1		LAND USE COMMISSION STATE OF HAWAI'I
2		
3		Hearing held on July 23, 2020 Commencing at 9:03 a.m.
4	Helo	d via ZOOM by Interactive Conference Technology
5	VII.	Call to Order
6		
7	V111.	STATUS REPORT A02-737 U of N BENCORP (Hawai'i)
8	IX.	ACTION
9	121.	A02-737 U OF N BENCORP (Hawai'i)
10		* Consider Motion to Rescind Order to Show Cause or to Continue Hearing on Order to
11		Show cause filed May 8, 2019
12	Х.	HEARING AND ACTION * A02-737 U OF N BENCORP (Hawai'i)
13		Hear evidence, deliberate and take action on Order to Show Cause issued March 29, 2019
14	XI.	
15		DR20-69 County of Hawaii and DR20-70 Linda Rosehill, et al
16		* Consider Petitioners, County of Hawaii's and Linda Rosehill, et al's Petition for
17		Declaratory Orders regarding Short Term
18		Vacation Rentals as Farm Dwellings
19	XII.	CONTINUED HEARING AND ACTION (If Necessary) A17-804 Hawaiian Memorial Life Plan, Ltd (O'ahu)
20		* Petition for District Boundary Amendment
21	XIII.	Adjournment
22		
23		
24	BEFOR	E: Jean Marie McManus, CSR #156
25		
	1	

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
2
      JONATHAN SCHEUER, Chair (Oahu)
      NANCY CABRAL, Vice Chair (Big Island)
3
      EDMUND ACZON, Vice Chair (Oahu)
      GARY OKUDA (Oahu)
4
      LEE OHIGASHI (Maui)
      ARNOLD WONG (Oahu)
5
      DAWN CHANG (Oahu)
      DAN GIOVANNI(Kauai)
6
7
      STAFF:
      JULIE CHINA, ESQ.
8
      Deputy Attorney General
9
      DANIEL ORODENKER, Executive Officer
      RILEY HAKODA, Chief Clerk
10
      SCOTT DERRICKSON, AICP/Planner
11
      DAWN APUNA, ESQ.
      Deputy Attorney General
12
      RODNEY FUNAKOSHI, Planning Program Administrator
      LORENE MAKI, Planner
13
      State of Hawaii, Office of Planning
14
      JOHN MUKAI, ESQ.
      DIANA MELLON-LACEY, ESQ.
15
      Deputy Corporation Counsel
      MICHAEL YEE, Planning Director
16
      APRIL SURPRENANT
      Acting Deputy Planning Department
17
      County of Hawai'i
18
      CALVIN CHIPCHASE, ESQ.
      CHRISTOPHER GOODIN, ESQ.
      Attorney for Linda Rosehill, et al
19
20
      KATHERINE GARSON, ESQ.
      DEREK SIMON, ESQ.
21
      JULIE ANJO, ESQ.
      ALLEN ANJO, ESQ.
22
      Attorneys for U of N Bencorp
23
24
25
```

			3
1	INDEX		
2	LUC PROCEEDINGS:	PAGE	
3	A02-737 U of N Bencorp	6	
3	PUBLIC WITNESSES:		
4	Aaron Esparza Espereza		
5	Direct Examination	13	
6	Alapai Kaulia		
7	Direct Examination	17	
7	Cross-Examination/Petitioner	20	
8	Wilfred Murakami	0.0	
9	Direct Examination	22	
1.0	Rollin Rabara	0.0	
10	Direct Examination	28	
11	PETITIONER'S WITNESSES:		
12	Francis Oda		
13	Direct Examination	3 6	
	Jeff Overton	36	
14	Direct Examination	5 5	
15	U of N BENCORP OSC	100	
16	PUBLIC WITNESSES:		
4.5	Roger Hamilton	100	
17	Direct Examination	103	
18	PETITIONER'S WITNESSES:		
19	Leia'ala Fruean		
20	Direct Examination	106	
	DR20-69 and DR20-70	125	
21	COUNTY OF HAWAI'I WITNESSES:		
22			
23	Michael Yee Examination	135	
24			
25			

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha mai kakou. Good morning. It 9:03 a.m.

3 This is the July 23rd, 2020 Commission 4 meeting which is being held using interactive conference technology link videoconference 6 participants and other interested individuals of the 7 public via ZOOM and internet conferencing program to comply with the State and County official directives during the current pandemic health crisis. Members 10 of the public are viewing the meeting via the ZOOM

I would like to stress to everyone the importance of speaking slowly, clearly and directly into your microphone, and that before speaking, please state your name and identify yourselves for the record.

This is especially important for rooms with multiple people, such as who is actually talking. That way we have one camera.

Also please be aware only (frozen screen).

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, you were freezing half way through the introduction, so I think we missed a couple things.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Where did I --

MR. HAKODA: Right at the start, Chair.

24

1

2

5

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

webinar platform.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: At the very start?

2 MR. HAKODA: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Take two.

It's 9:05 A.M. This is the 23rd, 2020 Land Use Commission meeting being held using interactive conference technology link via ZOOM internet conferencing program with State and County official operational directives during the pandemic.

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

As I noted, or tried to, earlier, this is especially important for people who are in rooms with others, for instance, County, we cannot see readily who it is that is speaking.

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

This ZOOM conferencing technology allows

the Parties and each participating Commissioner individual remote access to the meeting.

Please note, as was recently demonstrated on my connection, that due to matters entirely outside our control, at one time or another, one or other members might have occasional disruptions to connectivity.

If you see such disruption, please let us know as we try to record the audio/visual signals to effectively conduct business during the pandemic.

I am Jonathan Likeke Scheuer. I am the LUC Chair. I am on Oahu along with Commissioners Aczon, Chang, Okuda, and Wong, our LUC Executive Officer Daniel Orodenker, our LUC Chief Planner Scott Derrickson, Mr. Riley Hakoda, the LUC Deputy Attorney General Julie China, and our Court Reporter Jean McManus.

Commissioner Cabral is on Hawaii Island.

Commissioner Ohigashi is on Maui; and Commissioner

Giovanni is on Kauai. We currently have eight of

nine seated Commissioners.

A02-737 U of N Bencorp:

Our next agenda item is a status report on A02-737 University of the Nations Bencorp (Hawaii).

Will the parties please identify yourselves

1 for the record?

MS. GARSON: This is Katherine Garson from Carlsmith Ball for Petitioner University of Nations Kona, Inc. Here with me in Hilo, Derek Simon, also of Carlsmith Ball, and Julie Anjo and Allen Anjo are general counsel for University of Nations Kona.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you Ms. Garson.

County? County of Hawaii, can you hear me

now?

MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diana

Mellon-Lacey from Corp Counsel for County of Hawaii.

Also present with me is John Mukai from Corporation

Counsel and Jeff Darrow from the Planning Department,

and April Suprenant and Michael Yee are not here at

the moment but they will be joining us.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Office of Planning?

MS. APUNA: Good morning, Chair, members of the Commission, Dawn Apuna Deputy Attorney General, and here with me is Rodney Funakoshi and Lorene Maki.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me update record, and please wave your hands or anything as my internet connection appears to be unstable.

On January 8, 2020, the Commission met in Kailua-Kona at the NELHA facility, and voted to deny

the University of Nations Bencorp's Reconsideration of the Order Granting the University of Nations

Kona's Motion to Continue the Hearing on the Order to Show Cause to only allow typographical corrections, date changes to the Petitioner's Corporate name change, and associated amendments and corrections to the caption.

March 23rd, 2020 the Commission received two documents: The Petitioner's Withdrawal of its Motion to Amend the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated December 21st, 2006, and the Petitioner's Motion to Amend the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order dated March 23rd, 2020 along with Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 20.

Between March 25th and July 7th of this year we received OP's request for extension of time. We issued a prehearing order for the parties.

The Petitioner, OP and County submitted a Joint Stipulation regarding the scheduling of the Motion to Amend the Order with LUC.

The County of Hawaii submitted Statement of Position on the LUC Order to Show Cause, the Petitioner's Motion to Amend.

The Petitioner filed its witness list,

```
exhibit list, and first Supplemental Memorandum in
1
2
      support of its Motion to Amend the Findings of Fact,
 3
      Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order filed
 4
     March 19, 2019, as well as Exhibits 21 through 29.
5
                OP filed testimony on the Petitioner's
 6
     Motion to Amend, and the Petitioner filed its second
7
      list of rebuttal witnesses in response to the OSC
      issued May 20, 2019, as well as its response to OP's
8
9
      and County's Position Statements of Position.
10
                On July 14, 2020, the Commission mailed the
11
      July 22-23 Notice of Agenda to the Parties and
12
      statewide, Oahu and Hawaii regular and email mailing
13
      lists.
                Let me go over or procedures for today.
14
15
                First working staff --
16
                MR. HAKODA: Chair, you're cutting out at
17
     the very start.
18
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yeah.
                                              Where did I
19
      get to?
20
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Staff, chair.
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:
                                       Thank you.
22
                Working with staff, some mentioned
23
     procedural matters for today.
24
                First working with staff, I will note any
25
     public written testimony received.
```

Second, I will call on any individuals for pre-registered to testify, and I will bring them into the ZOOM meeting.

Third, I will, after all registered testifiers have completed their testimony, I will call individuals from the general audience who may wish to testify in this matter.

For individuals from the general audience who wish to testify in this matter who are not pre-registered and are participating via phone, if you're participating via computer, use the raise-hand function. If you're participating via phone, dial star 6, toggle mute/unmute, and star 9 to raise your hand.

For all witnesses both registered and not registered, I will bring you into the meeting, swear you in, and you will have two minutes to testify.

And after your two minutes, you need to remain available for questioning by the parties and the Commission.

After the completion of public testimony, parties will be given the opportunity to admit their exhibits into the record.

