as the Commissioner to be there. So I can see how we would try and work out some kind of combination like we did before, but have a big screen, like we do there, and everybody can see who's there and who's participating.

So I think that -- and as well as being able to ZOOM, because then we don't have to spend

State money to fly over and stay in hotels and all of that. So I see that combination. I think it's completely unworkable if you think that I'm going to open my office, or even let people know where I live or anything, sorry, but I live in downtown Hilo, and I probably, if I opened this office to have people over my shoulder, I could have -- right now, if I walked outside, I would probably have at least 20 homeless people come right in and be all warm and fuzzy and out of the rain, et cetera.

So I think that's completely dysfunctional to think that we have to have a space on that island for every meeting that people could attend, instead I have a solution. We have State pubic libraries everywhere, and in almost all the towns, or some kind of set up has been even in Na'alehu, or even in small areas, some kind of public library with a computer or two. Have it be posted that everybody could go to those sites, if they don't have their computer, and attend by ZOOM at a public library setting or something.

So I think use of facilities the State already has instead of imposing on crazy new ones, so I don't know all the details, but I'm saying who makes up this stuff? I mean, what are they smoking?

So I would say definitely use the libraries or something so the public can attend, if they don't want to fly to Honolulu for the meeting, or they don't have their own computer.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Cabral.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Question about the removal of jurisdiction from the Land Use Commission up to 100 acres. Is there anything in the legislature that make sure that there is consistency of decision Statewide that would implement that?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: There is not. I mean, the 100 acre bills -- and I've had discussions with the heads of the various departments, Planning and Permitting, although that's in flux right now because we've got a couple new ones, but not only is there a lack of consistency required in the bill, but I'm not sure -- well, the Planning Directors understand what they're getting into if this happens, because it's my personal opinion that the Supreme Court hasn't mellowed with the 15-acres decision because there hasn't been a lot of lawsuits over it.

Once you're talking about 100 acres, I think that the Counties are going to find themselves

in a position where they're going to have to do
exactly what we do, and that is hold contested case
hearings for every decision that they render. And
the Planning Directors are actually weary of this
bill, because they're afraid that they're going to
end up having to handle the Public Trust Doctrine
issues that they don't have to handle right now,
because we handle it for them.

Although it would seem that the Mayors, for instance, are in support of this bill, the head's of Department of Planning and Permitting are not because it's scarey. And that is one of the problems is that the inconsistencies with regard to the decision-making would come to the forefront.

One of the other problems that we see is that the Counties are notorious for ignoring the State's issues. And the things that come to us from OP that need to be handled with regard to infrastructure that would cost the State if the developers weren't going to have to build it. And would probably not get put into any conditions on the bills, I mean, on the decisions and orders. And issues that the Land Use Commission would raise and Office of Planning would raise with regard to impacts on the needs of land for food sustainability, climate

change and the rest probably wouldn't get it either.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: What is the development community feeling or input into the bill regarding this matter? Because there is a sense of -- at least there is a sense of knowing what to do for a developer at the present time. And there is no -- the lack of consistency would create some problems for developers. I'm just curious as to whether or not --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: That's exactly right.

There's a lot of misrepresentation as to what would occur with this bill. Some of the less akamai developers, shall we say, are convinced if the County handles things, then there would be a lot of appeals.

I mean that's one of the reasons some developers are in support of this bill.

There is a feeling on the part -- not a feeling, but I mean, Nancy, has put it very succinctly in a couple conversations. You know, the County Councils are more easily to be circumspective about it, are much more easily influenced than the Land Use Commission.

The County Councils are political. There's all sorts of things that they need and want from developers as politicians, or that developers can

give them. The development community's feelings are that some of the development community feels that that control will allow them to move projects forward in the face of community opposition.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The last question I have, does this bill grant to any specific authority within the County structure? In other words, does this bill require the Planning Commission to follow it to implement, or does it require the Council, because once you get the Council involved, wouldn't that be more like a legislative act rather than quasi-judicial?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: That's exactly part of the problem, the bill leaves it to the decision-making authority at the County. That's a big part of the problem.

I should point out that our understanding is that it's not the developers that are pushing this bill, that it's the realtors.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions, Commissioners?

Commissioner Okuda.

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

You know, what I'm going to say in answer

to the question, what does the development community think, it's not based on any scientific study or anything like that, but what I tried to, since frankly, I'm not really a planner. When I got on the Commission, I tried to talk to a whole bunch of people because I knew -- I was being very frank about it -- I was being appointed not because I knew anything specific about land use planning.