After the admission of exhibits, the Petitioner will provide the Status Report. I will

1 then call on the County of Hawaii and OP to offer any 2 comments regarding the status report, and the 3 Petitioner will be allowed to respond to any comments 4 made by the County and Office of Planning. 5 From time to time I will call for short 6 breaks, approximately one every hour. 7 Are there any questions on our procedures for today, beginning with the Petitioner? 8 9 MS. GARSON: No questions. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County? 11 MS. MELLON-LACEY: No questions. Thank 12 you. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP? 14 MS. APUNA: No questions. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? Thank 16 you. 17 Either Mr. Derrickson or Mr. Hakoda, is 18 there written testimony on this? MR. HAKODA: Mr. Chair, Riley Hakoda. We 19 20 had no written testimony. We had Mr. Francis Oda and 21 Jeff Overton registered on behalf of Petitioner, and 22 other public witnesses are Martin Rediger and Robert 23 Rechtman. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. 25 Going in that order, I'm going to bring in

Mr. Oda -- Ms. Garson?

MS. GARSON: Mr. Chair, procedurally, Mr. Francis Oda and Jeff Overton were going to assist in the presentation of our status report, so I don't know if they registered incorrectly, but they were going to be assisting with the status report.

And Mr. Rediger was on standby should this matter proceed or you have any questions. He's also from the University of Nations and Paul Childers also, so they're within the University of Nations and they are physically on standby if you have any questions that we could not answer ourselves.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I had a little bit of audio problems here. What I understood you to say, all four names mentioned are people who are on standby for your presentation?

MS. GARSON: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So we can wait to call them in as testifiers, if you want to call them during your presentation.

Are there any other people who are attending this meeting as members of the public who wish to testify in this matter? If so, please use the raise-hand function and I will admit you in.

I am going to admit in Mr. Aaron Espereza.

When you come into the meeting, please enable your 1 2 audio and video. You need to unmute yourself and 3 turn on your video. 4 THE WITNESS: Can I speak? Can you hear me 5 now? 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That is better. I'm 7 going to swear you in. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're 8 9 about to give is the truth? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You have two minutes. 12 Please go ahead, beginning with stating your name and 13 address. 14 AARON ESPARZA 15 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 16 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 17 testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 19 THE WITNESS: For the record, my name is 20 Aaron Esparaza, speaking on my own behalf. I live in 21 73-4177 Malino Place, Kailua-Kona, speaking regarding 22 University of Nations. 23 Since 2017 I've worked in organizations 24 such as Catholic Charities, as well as for

25

(indecipherable) in Kona.

I'm versed with the foster care system, social workers, attorneys, children and resource caregivers.

Throughout my time at Catholic Charities

I've noticed a drastic increase in the improvements

of the university in their role (indecipherable).

The RCD that training have provided for have gone above and beyond helping foster children and their parents. And to me they've become some of the best foster parents here because they do not get conflict, no reports of abuse or harm, providing a way for bio parents to connect with the children.

When the university started keiki closet, we were very excited because CWS does not have a holding space for the Nation. The Catholic Charities have had very little space. So to have a dedicated site where RCDs and bio parents could come get supplies and advice is a big deal.

And one of my clients here at the Kohana stated that he was able to get a high chair for his kid. I believe that was extremely helpful.

During this pandemic I believe the university realized an important error. As the planes with grounded and their missionary kids did not have a country to go to, they though, well, maybe

we should do missions here and support the island (indecipherable) but then they realized they did not have many, if not any long-term projects or support (indecipherable). I think it's critical to know and share.

I know how many in the community either do not why it exists, or they're completely indifferent.

During the Corona Virus back in March and April, I was working with many organizations non-profits and government officials to come up with plans to identify needs to meet them.

One particular need was met. I was able to rally (indecipherable) and they rallied 80 volunteers from the University to help clean the entire -- (indecipherable) helping the janitorial staff, providing help on construction and playground.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Two minutes. Could you summarize your testimony?

THE WITNESS: My final thought, I can't speak to the construction plans. I hope they can address the three big crisis (indecipherable) but whatever it is at the finish line, I hope that instead of people from mainland, that there is an integration of community leaders talking to families, cut away from their families. Because they know this

is a blessing to them and the aina. 1 2 So the University continues to keep 3 checking their hearts, know the plan is not to be 4 taken for personal gain. We are stewards. Continue to love the people, provide for the widows and 5 6 orphans of the aina (indecipherable) -- thank you. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Before you sign off I'm going to ask if any of the parties have questions 8 9 for you, beginning with Ms. Garson 10 MS. GARSON: No questions, thank you. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County? 12 MS. MELLON-LACEY: No questions, thank you. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP? 14 MS. APUNA: No questions. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, any 16 questions? 17 MR. HAKODA: Chair, you are frozen. We left off --18 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I left off with 20 asking the Commissioners if there were any questions. 21 MR. HAKODA: Chair, this is Riley. I 22 believe none of the Commissioners have any questions 23 for you.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm back. Not sure

COMMISSIONER WONG: Because, Chair --

1 what happened. 2 COMMISSIONER WONG: None of the 3 Commissioners have questions, Chair. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. 5 Esparza, for your testimony. Thank you. 6 I am now going to admit Alapai Kauila. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is the 8 9 truth? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your 12 name and address for the record and proceed. 13 ALAPAI KAULIA 14 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 15 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 16 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 THE WITNESS: (Hawaiian spoken.) 19 My name is Alapai Kaulia, and I currently reside in the ahupuaa of the University of the 20 21 Nations. 22 MR. HAKODA: Chair, this is Riley. We need 23 the public witness to please slow down, and he's 24 breaking up, so please speak more slowly so that we 25 can be sure we're catching your testimony.

1 Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

My name is Alapai Kaulia. I currently reside in the Ahupua'a of Wa'awa'a. It's the same ahupua'a as the University of the Nations is proposing. I am here to testify on behalf of the Haleo Hawaiian language class that they hold on campus. I have been part of that class since 2013. I have also taken Palamanui, which is the college classes.

First I like to say I'm here on behalf of myself. Through taking the Hawaiian language class through University of Nations, I am currently a teacher and helping cover the shortage of teachers within the State of Hawaii because there is a shortage of Hawaiian language speakers.

I was offered \$3,000 in scholarship because I am native Hawaiian. Like I said, I've been teaching since 2014. I started class in 2013, and being able to gain the language from this class as well as Hawaiian lifestyles, I was offered a job by Department of Education and I have been working for them since 2014.

In 2017 I moved up to a science teacher, within the middle and high school of that class, and

I truly believe that the Haleo class has been supporting the community.

Since joining the class 2013 I have been able to network with others that have been part of the class since 2011 and able to join initiatives to get (indecipherable) -- in every home, helping the teacher shortage within the State of Hawaii.

I've also been able to become a site coordinator for after school programs through the language class, and I have deeper understanding of place. And this class has also given me the ability to provide future for our kanaka, our future Hawaiians that are out there using the knowledge of our kupuna. So I fully support University of Nations.

Prior to becoming a Hawaiian language student of theirs, about 24 years ago I was able to get impacted by them in a low income housing where they were able to come and provide food as well as spending time with us.

So I really support what they're doing.

And I'm not speaking on behalf of the school, but I know there are a total of nine people that came to our school, two are volunteers which were there before me, so I can say that this program has made a

big impact on our community within the Island of 1 2 Hawaii. Mahalo. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo for your 4 testimony. Questions for the testifier, beginning 5 with Petitioner? 6 CROSS EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. GARSON: 8 Kathy Garson, attorney for the Petitioner. 9 Just one question. 10 So when you went through the program, did 11 you have to pay tuition for the language program? 12 I did not. Α 13 So that was the scholarship that I was 14 provided, total of seven classes. I was provided 15 \$3,000 in scholarship myself. I also had family members, so my family has been personally impacted 16 17 with at least \$7,000 of scholarship into the Hawaiian 18 language program. 19 And I believe it's for the native 20 Hawaiians, because when you go to the college, 21 they're teaching in the academic style, and that's 22 totally different. I learned more in the lifecycle. 23 Q Thank you very much. 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair? Chair, are you

there? 1 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I am still here. 3 COMMISSIONER WONG: Petitioner just 4 finished their questioning of the witness. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I was able to hear 6 all of that, but I'm not sure what's happening here. 7 County? MS. MELLON-LACEY: No questions, thank you. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP? 10 MS. APUNA: No questions. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 11 12 Commissioner Okuda. 13 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Chair, for the benefit 14 of the court reporter, could the person who has been speaking for the County identify themselves? Thank 15 16 you. 17 MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diana 18 Mellon-Lacey speaking for County of Hawaii. 19 The County of Hawaii has no questions for 20 this testifier. Thank you. 21 COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, I thought you 22 froze again. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm not at the 24 moment. Are there any further questions for Alapai? 25 If not, mahalo for your testimony.

1 THE WITNESS: Mahalo. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any other 3 members of the public wishing to testify on this 4 matter? If so, use the raise-hand function. 5 I'm going to bring in Wilfred Murakami, 6 followed by Rollin Rabara. 7 Mr. Murakami, if you would enable your audio and video. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Can you hear me? Good 10 morning. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 12 affirm the testimony you're about to give is the 13 truth? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: State your name and 16 address for the record and proceed. 17 WILFRED MURAKAMI Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 18 19 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 20 testified as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 THE WITNESS: Wilfred Murakami, reside at 23 81-979 South Kapili Loop in Kealakekua. 24 I am -- you want me to wait for you to give 25 meet okay to testify?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: So I was a State principal at Kealakehe High School until June of 2018, and I was a principal since the school opened.

In addition to that, you know, I served about 48 years active service in the Kealakehe community. And so I have a long history of working with public education.

As principal of the high school, I was able to have the opportunity to work with University of Nations, and enlist their help in helping the school in general in a number of projects, whether it be serving, helping the community.

And a part of that that is very close to my heart was helping the English learners in our school and in the community, and people, the volunteers as well as the coordinators, Chris Richards, who I primarily worked with a lot was instrumental in helping us to provide the manpower needed to tutoring, to build relationships, to help supervise the campus, to help provide transportation in certain instances, to provide access to their facilities so that our kids could get to see construction that was going on there, and the development of some of their high tech facility.

Before I left, we had made some plans to be involved in video technology and trying to do a partnership between the school and the University of Nations to use their recording and televising facilities.

I found that the people really do -- who came to the school -- really love our community and they want to be invested in the development of the children, especially that's the aspect that I dealt with.

And one program, which is teaching second language learners English, they volunteered several of their community members to come in and actually be trained as tutors with no compensation. They would meet with us. They would get trained, and then they worked with a group of students for about two or three months after we went through the training.

So the short of it is that they have been active participants in our community. They have not been a community that comes by for their own -- well, I guess it's their own ends, because they use to empower the community.

And I have seen action on their part, and as I said before, I've been serving as a teacher administrator for 48 years in Kona primarily in the

Kealakehe area, and I have never seen such 1 2 longstanding quality volunteerism. We have help 3 from --4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can I ask you to 5 summarize, please, Mr. Murakami? 6 THE WITNESS: We have had help from other 7 organizations, University of Nations, their 8 volunteers have been very, very consistent in 9 providing a willingness to help our kids. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 11 Questions for the witness, starting with 12 the Petitioner? 13 MS. GARSON: No questions. Thank you, Mr. 14 Murakami. 15 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County? 17 MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diane 18 Mellon-Lacey for the County. Thank you. We have no 19 questions. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for 21 identifying yourself, County. OP? 22 MS. APUNA: No questions. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 24 Commissioner Okuda. 25 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I just wanted to say

1 thank you to you and the public school teachers. 2 think historically in this community it's been an 3 education and have given opportunities to people in the community. So thank you again to you and local 4 5 educators. 6 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything else --Commissioner Cabral. 8 9 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Hello, this is Nancy. 10 THE WITNESS: Hi. 11 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I wanted to also thank you as Commissioner Okuda stole my thunder, but I 12 13 wanted to thank Mr. Murakami also for being willing to serve our students, and the other testifiers. 14 15 Also I was really glad to hear from people 16 in the community that University of Nations has been 17 and is involved with our Big Island community in the 18 Kona area and helping to serve our general public. 19 So I appreciate their on-the-ground report, 20 otherwise it's just paperwork, lawyers that we get to 21 hear from, so I appreciate the public coming forward. 22 Thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 24 Commissioner Cabral.

Anything else?

1 Thank you Mr. Murakami for your testimony. 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you for taking the 3 time. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Oh, Commissioner 4 5 Ohigashi, excuse me. Commissioner Ohigashi. 6 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to 7 commend you, especially since it appears you're on the side of the road parked in your car. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. 10 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to make a comment that I think that one of the benefits 11 of the ZOOM technology is to permit this kind of 12 13 testimony. Thanks a lot. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: My internet connection is displaying the downsides of the 15 16 testimony, but your testimony is displaying the 17 upside. Thank you for your testimony. I'm going to demote you back into the audience. 18 19 I'm going to bring in Rollin Rabara. Could 20 you enable your audio and video? THE WITNESS: Can you hear me, Chair? 21 22 Chairman, can you hear me? 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, I could hear 24 you. I can hear. 25 THE WITNESS: Okay. Aloha, my name is

Rollin Rabara, born and raised --1 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I need to swear you 3 in. Actually, I'm going to first ask you, you're not 4 driving, right? 5 THE WITNESS: After I tell you what I did 6 for my lifetime, I got to guarantee you I'm not. 7 That's a good portion of my life. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 8 9 affirm the testimony you're about to give is the 10 truth? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Now, please proceed. 13 ROLLIN RABARA 14 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 15 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined an testified as follows: 16 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 THE WITNESS: Good morning, Rollin Rabara, 19 R-a-b-a-r-a. I'm born and raised resident here in 20 Kona. I just retired from the Hawaii Police 21 Department after a short 29 years of service. 22 As I stated earlier, born and raised here,

As I stated earlier, born and raised here, so I'm very familiar with some of the good stuff obviously that University has done in our community.

As you already know, University of Nations has been

23

24

part of our to community for about 40 years now.

They've been involved in many, many different types of activities. A lot of it involved projects, various projects obviously straight out to our community. As well as too, I know when they first started rolling in as far as students and work staff, they actually (indecipherable) -- that's when we got to know a lot of the early leadership of the Catholics at that time.

As we move forward, and going to relate some of this to my work experience. When you talk about a University connected, and we talking about having the students there, you look at, you know, you compare it to some large university where you got problems that be might occur on those campuses. And I can testify basically from experience that we really never did actually get any calls to that campus from the law enforcement standpoint, I'm talking about.

In the meantime, we did grow a relationship where we could do training there. We did some active shooter training there at the campus. Sometimes it's kind of tough to do it on high school campus, but they were nice enough to actually have us do several trainings there and involved the students as well

too.

And that prepared us obviously in the -- hopefully -- that something like that would happen in our state.

know that they have been a part of our community for a long time. We haven't, again from the law enforcement standpoint, we haven't had to deal with much of anything at that campus outside of a few minor things. But nonetheless, they have showed that they're good neighbors obviously to everybody here in Kona, including our first responders as well too. So I can have nothing but aloha for the campus, for all the people involved as well too.

And I could see that their vision obviously to expand the campus and take on another 60 acres, high school and all the things they actually doing can only be positive in this community. And right about now I would imagine that we need a lot more (frozen screen).

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your testimony.

Ms. Garson?

MS. GARSON: Thank you, Mr. Rabara. No questions.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County. 2 MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diana 3 Mellon-Lacey, County of Hawaii. We have no 4 questions. Thank you, Mr. Rabara. 5 MS. APUNA: No questions. Thank you. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 7 Commissioner Okuda. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 8 9 Thank you, Mr. Rabara, for your testimony. 10 It might have been my internet connection, 11 but I kind of lost the last part of your sentence or 12 your testimony. 13 Can you repeat that -- give us the final 14 part you were saying? 15 THE WITNESS: Pretty much just reiterating 16 the fact that U of N has obviously been a good 17 neighbor to all of our people here in Kona, both from 18 a business standpoint and first responder standpoint, 19 which I was a part of obviously, and just in general. 20 I mean they have -- I was mentioning 21 earlier, call for service, that campus there really, 22 you know, testify to the fact that we had no calls 23 there. And when you're dealing with a university of 24 young adults, obviously there's going to be a

tendency -- you can look at Manoa campus as well as

UH campuses abroad, you know, you see stuff that will happen on those campuses. We did get calls there for service, but they were very minor in nature. Nothing real serious.

But most of all it's opening doors to allow us to do training on the campus, became very important too for us moving forward.

been my internet connection, but at very beginning of your testimony you identified who you had retired from -- I don't want to assume. I think I can figure out the context, but can you state, just so that it's clear on the record, who or what organization you retired from after all those years of service?

THE WITNESS: (Frozen screen.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: He may be frozen.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm sorry, your response broke up again. Can you repeat what you just said, please?

THE WITNESS: Retired from the Hawaii

Police Department, and actually assigned to the Kona

District, patrolling sergeant.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much for your testimony, and thank you very much for your service to the community.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much for your testimony.

THE WITNESS: Appreciate it, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any other members wishing to testify on this matter? If so, please use the raise-hand function. Seeing none.

One moment.

I would like to begin with the status report on the docket, but what I would like to do is to note that while now for the last few minutes my internet connection seems be stable (frozen screen).

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair --

MR. HAKODA: Chair, this is Riley. The moment you said you were not having problems, we started to have problems with your transmission.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think the judicial term is bachi. So what I would like to suggest, hopefully this will not freeze, for the safety of my LUC colleagues and staff downtown, I would like to remain at home if possible, but if this continues much, I will declare a recess for about a half our hour and head down to the office. But with that, can we start with your status report?

MS. GARSON: Yes. Good morning, Chair and members of the Commission.

Again, Kathy Garson for the University of Nations Kona. Francis Oda from G70, and Jeff Overton from G70 are also going to assist in the status report, but if I could just kind of tell you where we are going to go with this, that would be great.

As you know -- thank you for allowing the University the time to file their Motion to Amend, which as you mentioned filed on March 23rd, and at the same time we also withdrew the 2006 Motion to Amend so that the record was clear and you would only have one Motion to Amend pending.

I want you to know that the University didn't stop work upon filing the Motion to Amend, they actually continued on. And there was a conceptual infrastructure master plan that was filed as a supplement later on in June, and so we'll talk about that.

OP and the County support the motion showing that there's a viable project moving forward. And what we are going to discuss in a few minutes, since we last appeared in front of you in January, there were a few modifications to the project, so we wanted to point this out.

We took into account some of the things that the Commissioners said to us, made some modifications to the project, so we do want to go over that.

Mr. Oda will first present to you. There was a question about how the sense of place was going to be incorporated into the design, and so he's going to discuss that with you.

I think he can also, if he's willing, speak a little bit about volunteerism at the University of Nations because he is involved.

Then we're going to have Mr. Overton discuss the changes that have been made, and also give you an update on basically the Chapter 343 implications moving forward.

So if we can allow Mr. Oda in, and if you can also let Mr. Overton in at the same time, I believe Mr. Overton was going to share his screen for Mr. Oda to speak, if that was possible.

About how long do you envision your presentation?

MS. GARSON: I think Mr. Oda will be about ten minutes, and Mr. Overton perhaps 20, so I'm thinking a half hour. Please don't hold me to that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's possible.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: (Frozen screen). So

1	I don't know if that was my side or your side.
2	MS. GARSON: I'm thinking ten minutes for
3	Mr. Oda, just for his presentation, not including any
4	questions.
5	I think Mr. Overton probably about a half
6	our or less, without any questions.
7	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Well, let's start
8	with Mr. Oda. I'm going to move both Mr. Oda and Mr.
9	Overton into our meeting.
10	I'm going to swear both of them in so they
11	can talk freely.
12	Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're
13	about to give is the truth?