Now whether or not this perception is true or not, it seems a perception that we have these additional layers of government, it makes the process inefficient.

So I think if the process is inefficient in some ways, then, you know, inefficiency should be addressed. If the perception is wrong about inefficiency existing in the process, then the perception should be addressed.

You know, the State spent good money sending me and all of us to various national planning conferences. I think one of the things which is really not just in any of these bills, but could be considered, is one of the city's in the Bay Area basically created a concierge kind of position where this one government official would be the concierge to basically help shepherd developments through

whatever regulatory processes are there. You know, its a sad commentary that many of our private clients feel like they have to higher consultants called "expeditors" to get their projects through County Planning Departments or Building Departments.

So I think just the fact that things are just left to the County doesn't necessarily take away inefficiencies, but to the extent a bill is designed to remove inefficiencies of multiple types of approvals where you're really resubmitting the same old, same old things, things that should be looked at, but otherwise, I see what Dan is saying.

Chair, if I could say one more thing about having, you know, hearings or meeting places for the public.

I think ZOOM technology is really good, but it's really important to have actual physical location where people can come and voice their views. And I agree it could be the public library, it could be whatever alternate site, and though there is a concern that things might get out of control, I would urge everyone to kind of err on the side of actually expanding participation.

If there ever was a hearing that would have led to, you know, a real contentious-type of things

agetting out of control, it was the Mauna Kea hearing.

And in the end, I think probably some people would agree with my assessment, the vote of the Land Use Commission was frankly contrary to the vast majority of the people who were in the meeting room at the Nani Loa Hotel, and was not consistent with what they wanted. But the feeling I got in the end with the people who we basically did not agree with, they were the ones coming up shaking our hands and saying "thank you very much for coming out to the community. Thank you for listening to us. Yeah, you didn't vote in our favor, but we understand what your position is. We might not agree, but thank you for coming

out."

I think one of our jobs is basically to restore trust of the people in government. And trust in government is not going to be helped if everybody is remote.

It's really important, not only for the LUC, but for all other boards and commissions to actually go out, at least have some people out at the community level to make it clear that, you know, we're showing by action we really want to listen to you, and we're here.

Aside from the fact some people can't use

technology. That's my comment, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Mr. Orodenker.

with Chair (sic) Okuda. It's our experience that there is a tremendous amount of value in holding hearings. I actually think that this virtual meeting system is working and is convenient, but in terms of public trust -- not the Public Trust Doctrine, but the public trust there is tremendous value in this Commission actually traveling to the communities in which the issues are being raised, and being present and having the community be able to come and see and watch in person exactly what is happening.

I don't think that virtual technology gives the community the same level of comfort that they are being listened to and that the issues are being well-aired and discussed as it does in a public meeting in person, as opposed to virtual meeting.

So I would agree with Commissioner Okuda.

The difficulty that we're facing right now -- I

didn't mention this, but the Governor's budget right

now proposes that next year or the coming fiscal year

that our travel budget which is most of our

non-personnel budget, be cut by 50 percent, and the

following year be cut by a 100 percent.

Assuming that that is what we end up with, we won't have any choice but to hold meetings virtually, and the second year, the biennium any Chapter 91 or Chapter 92 requirements that would have us needing to travel, even staff to a neighbor island, would be impossible for us to handle because our budget will be gone for that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thanks, Dan.

Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I concur with the comments of Commissioner Okuda, and as expanded by Mr. Orodenker. I see real value in especially our more controversial contested cases. I think if, looking back over the last year, I go back to Mauna Kea case that Commissioner Okuda referenced, and that had incredible community engagement, and it was very appropriate and important for us to be able to interact and be before the public, that public trust.

I look back over the numerous ZOOM meetings we have had, we have not had an outpouring of the community really showing up in numbers like that.

I'm a little concerned about the forthcoming meeting in March on Kauai. There's a tremendous amount of community interest in that case, and it's a ZOOM

meeting. I think it will be a real test for us, eye opening. I wish we would have some of that meeting in person. It's not going to be possible. But going forward I think that we should thrive for some meetings in person, especially on the neighbor islands for the cases that are a large number of community members that are interested, have expressed interest in those cases.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

Commissioner Giovanni. Commissioners? Commissioner

Wong. Followed by Commissioner Chang.