14	MR. ODA: I do.
15	Mr. Overton: I do.
16	FRANCIS ODA
17	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
18	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
19	and testified as follows:
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	JEFF OVERTON
22	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
23	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
24	and testified as follows:
25	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Overton, you have

1 the ability to share screen.

MS. GARSON: I'm sorry, I thought I lost everything, but he's sharing his screen.

BY MS. GARSON:

Q Mr. Oda, can you please introduce yourself to everyone, give a little bit of your background?

And I kind of prompted the Commission that you were going to talk about the design and the sense of place that was incorporated, then also about your experience and involvement with the University of Nations.

A Okay, thank you.

Aloha, Mr. Chair, and members of the Commission.

So I want to talk to you today to give you a little bit of my background. You already have my resume and all that, but I was asked by Katherine to share a little bit more background especially in regard to my education.

I got my architecture degree from Cornell,
my Doctor of Arts from University of Hawaii. I'm a
member of AICP, that's the planning organization.

I'm also pastor of a church here in Honolulu that's
located in Chinatown that ministers largely to people
who are usually homeless, out of prison, and sort of

out of dysfunctional habits such as alcohol, drugs, things like that.

In the late 1990s I worked extensively with George Kanahele, who I think many of you know or knew. George and I worked towards defining a kind of Hawaiian sense of place as we understood it at that time. And we made many talks, gave many talks around Honolulu, talks about this subject, and even went as far as New Zealand together requested by the East-West Center to talk about how this might apply to Maori land and Maori culture.

And then, again, in the late '90s, when the convention center competition came up, Momi Cazimero and I were asked by the State to define Hawaiian sense of place. That was the first time that that term had actually be been used officially in any kind of State document, and that was a requirement for the competition for the convention center.

George was on the one of the teams, in fact, the team that ultimately won the competition. So Momi and I had a series of talks that we gave to not only contestants, but also the larger community about what Hawaiian sense of place was. That was a new term, a phrase very commonly used, of course.

Well, in general things have developed much

further than that, but I just wanted to share with you how this might apply to this project, how this does apply to this project.

And what we wanted to do is give these students, who come from all over the world, a setting that, while modern, would reflect a sense of Hawaiian space and culture.

And, as you know, this land was extensively disturbed by agriculture, and right now it's covered with kiawe and a lot of brush, but it does retain certain archaeological features that contribute a lot to the meaning of the place and especially the Kuakini wall. What we did was what we do for all our projects, we first identify the people. And all of us know what the piko na'au is. It's related to enable the source of energy, light. And we always locate first the piko na'au. And I'm going to show this to you.

Jeff, could we have that screen?

Could you put the palm over the area of the piko na'au, which is there in the center. There is also, as probably many of you already know, so many people, there is also piko po'o, which is the location and source of the ancestral knowledge, spiritual knowledge, and all of that. And that's the

chapel here where you see the palm.

And the piko mai, which in general relates to the future, future generations represented by the genitals. And the lower school, the high school, that we define as the piko mai, the younger people, the next generation.

What we did after that, what we always do, then we put facilities that really relate to these concepts of the people around what we sense are the locations of these people, for example, the piko mai, we have things like student resource center.

Of course, we have a large gathering place here (indicating), we have a cafe. We have instructional facilities. And what this does is give a sense of real place to the center of this extension of the campus.

The piko po'o, the chapel. The chapel reflects the knowledge, the spirituality of the place and at the same time the school down below was developed around what we consider to be the piko mai.

What we did in terms of connecting these up, and I see that what I'm going to do right now is go to -- ask you, Jeff, to go to the rendering.

This gives you a sense of the area of the piko na'au as well as the piko po'o, and this is --

will be the center, centering place. It includes the resource center, the cafe, and classrooms as well as the chapel.

There was a historic trail bisecting this, and what we've done is connect these piko with a path, and you can see it here. This path we sort of wanted to make it like a dry streambed, water, as you all know, is very valuable there, so we only have water at certain key locations. I think you can see a little water here. No, up mauka, yeah, right around here (indicating).

Well, you know, at the chapel there also is a major water feature, but the idea here is water, increase volume. The relation with the dry streambed being defined by rocks and pebbles, as well as dryland vegetation, ground cover, and it connects these piko in a continuous way and, of course, there are paths elsewhere, but this is the major spine of the campus.

We now go back -- well, why don't you stay here and come out a little bit in this drawing, a little bit more. You can see here on the corners three of four major archaeological sites. We've tried to honor them and actually at the beginning they had this idea of integrating them more into the

function of the campus. But then we realized that three of the four had iwi. So what we decided to do was honor them by certainly preserving them, putting a wall around them, 20-foot setbacks and all of that, but not really physically involve them. Here you see little indication of concept of palipili (phonetic).

Jeff, can you point that out, that relates to the cafe area, and there are all kinds of activities that go on the campus that are demonstration of cultural parts of Hawaii, and we think this could be one of the centers of them, but they will be distributed throughout the campus.

We also envision that there will be imprints of Hawaiian art and graphics throughout the campus that will give it a stamp of being here in Hawaii, and not somewhere else.

Putting in walls will be restored as you see in the application.

Now, the landscaping is going to be largely native dryland species, so we're going to limit the grass, but we are going to have a few areas of grass which, as you know, require a lot more irrigation, but what we want to do is do it sustainably. So we will recycle groundwater to irrigate the landscaping.

Now, the buildings are going to follow what

I call the ranch style of kama'aina art structure, which is sort of the signature style of Kailua-Kona. So the buildings will be largely wooden, which as you know, renewable material with metal roofs. This whole complex will be very sustainable. It's going to be naturally ventilated. There will be PV on the roofs. There will be water saving devices.

As I mentioned, recycling of groundwater, and improved storm water system. And the buildings are going to be built into the slope in that they won't be more than two stories above the upslope elevation, more or less the mauka elevation. That's to preserve mauka-makai use from any properties at higher elevations.

So in general, the campus we hope will reflect its place in Hawaii, and it's going to serve the needs of this international student body. We want them in their time here in Hawaii to really sense more of the culture, more and more of the culture, and really be able to be responsible for extending the culture here on this campus.

Katherine asked me to talk about
volunteerism. The history, and YWAM -- and I have
been familiar with YWAM for 30 or 40 years. I
work -- I am chair of a local board called TOW,

transform our world, and YWAM and University of

Nations are very much -- we work together on things.

And I have been just always super impressed by their commitment, the commitment of the people that they train, and the volunteers that they have.

The volunteers are from all levels, but there are many that are volunteers that have phenomenally successful careers in engineering, business, whatever it might be. And on this project I'm actually one of those volunteers.

It is something we give not just to them, but to the community, and to this global enterprise, because the focus of YWAM is really to serve nations -- well, always, the most needy in nations, and so I think volunteers are motivated by that, and they give sometimes years of their lives to helping YWAM.

So thank you very much. Mahalo for listening to me and happy to take questions at the appropriate time.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Oda.

Ms. Garson, is the witness available for questions from the County, the OP and the Commission?

MS. GARSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Maybe, Mr. Overton,

- 1 if you want to stop screen sharing for a moment.
 2 Thank you.
- 3 Questions from the County for the witness.
- 4 MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diane
- Mellon-Lacey from the County. We have no questions at this time. Thank you.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
- 8 Ms. Apuna?
- 9 MS. APUNA: No questions. Thank you.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
- 11 Commissioner Chang.
- 12 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Chair.
- 13 Thank you, so much, Mr. Oda.

much. I appreciated that.

18

23

project.

- As a native Hawaiian I greatly appreciated
 the thoughtful presentation, and especially the great
 sensitivity that you and your team with the
 University put into this design. Thank you very
- I know we talk about the three pikos, but
 not everybody truly integrates that into activity.
 So again, I appreciated your presentation and
 specifically how that's being integrated into this
- I just wanted to ask with respect to the consultation process, maybe you'll have others who

are going to talk about this, so if you're not the appropriate person, but I understand that there's been iwi on some of these archeological sites. So how are those families engaged in your process, if they are?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm not the one to address that, so you might ask that question of Jeff. That has been considered, of course.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And so the other question maybe that you can answer is, a lot of the nations, their financial plan is based upon volunteerism, and a lot of it dealt with actually very skilled expertise like yourself.

So is this the level of volunteerism where skills that would otherwise you would have to pay for consultants, there are volunteers who are willing to do it at no cost, but to support the University of Nations.

THE WITNESS: Yes, my experience I've met a number of these volunteers and it kind of blows my mind, these are people extremely successful.

Probably one of the reasons they can volunteer because they have been so successful. They literally leave where they are. Many are retirees, and come and live on the campus to help. And that's usually

coupled -- and they become a huge resource not only in the area of their expertise, but their maturity as successful people, as models to these young people who a lot of them have just gotten out of high school and some of them have talked -- I know I have lectured to a number of the foster system.

These people are so young. And to a certain extent they have dedicated, but kind of -- but they are -- and I think these volunteers really have something you cannot find. You cannot find this kind of wisdom, this kind of talent that they have.

Most feel even if they had a lot of money, couldn't even afford to hire them.

Some of these have come with various technology, and so not only University of Nation, it's like cutting edge of a lot of technical development there.

And I think a lot of what we see here which arguably might be in the adjacent parcel, so arguably \$100 million or so of development. Started off four years ago or so, piece of land very similar to the one we have right now. And I think they developed that largely in the same way that they are projecting to develop this.

So I think they have a tract record that

they can rely on as they move forward. And, in fact, if anything, as you well know, you kind of develop momentum as you go along.

When you haven't really started yet, it's hard to get people to jump in, but at this point they're at a critical mass, so I believe they can do that area.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So in other words, when you can quantify the volunteerism into a monetary value that is -- I'm trying see that part of their financial plan is based upon this volunteerism.

I mean, you've done enough development in Hawaii, the quantification of that volunteerism does equate to real dollars towards their financial?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it does. And we actually interacted with them on that, questioned them. But they have past experience. And so I have to -- we had to see to that, and I think that their past experience is amazingly successful.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.

I really appreciated your testimony.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda has questions, but we have been going an hour and 15 minutes. I would like to take a ten-minute break which is necessary for various reasons.

1 It is 10:15. We will reconvene at 10:25.

2 (Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: 10:27. We are back in session. There was a question from Mr. Okuda for the witness.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Oda, I know you have not been offered as an expert witness. But for those of us who might not know your full background, can you tell us a little bit about it, like, for example, I notice you have a designation FAIA. I think that means Fellow of the American Institute of Architect.

Can you give us a little bit of your professional background besides planning background?

THE WITNESS: Sure. I am a Fellow of the American Institute of Architect, which as we all know, it's kind of this separate college that you get selected to as a practitioner. Maybe it's a function of (indecipherable) -- something like that. It's an honor to be there.

I have been a principal in G70, which is an architecture planning engineering design firm which is going to be about 50 year's old next year, and I was the president and I'm now its chair. And it has come before you many times, but we have a practice

here in Hawaii, Indonesia, throughout the Pacific,
Tahiti, Japan, quite extensive.

Aloha United Way, various other non-for-profit organizations, and I'm now the vice chair, make sure to take care of Hawaii's public radio. So I've tried to involve myself in professional work.

I've been, of course, president of the local American Institute of Architect Chapter in Hawaii, but that was many, many years ago.

I have taught at University of Hawaii, in fact, it was University of Hawaii that brought me back from California where I had a practice, 30 years old at that time, had a practice in Berkeley with my partner, Vice Chair of the School of Design there, and we were fortunate in winning many awards.

My wife and I wanted to come back and raise our family back here in Hawaii.

Is there any other aspect of my background?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: If you don't mind, if

you can try to speak more into your microphone, I'm

having a hard time hearing. It could be on my end.

You have also been the architect of many, for lack of a better term, significant or big projects in Hawaii, is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Over the years, I've been fortunate to work on all kinds of projects from urban planning project to, for example, the master plan of City of Kapolei, master plan of Ho'opili.

And so I've been involved in large urban plans, to things like university facilities, school facilities, hotels, for example, the two hotels on Lanai, used to be known as the Lodge at Koele and Manila Bay. I also designed the recently reopened Four Seasons.

The facility at Hanauma Bay, for example, that represents my feeling about architecture fitting into the environment. I thought there should be no building on it, just the mauna. We did it in such a way that it doesn't look like a building.

My doctorate, my dissertation for doctorate was architect versus culture. What I did was trace architecture not from an historic architect, but from the Hawaiian perception of geology, the land, and my belief as well has been that (indecipherable).

MR. HAKODA: Mr. Chair, this is Riley. Mr. Oda needs to speak up into his microphone. We are having trouble hearing.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, is this better?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's better.

We might -- with extreme respect for the

witness, we do have a very long and full agenda today.

THE WITNESS: So I'll conclude by saying just as you are keepers of the culture, I believe architects, planner, others in the professional roles should be keepers of the culture, also builders of the culture.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Based on your education, years of experience, do you have an opinion about the viability of the project that's being proposed here?

THE WITNESS: Yes, of course, the project is projected at over a number of years, but I have absolutely no question about the viability of the project. I am fully convinced that the project will be developed. How many years it might take is a question, but that it will be completed at some point I have no question.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much,
Mr. Oda, for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Oda, I was just wondering with regard to your present, I guess, conceptual plans, how does that -- is that different

from the 2003 plans that were on file?

THE WITNESS: In 2003 the idea was to involve the campus, but in a much less significant way, and also, you know, that there was a venue for tourism, which had to do with the campus program which they have to this day, which involves Hawaiian dance and music, they call it Island Breeze.

The proposal that we have now before you totally integrates the campus into it. So it's a matter of degree. And I believe that this total integration actually is a very good use of this land because it has developed it partially for housing. It involves housing right now, and as we proposed it, but for people directly related to the program.

So I think that that's positive.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The other question that I had is, how does your proposed conceptual plan differ from the proposal's made in the 2006 Motion to Amend, if you're able to answer that?

THE WITNESS: I am not able to answer that. I have seen that, but not having been involved in that, I cannot say.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Thank you for your testimony.

THE WITNESS: Sure, thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioners, are there further questions from the Commissioners?

Mr. Oda, if I may, I know that the Kuakini wall is being preserved and restored in this plan.

Could you speak at all to any consideration of its cultural or symbolic historic value and its relationship to the new plan?

THE WITNESS: Well, what we're doing is setting back from it. It does decline the separation between the schools and this research complex that part of an on-going program, but beyond that we went through maintenance and enhance the integrity of the wall, because we realize it's not just on our site, it's something that extends much further.

So outside of restoring it and honoring it by the setbacks and maintaining a nice, and of course, interpretive information regarding it, and that will be true of all the archaeological sites.

It's not consciously integrated. However, as you well know possibly better than me, the Kuakini wall was always a separate, always a dimension. And so that it is a division between now the schools, younger kids, and this research center.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

1	Is there anything further, Commissioners?
2	Thank you very much, Mr. Oda.
3	Mr. Overton was next, is that right, Ms.
4	Garson?
5	MS. GARSON: Mr. Overton was going to talk
6	to you about some changes in the master plan since he
7	last presented to you in January, and then the
8	completion of the report that's supporting the Motion
9	to Amend.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You want him to do
11	that now?
12	MS. GARSON: Yes. And I was a little bit
13	off in my time estimate previously, so I apologize.
14	So perhaps Mr. Overton can give you a better idea of
15	how long he might take.
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I will note that
17	January 2020 seems like about five years ago. We
18	were all off on our time estimates of how 2020 has
19	gone.
20	Mr. Orodenker, you're muted, if you want to
21	start.
22	JEFF OVERTON
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	THE WITNESS: Chair, good morning. Good
25	morning, members of the LUC. Jeff Overton, principal

planner with G70, and a pleasure to be present with Dr. Oda, also the University of Hawaii architect he failed to mention. It was his first position back here in Hawaii. So he has a long history with University, and with this project.

So today I'm going to provide and try to speak as quickly and clearly. I'll also go outside and jiggle the wires, because I share the same ahupua'a that Jonathan lives in. Hopefully that will help us connect through here.

Providing a presentation on the update of the master plan for University of Nations of Kona, following our last status update hearing in January, the Commission hinted to the Petitioner that these plans are quite ambitious. And that, you know, can you really do this as some of the comments have been made today.

And so at that time we came away from that hearing discussing that very question. And the University of Nations leadership went back. Worked with our architects and master planners to take a closer look at the plan and decided upon what were truly the necessary elements of the plan and where we could possibly consider trimming where necessary.

They reviewed this internally with

leadership, went back, sharpened their pencils, and I'm going to present to you some adjustments that we made to the plan that were part of the March filing and go through that.

So I'll share screen here as I continue. Hopefully you folks can see that.

So here is the January exhibit for the overall master plan. And I'll try to zoom in just for better use on your personal devices.

What we have shown here is removal of six dormitories in the plan where these red X's fall. We had a cluster of dormitories in this mauka position here, and a couple other locations where dormitories are being dropped out of the plan.

So six buildings have been removed from the overall dormitory program, as well we are eliminating two of the instructional buildings right here in this location here (indicating).

Now, we're able to do this basically by reviewing, carefully reviewing the program, matches up with reduction in the enrollment from what was 5,000 student count at the full development period down to 3,000 students in this program.

So the thinking has been dialed back a little bit, taking perspective here that in some ways

this will relieve the density on the project,
development requirement to the overall cost, and yet
still really service the projected program needs here
and furthering their mission.

So the revisions to remove the buildings actually results in the increase in open space on this property from what was, back in the January filing, to a total of 56 percent in the current one.

So with this removal I want to show you the next kind of generation of the plan here. You can see this is laid out nicely here. We've got much more spatial kind of ground here that allow the dormitories to layout properly in this location, freeze up some space in the instructional area, and as Francis described, piko na'au, and the area here, the center of the campus.

In March 2020 filing G70 also completed it's Environmental Planning Report to support the Motion to Amend. As was explained previously, the Environmental Planning Report includes updates to previous technical studies that were done for the Petition Area.

I described these briefly at our update hearing in January, and we promised that we'd share with you the summary findings from the Environmental

Planning Report, specifically the technical studies that were there.

So the studies that were conducted were natural resource study, a flora-fauna study, mobility analysis report, which really is a traffic study that was done and addresses the other modal transportation elements. Preliminary infrastructure assessment, a civil engineering (indecipherable) water supply analysis was done. Cultural Impact Assessment update with the Ka Pa'akai O Ka Aina analysis that was included here.

The archeology had largely been completed previously, and those studies as well as the SHPD correspondence were included in the Environmental Planning Report.

Then we also addressed project's conformance with the County General Plan and Draft General Plan update as well as the Kona Community Development Plan.

It's important for us to emphasize here that the Petition Area is -- previously in the State Agricultural District before it was reclassified over a decade ago, very poor agricultural conditions on this property. All the soils land study are Bureau rating E where it is very poor, among the lowest

levels of ag productivity. It doesn't mean some farming can't occur on here, because there's obviously some in the demonstration projects that are included on campus, but it's a very restricted agricultural capability here.

It's in an Urban area that's classified as medium density in the Urban and the General Plan as well as the Kona CDP.

So if we could, let me provide you with kind of a high level of the technical studies, I'll come back to the screen.

AECOS is the consultant that provided us with the flora-fauna study, and with the exception of the Hawaiian hawk, which you'll see circling the thermals overhead there. There's no plant or animal species that are protected status or proposed for protection under either federal or state, none of these were detected on the Petition Area. There's no federally delineated critical habitat for any of these species included here or close by to the Petition Area.

And the study made recommendations as to lighting with which Petitioner will comply with there, dealing with seabirds.