The "raise your hand" function is harder in your room.

COMMISSIONER WONG: I guess what happens, we are in a quandary right now, especially for the Land Use Commission and the State as well, because we have the COVID issue; we have the budget issue. The budget is driving everything for the State of Hawaii in terms of travel and reorganization and all that. Our hands are pretty much tied on that issue, right, if I hear it correctly.

I agree with Commissioner Okuda and also
Commissioner Giovanni that we should be out in the
different islands if possible because of our
connection with them, but right now it's hard because

of the travel restrictions and the budget.

And I just wanted to state for the record that, you know, it's going to be hard for us to figure out even next year because the biennium budget is zero travel. But we should try to figure out something.

I like Commissioner Cabral's statement for allowing people to use the library. I didn't even think about that. So Commission Cabral had a great idea, that issue that we don't invite them to our house, but let's say for Oahu, we may have to use this conference room we're at for Oahu people to come, I mean, as long as its less than so much people because of the COVID.

That's all I'm saying, that a lot of larger issues that we have to think about besides our own little issue about how it's going to affect everything else. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Chang, followed by Commissioner Cabral.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think that we are -- it's one, a question of balance. What do we need versus what may be the best. I will tell you, I have found that these

virtual meetings have opened participation to a much broader group, because people don't physically have to be at the location. They don't have to travel. So to that extent, I have welcomed the virtual platform of the way of engaging the community, and whether they participate or not, there's an understanding of our process and they see how we conduct it.

So I see great value. I also think that's the reality of the future. Even if we address COVID and the pandemic, whether it's the budget shortfall, but I think there will be this virtual platform that has created an ability to reach a larger constituency.

I do agree that there is value to having in-person representation, or an opportunity to see it.

My suggestion would be when we have a matter involving that particular island, that that's where there would be the island representative. We find a public facility, whether it's a library, but that would be the place where we would open it up to the public. And you would have that island representative being there. But we would not have to have one on each island, so that we can satisfy at

least the constitutional mandate to be at the location where the land is located.

But I think that way addresses where we don't all have to travel. I will tell you, this has been a luxury for me that normally when we have LUC meetings, I mean, we are leaving our houses at 5:00 o'clock in the morning and don't get home until 7:00 at night. Now we are able to do other work.

So part of it is, as I think we have all mentioned, this is a voluntary board, but we are all giving up a considerable amount of time to do the travel. So one, to accommodate the community, I think it would be appropriate to have the island representative and a public facility where the public on that island can attend in addition to the virtual platform. But I see great value in continuing the ZOOM or some kind of virtual meeting.

I was -- last night we had a town-hall meeting for Kaneohe. We had over 120 people on the ZOOM. And the legislative said normally they get about two-dozen people. So again, I think if we're looking at public participation, this is the wave of the future, at least a portion of it where I think people are getting used to, but it also ensures some safety, but again, greater public participation.

So I think we can come up with some kind of hybrid, and if we anticipate, it's going to be a very controversial meeting, I'm certain we can make some kind of travel adjustments where maybe more of us can travel. But I think that at a minimum the island representative would provide a facility on that island.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Cabral followed by Commissioner Ohigashi.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I agree with everybody, in-person meetings are wonderful, especially controversial, but so many aren't. Again, if we did a hybrid, but no travel money, limited options.

The other thing, rather than on Oahu, your office there or the conference room, I'm assuming that's the conference room down the hall from the LUC office, is nice and convenient. But I would really recommend that we try and find like on Oahu, the airport as your meeting room that's on the top floor there, because any place you can be that you take that public away from your own office, you know, whatever, there's plenty of parking there. There's security there, somebody else's security. There's

somebody else is cleaning the place constantly,
because, you know, COVID is going to be a long time,
and then even after that, I think people are going
to -- so if you're going to have hybrid-type
meetings, I say use public facilities outside of, you
know, the normal ones, even at hotels, I think Dawn
is talking about sort of like we did when we had them
and go down in the basement of the State building.

up, and that was okay and stuff, but I think hybrid and ZOOM is never going to go away. It's all about the money right now. There's no money, so they've got to figure out how do it, and I think the legislators err on the side of -- if you worry about the minority of people who do not have access to a computer, the minority of people. It's like, if you wanted to come to a LUC meeting, and they don't drive, are we supposed to send a driver for them? There are those people. You cannot cater to the whole world, to that miniscule number of people who can't do something.

So people are finding their way to ZOOM. In have an unbelievable -- I manage all these condominiums and subdivisions with all these senior citizens, and it's amazing how many of them find

their way to the ZOOM meeting when they want to.

citizens to figure it out, and if you have a constant place where they don't have a computer, which a few don't, but so many more do. So I think we just got to come up with what we're going to support, and of course, Dan going to the legislature, he's got to connect with other agencies, and I feel like our LUC meetings and our staff are much more advanced on how to figure out how to have these meetings than many of these other State agencies.

I mean some of these State agencies, I think they just went home. They pick up their pay check and that's the only duty they do. I'm sorry, not all of them, but there's quite a few agencies that have no other duty that they're doing. So I mean, it's a balance, but with no money we have no option, and every year it can change. The law needs to be written to where it can be flexible. It can't be "you must" or "you must", because then every year it has to change. That's my two cents again.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Like Gary, I wasn't

chosen for my vast land use. Like Gary, we were just chosen for our good looks.

meeting is an important factor. I point back to the one we had on Lahaina project. I don't think that there would be such a settlement and community buying without that initial first meeting. And, you know, and I understand the dollars and cents-wise, but that's the trade-off we are making, and I think we lose that kind of opportunity.

The second thing is that I'm finding random talks about what concerns we have. I'm little kind of worried about how are we going to utilize existing legislative whatever protocols they have. How are we going to go without a committee or without some of us pointing to the legislative committee or do the necessary lobbying.

So if Dan can explain to us what options, what the procedure will be, that way we can at least maybe agree to conditions or --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Orodenker?

The question is essentially we had the permitted interaction group as a way of making sure that the staff, who was tracking bills and have to often turn on a dime to develop and write a position,

have a way of keeping in touch with the Commission, it's policy desires.

What do we do?

is no way that this Commission can react quickly enough to handle changing issues at the legislature. The only way that I can foresee handling this is that -- first of all, under the OIP's guidance, two of you can talk at any time as long as you are not talking about deliberating towards a decision on a substantive matter.

So you're free to talk to each other about your concerns with regard to any legislation that's out there. The only way that I can perceive of handling this is I'm simply going to have to call various Commissioners on the day that we get information on a bill, and sometimes there may be only a few hours before a hearing is scheduled to discuss the matter. That's one by one. That's the only way that I can foresee doing it.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have a follow-up, Commissioner Ohigashi?

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I think that's a good idea, but that is the way it looks like it's going to have to be. But if there is some issues

that you want to -- is it permissible for you to email all of us and say this issue came up with regards to legislation and --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: It's permissible -CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I want to recognize
our Deputy Attorney General, Ms. China.

MS. CHINA: I think you're still going to have a Sunshine issue, and you can still create a permitted interaction group as regards to certain bills or certain issues that you want to have represented by you to the legislature.

I mean, it's just that at today's meeting it was not properly recognized as the Sunshine agenda issue was not proper. You can still, at your next meeting, have your permitted interaction group to go forward in this legislative session. We've never said you can't do that.

unworkable situation. By the time -- in order to notice this meeting, we had to send out the notice a week ago. Most of these bills were not posted until two days ago, and we already have hearings scheduled on it. It is impossible to work under those situations in the manner in which the Attorney General is suggesting. That is why we're left with

the staff having to contact the Commissioners individually when these matters arise. There is no way we can schedule a meeting under the Sunshine Law in time to handle the notice and these individual bills as they come you up.

MS. CHINA: Mr. Orodenker, you know, I am not the bad guy. This opinion of the OIP, this is what they have been telling us about how to handle this. If something is super urgent and you can't do it, you can't create your permitted interaction group to handle a certain bill for the rest of the legislative session because that's what we have been advising.

You can do it, that you can, you know, now that you know what the bills are, and now you can actually create your permitted interaction group to handle these bills for the rest of the session. It's not that we have told you that you need to have a created permitted interaction group every time you have a notice of the bill.

Now you know what the bills are. And can use comitted interaction groups -- and as alternative you can have an emergency meeting. That's what OIP has said.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. China, if I may.

I don't think anybody was suggesting you were the bad guy or woman.

I appreciate the tone of frustration. I want to recognize Commissioner Okuda followed by Commissioner Aczon.