Now, the mobility assessment report, the

traffic study conducted by Ferren Piers basically for Phase I, there is going to be modest affects associated with the driveway of the existing campus, driveway and that refuge lane was recommended at that location.

This could be accomplished within the existing highway with restriping and some minor pavement modifications.

But in Phase II and III, with growth of traffic, ambient traffic on the highways as well as the campus population growing, the Petitioner will be -- have both King Ka'ahumanu and Kuakini Highway, we're aware of phase improvements that are programmed for both of those facilities.

And so it's a nice measure of the growth of the campus along with infrastructure improvements, the Petitioner could be required to contribute funding or collect selective improvements here, and that further consultation with both DOT and DPW will be required as being consulted with this going forward. It's many years out.

The intention was that Petitioner would make improvements on their own property such as right-of-way, right in-lane, right out-lane, which connects to the highway, and that's kind of a softer

way for the project to interface with the highway and not cause disruptions.

G70 civil engineering did the preliminary infrastructure report that's included in the Environmental Planning Report, and it indicated that a new water source would be needed ultimately for full build out of campus.

We identified three potential sources, working with Tom Nance, water resource engineering, and so that information is included in the report as well.

They connected with the County with regard to the wastewater facilities capacity and the DEM had indicated that they had capacity available at their Kealakehe Water Treatment Plant to accommodate the planned increase in demand generated by the campus improvements.

Finally, we have also provided updated cultural assessment and the Ka Pa'akai analysis, and these studies indicated although there may be over time significant and cultural resources on this property, the CIA did not identify any past or ongoing traditional or customary practices. And the reports made recommended archaeological and cultural cautionary monitoring measures as Dr. Oda pointed out

in the master plan.

We have set aside and protected with walls, the heiau structures, the different archaeological preserves on the property. And so those are indicated in the master plan as setback and walls and protection.

Dr. Rechtman is the archeologist ASM affiliate who can provide further details on that as necessary.

So with the supplemental filing that was made in June, civil engineers prepared a conceptual infrastructure master plan for the report.

The Petitioner was really looking forward to advancing the project towards a County rezoning application with the conclusion of the Motion to Amend, and so I'm going to show a couple of exhibits that relate to the infrastructure.

And, Chair, I've probably got about five, ten minutes left max here on this presentation.

Here is -- I'll zoom this back -- this is an existing infrastructure, and first phase site and utility plan that was included in the report. So this is an important exhibit, because I know one of the questions that came from the Commission is what are the initial phases of development in the Petition

Area, and some of this is explained in this graph that I'll walk us through.

Actually quite a lot of work that will be completed in Phase I infrastructure plan. We believe that with the existing campus infrastructure, the demands are modest and that we could use many of the existing utility connections to tie into.

One of the major elements in here is shown in blue. We kind of grade out what is the existing campus, but you can see this blue line that comes up through the center, and this is really the center spine road of the campus. It meanders along the boundary of the Petition Area here, and will form the connections, the driveway, access points for the first phase of development of the expansion area.

So you can see the parking area that is associated with the area that eventually will feed into the schools but service the existing campus parking demand.

Student resource center here (indicating) and access drive, there are two of the instructional buildings here, as well as two of the dormitories in Phase I, athletic practice field and gymnasium.

Further up, additional support facilities for parking, storage facility, industrial use up at

the top here.

And a couple of the points, the spine access road, which exists today is actually quite narrow and needs to be widened and improved as it comes in here.

We will have penetration where these driveways come in and feed, and then the utilities will be connecting up. We have waterlines that are expanding through the campus, and doing the extension here, so the water system is being expanded. The sewer system as well is connecting up and coming into connect with the existing sewer system on the existing campus side.

There is a road that follows the perimeter of the Petition Area shown in this red ribbon here and basically follows the whole southern property boundary adjoining at the adjacent community here.

There's also a wall that will be built along this boundary in here. And so the combination of the wall and this access roadway that becomes part of the overall transportation plan on campus will provide access for instruction, support for construction, staging of the various elements, as well as equipment and access, and then form an important fire break with the community from this

62-acre area that is very overgrown, not that we've had a fire hazard here, but we are always paying attention to that in our planning and in the community that we want to be cognizant of measures to protect against fire in these areas. So that will be a good benefit in here.

2.1

As we look ahead to the full build out, and now we've got all the campus facilities are shown in the -- call it the reduced scope development plan that I had described to you before, and this built-in phases, you can see all the pieces of it that are coming in, so we have the waterlines that run through, sewerlines that come through and connect all the roadway system and the facilities.

In this infrastructure analysis some new findings emerged for particularly the wastewater system plan, and it's been determined that a new sewer connection needs to be made with the existing sewerline that extends along Kuakini Highway.

So we have circled this area here that shows connection to the sewer system, the existing sewer connection down here at this part, but this would be a new connection here.

This in conjunction with possible lane widening here within the County system at the

entrance, new entrance to the Petition Area that would happen in Phase II and III. We began to talk about this as a potential for Chapter 343 Hawaii Revised Statute environmental law triggered because we are utilizing County and public lands is a trigger understand Chapter 343.

You know, where we were last January we believed -- this area is so urbanized with development on both sides and makai of the Petition Area and the robust utilities that exist within the existing campus area, we really believed that we would be able to work with the existing infrastructure connections without making improvements on County or State lands here.

After studying it in greater detail, feeling it's here at this point that very likely we're using State and County lands here. And that nature as Chapter 343 triggers will require compliance through the preparation of an EA or potentially even EIS.

So that is a new factor that we have to address in terms of planning and the pathway here forward. Again, an EA was not prepared as part of the project before. Everything was done with an environmental report that supplemented the prior

Petition and filing since then. The good thing is,
we do have all the existing technical studies in hand
now that address the resource areas and
infrastructure concerns.

And so it really is going to come down to us determining what level of document needs to be done here, and going through the process to get approval.

So we would like to request respectfully to the Commission here that we will come back with a motion for the LUC to be the approving agency that accepts the EIS under the HAR 11-200.1 be the accepting authority here for this EIS.

So Kathy wears the legal hat, she can speak more formally on that, but that's the conclusion of my summary update here, and I'm ready to answer questions. Thank you.

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

Are there questions for Mr. Overton from the County?

MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diane
Mellon-Lacey for County of Hawaii. County has no
questions at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP?

1 MS. APUNA: No questions. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 3 Commissioner Wong. COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair. 4 5 Mr. Overton, thank you for the 6 presentation. 7 The question I have is this is a status report. And I quess the Petitioner wanted to -- is 8 9 looking at doing other things to their project. 10 How long more would this be, you know, if 11 you have to go through an EIS project, you know, everything else, how much more time will you need? 12 13 THE WITNESS: So because we have the 14 technical studies in hand, we feel like we could move very quickly. An EA could take five to six months, 15 an EIS more like nine to ten months. 16 17 Again, because we need to come before you 18 for actions that relate to approval of the documents 19 and such, we would be subject to your availability 20 and calendar, but I would call that expedited 21 timetable knowing we have much information available 22 to us and we don't have to start from scratch. 23 COMMISSIONER WONG: It's just that, you 24 know, I guess the Commission did change the boundary

amendments, and from that time now it's almost like

25

nothing has been done. And to me -- or it appears, and so it looks like now we have to do other things before we even break ground, so it's just that how much longer? That's the question, how much longer, or then you going to say something happened, then we want to Order to Show Cause again. That's the question I'm having in my mind.

Can you say something about that?

THE WITNESS: Well, at least from our side, G70, we have been supporting as described in January and today, we have been supporting on the architecture and master planning side, reporting on the civil engineer side as well as the planning and environmental consultant side.

I would say we've been quite busy actually helping University of Nations Kona address all of these pieces.

And as mentioned earlier, we were loading up to go forward with the project district rezoning at County level, which takes us to a higher level of detail.

So what you're not seeing is the level of rigor that's gone into each of those major disciplines in the time since we saw you last in January. We have all this information, technical

study, so there's an actual team that's working on this. We talk every week. We have a team of say four that are working on it, and this group of five or six consultants plus the attorneys and the people at University of Nations.

So there is a whole team working away on this every week. It is not on hold or in limbo. We are progressing forward, and that's where we discovered this wrinkle that honestly I'm glad we are out in front of it.

If this needs to happen, and we do officially trigger, again, we want to consult with the proper agencies State and County to be sure there is a trigger here, and possibly exempt, but we want to have an abundance of caution and not get hung up on a 343 technicality or so.

That's why we want to bring this fully transparent, bring it right to the Commission and say, this is what we found, and looks like we have to stay on progress we've got to accomplish this other task.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So the question I have, this is just hypothetical, is it better to change back the land to Ag and then come back with everything set and, you know, hit it all at one time,

all these changes, EIS and everything, and go from there?

I mean, in your expertise in seeing all these other things that came in front of us, would it be faster to do it that way, then amending, amending and all this other thing?

THE WITNESS: Well, I'm going to let Kathy come out with a formal opinion on behalf of the owners here, the University, but you folks are very attuned on where we are at with the project now, and frankly, I don't see the sense in backing up and starting over.

I think if we can get all the pieces together here, we can move forward. This is just a compliance requirement as we move ahead, but that's just my opinion.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Just that I'm very concerned because we also had the issue about affordable housing in one of the conditions, and now we are kind of looking almost like throwing that out into never, never land. Just one of those things running through when I hear this. That's all I'm just trying to say.

THE WITNESS: Understood.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair.

- 1 Thank you, Mr. Overton.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
- 3 Commissioner Wong.
- 4 Commissioner Chang.
- 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Chair.
- 6 Thank you so much, Mr. Overton. I really appreciated
- 7 your update.
- 8 So this is sort of a followup with
- 9 Commissioner Wong's line of questioning.
- So there are -- currently there's a status
- 11 report. There's an Order to Show Cause, and there's
- 12 | a Motion to Amend, and now you're raising the
- potential issue of coming back to the Commission to
- 14 be the accepting agency for the EIS.
- So maybe Kathy or your attorney might be
- 16 | the best person to address this, but what I'm hearing
- 17 you say, because I actually quite appreciate the fact
- 18 that you have all done a lot more thoughtful work in
- 19 this new plan, and it seems to be supportive and very
- 20 | viable and much more reflective of this community and
- 21 what may be best.
- 22 And looking at the surrounding property it
- doesn't appear that going back to Ag may be the best
- 24 use of this property.
- So nonetheless, you're giving us this

update on the status report. And then there is an Order to Show Cause, but a Motion to Amend the original LUC, what we approved on the conditions.

So I just want to confirm that since we met the last time there's been no substantial use of the property, all of the work that you've been doing is primarily technical studies and recordings, but you've not really done anything on the property itself. Can you just confirm that?

THE WITNESS: Our focus has been working on these plans and studies. So I would need to check with University if there's been any further improvements to some of the initial development components within the Petition Area. I know that they have done work on the archaeological preservation pieces with the walls protecting, which is I think the right way to start, you want to make sure you're attacking those sensitive sources. So that work is progressing.

I know they are advancing towards getting that perimeter road cleared along that edge, and getting that started, but I don't know the exact extent of what they have done there. Those are two things that I'm aware of.

The water fees is also something that is

very actively being pursued to be sure that -- it takes awhile to get all the pieces together for our future water system.

So characterizing the different pieces, all of the major pieces are in our motion, but there's not a lot of yellow trucks out there from moving dirt.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I appreciate that maybe we will just ask your counsel to confirm that. I guess for me, my concern is there was an existing -- procedurally there was an Order to Show Cause, I just wanted to make sure that there's really been no activity since there was a Motion to Continue that pending the status report. So I just wanted to make sure that there was really good will amongst everybody. That nobody was doing anything to put the LUC in an awkward position with respect to no substantial use of the property.

And so am I understanding your position that you're going to confirm whether 343 is triggered, or you're going to do a 343?

THE WITNESS: At this point it would be -I would say a reconfirmation of the trust. I'm not
saying we are going to do a 343. I would not have
brought that up if we had not felt certain we have

got a trigger.

Again, as I said when I came before you before, we really thought we were going to be able to work with the infrastructure connection, but that's not the case.

Just a little side bar, a lot of people over the years, five, six, ten years ago 343 was being interpreted very literally. People with waterline or a line coming in for a single line resident, were triggering 343, the rules were intended to pick up those things.

In this case, you might call this a fairly minor act that triggers us to a position where we have got to evaluate all the new uses that are contemplated in the Petition Area. So it's a toe over the line, so to speak, but it is one we can't segment out, so it does force us to document it and go through the process.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: But I did notice the Office of Hawaiian Affairs also submitted some comments and also suggested the same thing, and in an abundance of caution, it may be better just to do the 343, because if you do the 343, all of these studies and updates that you've done will be much more elaborated in the EIS.

THE WITNESS: Correct. We feel they're 1 2 strong enough to go forward, but we will also check 3 back with each of those consultants to make sure we 4 need that. Good point. 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much. 6 You've answered my question. 7 THE WITNESS: Aloha. 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 9 Commissioner Chang. 10 Commissioner Ohigashi. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I tried to answer 11 my own question that I asked Mr. Oda, and I'm looking 12 13 at Exhibit 4 attached to your Motion to Amend, and 14 that would be the original -- I guess, the original 15 approval in 2003. Then I looked at Exhibit 5 and that would 16 17 be the 2006 request. 18 THE WITNESS: If you want me to, I can 19 screen share them if you would like me to pull them 20 up. 21 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: No, no need. 22 just wanted to clear the record, and Exhibit No. 2 23 attached to your motion is the proposal that you have 24 now, is that right?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to make sure that I understood.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I apologize, it could be confusing.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Comment and sort of question. Maybe you can answer it, answer it eventually. I'm not getting -- looking at the original approval in 2003 as being -- for that area, as being sort of like a residential attached to some kind of looks like commercial kind of venture in 2003.

Then it has like a water park, seems to be a water park.

Then in 2006, my conception is that turned into more of a campus-oriented plan, and that included stuff like stadium, football stadium, which football could mean soccer, I guess, football stadium. Looks like softball activities, and it looked like more of a campus in getting away from the commercial activity as well as the residential focus type of use.

And then now the Petition Area is being totally encompassed by the educational use.

Is my perception wrong or is that -THE WITNESS: Thank you for those comments.

When I walked through this with the Commission in January, that evolution of the plan as you characterize it, it was sort of a joint plan for the condominium component and the attraction essentially, which is kind of a revenue generator and attraction ballpark, so that really didn't meet the mission of the school, the University and their direction going forward, so that was, again, departed in the 2006 plan which we were not involved with, did very much to retool the plan to add towards a campus master plan and eliminate the condominium --

But as you might recall, the layout of that plan was not done by our firm. And it very much did not fit the lay of the land at all. The grading and earthwork and visibility of structures, the cultural context, both native and Kona cultural, it just really didn't work.

eliminate the attraction, the water park, so that was

a purposeful direction.

So when we overhauled the master plan,

Francis and his team spent quite a bit of time

working with the new layout that was presented here

earlier, that very much more reflects the working

with the land, designing with nature here in this

sort of sustainable approach to the campus, much less

1 | earthwork, and really just fit better.

So, Commissioner, I hope that addresses your question.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Well, yeah, it sort of does. But I was just trying to find out, did you determine that there's a 343 trigger with a plan that seems to be less intensive and requires less infrastructure use, why would the 2006 plan not create a trigger, if you know?

THE WITNESS: At that point, again, we were not involved with the action at that point. I don't know if they had done the level of detail that we had done in terms of infrastructure, master planning, so University of Nations engaged G70 civil engineer to really dig into the details to be sure that we could serve wastewater requirements, utilities and access, and that's when this was discovered just really in recent time here.

So I would say it's a new twist, and it doesn't help the timeline, doesn't help the cost, but it's where we are for future build of the Petitioner.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Thank you, Mr.

Overton. I appreciate your professionalism in this.

I do have a comment, Mr. Chair. I just thank God that we had them withdraw their motion,

- 2 2006 Motion to Amend, and that we're not dealing with that at this point in time.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
- 4 Commissioner Ohigashi. I agree.

- 5 Commissioners, further questions at this 6 time for Mr. Overton?
 - I have -- if I may then, I have a whole line of questions about this overall project, and how we get to the good end that we all want to get to.
 - One, this is almost like a planning theory question for Mr. Overton.
 - In terms of the theoretical layout of this 343 process, if you're doing and EIS, you're supposed to start, I believe, with the EISPN to ask all possible interested parties for the broad scope of what you're looking at.
 - So then you can direct your consultant to look and investigate these things that come up during the preparation of this process to guide the preparation of the document.
 - And so I'm trying to reconcile that with the statement that most of these studies that you've already done are sufficient for incorporation into the EIS. Can you walk me through that?
- THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So in summary form, you address what is the EIS Preparation Notice. That's assuming an EIS is warranted here. That still needs to be determined. It may be the best course of action, because this is a significant use here, even though we believe the impact's mitigated.

So the preparation notice is really a scoping phase of the document, as you have said, and so coming into it with a very say work fleshed out master plan here, as well as technical studies, we have the benefit of really understanding the land, and having worked through the technical solutions that address this property.

So there is a change to the law that happened in 2019, which obligates, under EFIS (sic) process, a public scoping meeting that happens during the publication of this EIS Preparation Notice.

So it's a doubling of a thorough process to vet the front end of a project to get all the input and guidance towards aspects of the environmental review that should be fleshed out.

As professionals, and you've seen the team of experts that are working on the project with us, we've had to actually ask those questions of our team as we've gone through the master plan process, and

the environmental report that supports the Motion to Amend.

And we'd like to feel that we have been thorough. We've been out there with our agency consultation as well as input from the community through the process. Not to say that there won't be more and greater rigor offered if we issue a prep notice or do the early consultation that is needed for an environmental assessment.

That will give an opportunity for additional comments and directions as you've indicated.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So if -- I'm going to try and rephrase some of your response in my understanding, and you can tell me if I understood you correctly or not.

Whether EA over EIS process, there was a commitment to undergoing the outreach whether EISPN and scoping meeting, or process under development of an EA, and that can, and will, as appropriate, change the work that you've already done towards that. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I think it will supplement it. Whether it will redirect it or just inform it to a greater level, that's what we hope.

We are always open to hearing from neighbors, and the community and government, the resource agencies that need to review specifics on historic, et cetera.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay.

And I'll just note very briefly, I think I have in previous hearings, I've read the assessment from Mr. Nance. I'll just state that his assertion that there can be no impacts from a water development from the so-called mid-level source are simply an assertion of his opinion.

But actually are contradictory to some peer-reviewed scientific research in the area. So one would hope that during the EA or EIS process that there would be greater analysis done than just the individual opinion of one person, no matter how professional they are.

THE WITNESS: Yes, we will have a report from him. One of the points that there is a new water source developed is that the share always relates to really going to benefit the County as well in terms of providing a third of that source to the public in this area as well. But we will need to meet the rigor of all the analysis, as you point out.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything else,

1 | Commissioners, at this time?

Ms. Garson, what did you have remaining?
We are at 11:24. We are going have to take a lunch at some point.

MS. GARSON: So as far as the status report, it was sort of a wrap-up that we were going to be coming back to you with a motion accepting for your approving agency within the next few months, and with that, that was basically what we had for you for a status report and then to respond to any questions that you had.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let's do, if the Commissioners are up for it, let's do comments from the County, comments from OP, and any questions of any of the parties from the Commission, starting the County.

MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diana
Mellon-Lacey for the County of Hawaii. We have no
questions or comments at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: OP comments on the status report?

MS. APUNA: Thank you. OP doesn't have any comments on the status report.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, questions? Commissioner Okuda.