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

This is just me personally. I have no lack of confidence. I have a lot of confidence that as these matters come up, that the Executive Director and the staff and you, Mr. Chair, and whoever else you might want to consult with consistent with the requirements of the Sunshine Law, how you want to handle these things on a specific case, I really don't have a problem with that.

Mainly, because if I had a problem with something like that, you know, we could bring a motion to remove you as Chair or, you know, make a nasty statement to the Executive Director.

I think we all strive to comply with the Sunshine Law, and that's good for the community. Hey, whatever we do, it should be out in the open.

But as far as, you know, these procedural things where there's been -- and I know there has been consultation on procedural things. I have not

ever seen you or the Executive Director or anybody
else do things which have been contrary to what
people on the Commission have thought even
informally, and/or that anything was being done in a
nefarious way for playing office politics. By the
way, I've seen office politics in government, so I
think I can recognize that.

So I think the Deputy Attorney General, her position, I think she accurately states the law.

Following the Sunshine Law is not only the law, but it's important for us to keep trust in government, but I have a lot of confidence based on seeing the actions previously taken that when these issues come up very quickly at the legislature, you and the Executive Director with consultation of staff and to the extent you need to consult with other Commission members consistent with the Sunshine Law, I think we're actually okay.

And so to the Executive Director, I'm not saying we shouldn't, you know, we shouldn't be concerned or focused on these things, and it's a very good we focus on it, but it's really not a situation right now that I plan to lose any sleep over. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon.

VICE CHAIR AZON: Good morning, everyone.

Sorry I'm late joining you this morning. I just finished a conference from early this morning, international conference. I finished at 9:00, and I

was able to join two minutes after.

So, you know, the reason I'm saying this is this conference international, we have over 800 people participating, the entire United States also in Canada. And we were able to talk to somebody from Toronto, or somebody in New York or even California one on one, so this technology has lot to offer for everyone, not only for individuals but also State government agencies.

So this technology, ZOOM or other platform are here to stay. So the sooner we can be activated or vary these technologies, the better for us moving forward.

In-person meetings or in person, you know, one on one is very important, but sometimes we cannot get everything we want. Like, you know, Commissioner Wong saying even when people ask me, you know, how is work? How is construction? You know, it all depends on money. Our trade, our department is based on economy, you know. Money not coming in, there's no work. So same thing with government, the budget. If

there is no budget, we need to adapt that.

So going back to the in-person meetings, it should be, I believe, you know, updated basis, you know. I would defer to the Chair or the staff on, you know, to choose what meetings should be in-person. You know, like the controversial Mauna Kea or whatever that, you know, really the community would benefit on in-person meeting. So they have the staff or the Chair, even some of the Commissioners have a better feeling, especially their home counties on those important issues.

And by the way, you know, most of the times it's controversial issues, they have certain organizations that pushing one way or another. And usually these organizations or groups tend to organize themselves.

I've been to a meeting that certain groups coordinated, you know, organized themselves, they rented a room, and participate as a group, so there is other ways that we can do, you know, there is other ways that we can getting everything too. But again, going back to budget, sometimes we cannot get.

So the sooner we plan on those, the better for us. I believe there's going to be some kind of policy, some kind of strategy on moving forward on

1 how to deal with these meetings.

So again, you know, everything is based on economy, based on money. We just going to have to deal with what we are given.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,
Commissioner Aczon. Thank you all Commissioners for
this robust discussion.

I have a few thoughts. Commissioner Wong, you're raising both hands.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, sorry. Going back to AG and our Executive Directors's conversations.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Colloquy as one of the legal representatives before us would say.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Sorry. I'm just a local boy. Don't say anything, Lee. These hours, maybe eight hours, where do we go from here?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I had a couple specific followups regarding that. Can I articulate those, Commissioner Wong, to our Deputy Attorney General in the hopes of trying to get to where we're going?

One question I had, Ms. China, given the legislative ability to do gut and replace. Even like this week's list of bills is not next week's list of

bills, much less the list of bills that's going to necessarily carry us through the rest of the legislative session.

So I understand what you're saying about your interpretation of the Sunshine Law, but how do we deal with that practicality of how the legislature actually operates?

MS. CHINA: What you can do is you separated it into certain categories. You had four categories.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Which I expanded to $\sin x$.

MS. CHINA: You have a bunch of categories. With those categories you can create permitted interaction groups just on those categories saying with regard to certain categories or all, we're going to create one permitted interaction group or six permitted interaction groups to address these. And at your meeting, you know, you can discuss, you know, what in general your policy is towards these categories, and these permitted interaction groups could actually address, you know, be on a pivot when these legislations or bills, when the new ones pop up, or when there is gut and replace, because they're on the permitted interaction groups for these

1 specific categories.

And I think that would work, and you could create these groups as soon as your next meeting. I don't really think, you know, that it would hamper or hinder review in any way.

And what happened was, before this meeting, we did send staff -- it came up from the OIP and it was Sunshine Law options to address State legislative issues and measures. And I think staff could forward it to all of the Commissioners. And it gives options on how to address this on a, you know, quick take, because I think, you know, even OIP acknowledges that it's -- you need to act fast.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. There might be a specific question or followup from Commissioner Wong or Mr. Orodenker regarding that response that would try to help our conversation.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, so the question is -- can we create a pick today for the six areas?

MS. CHINA: No, it wasn't agendized as such.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So the question I have is, we have hearings now. What can we do until we create the PIG?

MS. CHINA: You know, I think you can give

your opinions here to, you know, what you think should be done as far as six categories, but I don't think you can create the PIG today.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So I understand. Let's say we have to testify tomorrow to a certain bill that will affect the Land Use Commission in general, saying they want to do away with Land Use Commission. How we going to testify to say we don't want to do away with Land Use Commission?

MS. CHINA: I think you have two options today as it is. You know, staff would definitely be testifying against it, and you as individuals could be testifying against it too. I mean, we were not asked for our advice prior to this. And I understand that you did it differently before, and you know, we might not have, you know, as a group, not have been advised that there is this memo from OIP advising about such law and legislature.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I just want to assure you that we did so on the advice of our previously assigned Deputy Attorney General.

MS. CHINA: Yeah, so, I mean, we just, we're just trying to give you the best advice that we can, and we're trying to get this done.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It sounds like we

have a commitment, a productive commitment to work together to first of all properly agendize the next matter in a manner so that these topically based one on one PIGs, we do have the most immediate issue of any bills that come between now and the next time we meet. We don't even know all the ones that might be heard.

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, there is two issues, first issue is I just want to ensure that you know when we did agendize today's hearing, everyone was noticed, so even Bryan Yee was noticed. So good to see him, but I mean, I would assume that everyone would do their homework once the agenda came up.

So you would assume that if there was issues that arise, that our staff would be notified or they would be called and say, hey, I have this issue. So that's the first thing.

The second thing is, for our AG, can we make a motion now to say on behalf of LUC can the Chair and the staff work together on any of the hearings that may occur until we create a PIG, and you know, do our thing for that fact?

MS. CHINA: Yes, you can do that, you know, until -- okay, yes, you can.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

response to Commissioner Wong, whether the motion is made and carried, I think the Chair and the Executive Director already have that authority, and so -- but yeah, I mean, I would be supportive of it, but even if it wasn't a motion, I think the Chair and Executive Director have the authority, and I kind of would expect that even if we didn't raise the issue, the Chair and Executive Director exercising their duties and obligations would be doing so anyway.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may, at this time, an hour and 20 minutes into our brief meeting. There's a few things I want to say observations on this overall discussion, and if -- would the Commission indulge me to do those in the hopes of sort of summarizing where we are at and how to go forward?

I will continue to work closely with the staff as legislative issues come up. I promised I was going to share with you that I was approached by House Finance Chair Luke to speak about -- well, initially I got a call from the staff of Representative Luke because, in response to an opinion piece I wrote on a personal capacity for

Civil Beat, it was published in December, and her staff indicated that Chair Luke wanted to discuss that with me, to which I was surprised and slightly nervous, but she actually expressed her appreciation for the article that I had written. And then she also shared with me that she was looking, in response to the State's budgetary situation, wanted to know a general orientation that we might have towards looking at reorganization of the Land Use Commission in its position in relationship to other land use regulatory agencies.

I only expressed my personal opinion, I didn't speak on behalf of the Commission, but I thought that given the State's budget situation, it's incumbent for all of us to say, yes, we are willing to discuss new ways of doing business, new ways of organizing that are thoughtful, logical approaches to how we can do our business effectively and fulfill our duties.

That was those discussions with her, and Representative Tarnas. So I wanted to share that with everybody.

I have a few other observations.

One, to go to, I guess, the discussion of, and the interaction with Ms. China and our Deputies

Attorney Generals, I would actually like to agendize for future Land Use Commission meeting really the subject of our representation by the Attorney General's Office. We have been, I think with the transition from one division of the Attorney General's Office to another, and with the practice in this particular division of the Attorney General's Office to rotate the Attorneys General rather than keep one attorney general assigned to us, it's presented certain different operational challenges to our thing, and I would like the ability to agendize that discussion so that we can talk about it in a Sunshine compatible way.

Mr. Orodenker, I'm going to ask you to help working with the Attorney General, of course, putting that on a future agenda.

Regarding the long and really thoughtful observations about whether we hold in-person meeting or remote or hybrids, one thing I'll say, not to be Debby Downer or Donald Downer, COVID might be a three to five-years rather than 12 or 18-month thing, so we might be overly optimistic to be looking for the time when we can choose voluntarily being in person and being remote.

So I think that the legislature, I think

it's good that there's at least a vehicle out there from the Office of Information Practices to address remote meetings, but I think they might be premature in thinking that they know what the world will look like in six months to a year.

Ms. China, you would like to say something at this point or later?

MS. CHINA: Yeah, just a quick statement that I just would like to say that in addition to the LUC, my division also represents a lot of other boards and commissions, and all of the boards and commissions, including the Board of Land and Natural Resources and the Commission on Water Resource Management have rotated Deputy Attorney Generals, and I don't think that we have had a problem with how we advise these boards and commissions.

I think you guys can set -- agendize this for a future meeting to discuss. It has been raised with our higher-ups, and the decision has been made to provide you with rotating agenda of rotating AGs.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Ms. China.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to make a comment on the restructuring of the --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I was going to agree

with you. I was moving on to like the pandemic ongoing. I don't know that we are going to get in-person meetings. I do agree there is value in being in person. I think that the meeting you referred to Pulelehua, the Maui Land & Pine project came out differently because of people like us, in seeing in our eyes and having the chance to talk to their decision makers.

And I think the last point which was more humerus than anything regarding Commissioner Cabral's statement that almost everybody is online. Yes, perhaps, but it reminds me of the rapper (indecipherable) skit where he asks, "everybody who's not here, let me know?"

So we don't necessarily know who's not here to say that they're not here.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I forgot about the restructuring issue. What I'm concerned about is that the Office of Planning or restructured Office of Planning would become some kind of super agency that would more than likely interfere with independence of the Land Use Commission's decision. And I point out to experience that I have on some County boards and Commissions where they're governed by an executive

director of that particular area, and I think that
the problem is that the Commission becomes too
dependent and too responsible to the point of view of
the director of any kind of comission if it is placed
under it.

So that's just my concern with the restructuring, that we would becoming, for me, actually losing a lot of independence, or becoming the preverbal rubber stamp.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi. Appreciate that.

I think I believe, Mr. Orodenker, the tone of the LUC's draft comments on potential hearings for this legislation, correct me if I am wrong, are to raise issues like that, and recognizing the legislature it's sort of the prerogative to reorganize government, but raise issues around what legal procedures we would have for fulfilling our business; is that correct?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So the spirit of Commissioner Ohigashi's comments can certainly captures if we want to maintain our independence?

25 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Just quickly, regarding future legislation, can I also ask, just ask that maybe we also, you and the Executive Director keep your eye out on things which might be outside of the Land Use Commission silo.

I just want to throw something out there, that we're going to be in years of limited budget, limited resources, and the question is, how do we move the State into the future 40, 50 years from now? How do we make sure that under represented or unserved people are protected?

And if you agree, I would ask that you see if a movement can be made to fund public classroom teaching 100 percent. If there's going to be cuts, let's not cut classroom public teaching, especially in areas where we've got underserved or what some people described as marginalized people. This pandemic is showing that people who got money can get their kids educated, and other people are being left behind. I think we need in this community to make a statement supporting public classroom education.

I'm not talking about high bureaucrats at certain departments that sometime appear in front of the Commission and we get all appalled that you're

getting paid so much money and can't answer our question. I'm not talking about protecting their jobs, their pay scale. What I'm asking is if you can just maybe kokua a little bit public classroom education. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

Commissioner Okuda. Your reference to budget made

me -- thank you for your comment. Your reference to

budget made me just want to acknowledge, while

acknowledging the comments from Commissioner Cabral,

Aczon and Wong that indeed we are in a State budget

and our ability to travel or not is going to be

restricted.

I just want to remind everybody that our total budget, I think, is \$500,000 a year. The State's 1.4 billion dollar shortfall is not going to be saved or lost or won based on an elimination of LUC's travel budget.

So I don't have a problem if this

Commission feels that we really need to have some

flexibility to have the ability when safe to meet in

person, I don't have a problem advocating for the

small amount of necessary funds.

Commissioners, are there further comments or questions on the agenda item that is before us

regarding legislative issues, or Mr. Orodenker within this item any further clarification you would like to have from the full Commission on pending matters?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Not at this time. I would point out to the Commissioners that the Commissioners are always welcome to participate in the legislative process as individuals and as Commissioners and that the legislature puts a lot of weight on Commissioner's testimony with regard to various issues. So that if something is occurring and you can't respond in a manner that you would like as quickly as possible, you are welcome to submit testimony.

We will try and keep the Commissioners apprised of what is happening. One question that was asked that I never got a chance to answer was, can I email everyone, and the answer to that is yes, I can email all the Commissioners with what is happening. The problem is that the Commissioners can't respond to everybody. They can respond to me as an individual, but I would caution the Commissioners once again on pressing that "reply all" button, because that is a problem.

But I will be sending out emails of what's happening, if there's anything significant.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Chang.

thank you, Mr. Orodenker. In followup to your comment, that would be really helpful if we, as the Commissioners, could receive perhaps, I don't know if you can do like a spreadsheet of the relevant bills and status. I don't intend to make more work for you, but that way you can put the Commissioners on alert as to critical legislation that individual Commissioners may want to provide testimony for, because I don't check the status of legislative bills, but if your office could create some kind of form for us at the beginning, and then just have a column on its status, so that you don't have to do more work as the session goes on, that that might be helpful, at least for me it would be.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to know from our Attorney General pointing to the box, that from the Attorney General, Deputy, whether or not -- what the contents of what the limitation in the contents of any such email should be whether or

not solicitation from the or -- I just want to be clear what kind of contents I'm not allowed.

MS. CHINA: Those are tricky. It really should not be -- gosh, really can't be like, for example, you know how you're playing telephone, you know, you email Mr. Orodenker and he emails back to somebody else with information, and you email a couple other Commissioners, so I guess he can give you status, but it's more properly, you know, it would really be more proper if we do things at Commission meetings.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: We cannot email?

MS. CHINA: Yeah, you really shouldn't be emailing.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So the Director cannot tell us status?

MS. CHINA: I guess he can send out email giving you the status between now and the next meeting, but it's going to be difficult because all of you have to hold your tongue and not be responding because it's going to be really easy to hit "reply all".

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I can assure the Deputy we are a demure and quiet group.

MS. CHINA: It's just so tempting, right?

When you see a thing and it's like "I have to reply." 1 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And one of the 3 possible solutions to this is that Mr. Orodenker 4 bcc's the Commissioners, so if you hit "reply all" --5 Is there anything else, Commissioners, at 6 this time? There being no further business, other 7 than to delightfully harass and welcome back Mr. Yee to our company. Nice to have you back, Bryan. 8 9 Is there anything else, Commissioners? Ιſ 10 not, thank you very much. I was very encouraged by 11 our discussion, particularly my fellow Commissioners' 12 deep commitment to engaging with the community on difficult issues face to face when possible, as open 13 14 as possible, making as many venues, avenues as possible for interaction with us. 15 16 I think Hawaii is -- not to self-praise too 17 much -- but Hawaii is well-served by the spirit that 18 you bring to your work. Thank you so much. 19 With that, it's 10:37. We're adjourned. 20 (The proceedings were adjourned at 10:37 21 a.m.) 22 23 24

25

1	CERTIFICATE STATE OF HAWAII)
2) SS. COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
3	COUNTY OF HONOLOLD
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on January 28, 2021, at 9:00 a.m.,
6	the proceedings contained herein was taken down by me
7	in machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
8	typewriting under my supervision; that the foregoing
9	represents, to the best of my ability, a true and
10	correct copy of the proceedings had in the foregoing
11	matter.
12	I further certify that I am not of counsel for
13	any of the parties hereto, nor in any way interested
14	in the outcome of the cause named in this caption.
15	Dated this 28th day of January, 2021, in
16	Honolulu, Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	/s/ Jean Marie McManus
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	