1 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 2 I have a question first to the County, then 3 same question to the Office of Planning. The question, if the County can give us 4 5 their thoughts. What is the County's position on 6 whether we should keep active the Order to Show Cause 7 proceeding that we have right now; or whether given the testimony that's been given, whether or not the 8 9 continued Order to Show Cause proceeding is 10 necessary? Does the County have a position on that 11 question? 12 MS. MELLON-LACEY: This is Diana 13 Mellon-Lacey. Speaking for the County, we do not see 14 a reason to go forward with the Order to Show Cause. 15 I believe we stated that in our Position Statement as 16 well. 17 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And, Mr. Chair, if I 18 can ask the Office of Planning? 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Go ahead, please. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: If Ms. Apuna or 20 21 someone from Office of Planning can also give their 22 thoughts on that. 23 Do we need this Order to Show Cause 24 proceeding to continue on or not?

MS. APUNA: No. We believe that the OSC

should be dismissed. But I was going to speak to 1 2 that in the next agenda item as far as the motion to 3 have it -- but, yes -- I mean, no, OP believe that 4 the OSC should be (indecipherable) --5 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I apologize to 6 everyone if I jumped the gun on that. 7 Thank you, Mr. Chair, no further questions. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's okay. 8 9 Obviously this is just a status report. These are 10 the questions looming for us. 11 Commissioner Chang followed by Commissioner 12 Cabral. 13 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Garson, can you confirm that there has 14 been no substantial use of the property since our 15 16 last hearing? 17 MS. GARSON: There has -- yes, there has 18 been no ground disturbing activity on the property. 19 That was actually one of the stipulations as we move 20 forward that there not be. 21 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you. I just 22 wanted to confirm that. I don't want to prematurely address the 23

In your summary, you did not talk about the

24

next agenda item.

Order to Show Cause or Motion to Amend. You just talked about the Status Report, and the next time you would come back to the Commission would be to be the accepting authority for the EIS.

So you acknowledge there is a Motion, Order to Show Cause and a Motion to Amend that needs to be addressed.

Maybe I misunderstood your summary of the next step.

MS. GARSON: And the way I understand your process too is that Motion to Amend is filed, and we've also filed a Motion for you to be the accepting authority or approving agency, and that while that is going on, you hold the motion in abeyance. That is my understanding of the process that was going to be taking place.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you.

I'm not as learned as my fellow Commissioners, but
I'm looking at my notes from January and that -- and
I appreciate both Mr. Overton and Mr. Oda and their
information and the drawings, because it looks so

wonderful and sounds so great, but, you know me, I like my money.

I'm concerned because I don't yet see it, and maybe it's premature that you're going to be able to show where the funding is going to be coming from. Somewhere in my notes I show Phase I is going to be \$14 million dollar cost, and that would be certainly something that needs to be a piece of the puzzle at some point to moving forward. I'm concerned about that.

And clearly affordable housing, housing is my thing. So I think that those are both issues that somewhere down the road we need to make sure we address, because those are questions that are always looming in my brain.

I don't know if you have any answers now but we will need them if we keep moving.

MS. GARSON: On, the affordable housing issue, we have a whole -- we can present to you the financial plan. I mean it is as it was in January with a combination of bank loan, fund raising, donation and the volunteer labor. So that has stayed the same.

With respect to affordable housing, one of the attachments to Motion to Amend, was we met with

housing department, Office of Housing Community

Development, and OHCD confirmed that for the

University campus and dorms, they're not considered

residential use, so that they don't trigger an

affordable housing requirement.

So to that degree, and philosophically I'm sure it's because dorms are housing students, and that is affordable housing even though it's not really considered a residential use.

So the other issue, I think that Mr.

Ohigashi was bringing up was how this seems like a different -- completely different plan. But one thing I'll say is that the old -- that 2003 plan did contemplate students and staff living in some of the housing, so there is that similarity, in addition to educational component being the same for both -- there was a five-acre portion that was meant to be an educational facility there.

So the financial -- again, we have people on standby, they can do their presentation. I think you have heard it previously, affordable housing we do have confirmation that the revised plan would not trigger as long as there's not a need for zoning requirements.

Just before I forget. We have somebody

also on standby to talk to you about a project that the University of Nations has done called Kamaaina Hale. And what they have done is they have taken affordable housing facility and renovated, completely renovated it. They manage it. There were 68 units, I believe, that were totally uninhabitable and people came in and renovated it, and now it's at 98 percent occupancy.

Again, we have someone here who can probably more articulately and completely explain that to you. But even though -- so they've done those. They have provided affordable housing for the community in the interim. And that's to answer Mr. Ohigashi's question why all this time there has been that affordable housing.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much for addressing those concerns. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral, are you done?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'm done. Thank you very much, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other Commissioners?

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, thank you.

I guess the question will be for OP. I

need just a hypothetical.

In terms of, we got through the status report. We got information that they're planning to change their, I guess, what they're going to do or build on that site from the first iteration to now.

What is your feelings on, you know, amendment, amendment in terms of just starting from scratch?

MS. APUNA: I think that -- there might have been some missteps in the beginning as far as I think they asked for reversion, but they had some guidance since then, and they have gotten their ducks in a row, and they have a new plan.

As far as amendment after amendment, this has happened before just recently, whether it's Pulelehua or Ka'ono'ulu, you know, maybe they hadn't done the right thing in the beginning, but I think they have gotten their stuff together, and they have this Motion to Amend that's pending that what we have looked at, and we do believe that there is good cause to not revert and to allow them to present their Motion to Amend and work towards a successful project.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So I want to ask you the same question that the Chair just asked about the

1 public notice issue for the EIS.

2 What would your opinion of that be?

MS. APUNA: I mean, I think that the

4 Petitioner -- their witness kind of explained -- I

5 | think they have a lot of the information that would

6 go into the review document, and they would

7 supplement and do everything to make it, you know,

8 enough for environmental review.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As far as the notice, I think we are in a different stage of the project. We're not at the very beginning, but I don't think that there's any kind of violation or notice, you know. I don't think they're doing things in the wrong order, necessarily.

COMMISSIONER WONG: That is all for me.

Thank you, Chair. Thank you OP.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to clarify. I don't think I mentioned anything about housing. I think it was Arnold, you made the mistake of mixing me up with Arnold, but I don't think it's right. I think it was Arnold.

MS. GARSON: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER WONG: No problem. It was me,

25 Chair. And I am better looking than Commissioner

1 Ohigashi, but thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm willing to entertain a motion on that matter. We can put this to a vote, which one of you is better looking.

Anything further at this time, Commissioners?

Ms. Garson, I appreciate the update. I certainly appreciate a much better explanation of the design considerations of this new master plan, which really reflect its presence in Hawaii and its particular presence in this area of North Kona.

I certainly have appreciated over the course of these proceedings knowing more about University of the Nations, its mission. How it operates. It's certainly increased my knowledge of and respect for the Applicant.

But I have to say, and maybe I'm making some comments you can either respond to them now, or when we go onto the next agenda item after lunch, but I guess I disagree in my mind at this point with OP's contention that the withdrawal of the Motion to Remand was a misstep.

I never understood why that was not pursued and I thought the only possible reason that might have been given by a consultant to your client that

it shouldn't rescind and apply for a new thing, is that you would have to go through 343.

But now there is this admission that 343 is triggered anyway. This is a brand new project, totally different in so many respects than the original docket proposed and approved by the Land Use Commission, and that's not to say that what's proposed isn't worthy, that we don't want to see things going forward, or saying that this land isn't better suited in the Urban District.

through to ensure that public interest is protected.

And I continue to be confused by what the course of action that is being pursued, and I'm sort of reminded that some of the early pandemic watching

Season 2 of West Valley, these Canadians guys who take hold of the hotrod, they can fix them up again.

And every once in a while there's somebody that comes in, I was going to fix up this car with my daughter, but she died. Can you fix it up now. They bring it in, and they look at the car, say, you know what, the frame is trashed. No way I can take this car all the way through without costing you so much money, but you know what, let's start with a new frame and I'll restore your car. The guy said, okay, let's go with

it.

But instead we seem to be clinging to this old rusted out frame of a former approval that has almost nothing to do with what we want to drive home.

So you can respond to that now or respond in later proceedings, but that's what I'm struggling with. How do we all move together successfully and in a straight forward way that complies with the law.

So way is -- I don't hear anybody saying it's not a good end that you're trying to get.

MS. GARSON: And, again, so the 2003 plan had expansion of the University component on it.

That was a five-acre portion of the Petition Area that was going to be an educational facility. The focus whether it be for commercial purposes or otherwise, it was always for educational purposes.

I can go through the Findings of Facts and also, again, say that a portion of the condominiums that were supposed to be built were meant for staff and students similar to the dorms that are being built now.

You know, I think a Motion to Amend is appropriate like this, and you have done things like this in the past in other documents, I think Emmanuel Lutheran, there was campus type thing that was

basically took up the whole Petition Area, and then was reduced to half of that, and the rest of it was affordable housing. So it's almost the opposite of what we're asking you to do now.

There is precedence. This is a Motion to

Amend type of action that I think the Commission has

approved before. And we're also talking about

basically you're not flipping it to somebody else who

is trying to do a different project. Same ownership.

I would say (undecipherable) and that is what a

motion to amend is for.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Would a Motion to Amend allow for the phasing of the project under 205?

MS. GARSON: Would it involve --

might not be using the exact right phrase, but we have projects which have much longer than a decade time horizon. We have a process by which we allow phasing. Can a Motion to Amend accomplish that same end?

MS. GARSON: So whether incremental redistricting is something that comes up when you're dealing with district boundary amendment, not necessarily a motion to amend. So that's incremental redistrict. As far as phasing is concerned, there's

nothing preventing you from allowing the Petitioner to phase their project. And one the things we are trying to show you that Mr. Overton (indecipherable) was that Phase I infrastructure improvements are really substantial commencement of the property.

- So within the first ten years the infrastructure will be built to satisfy that requirement. And I think, again, that's something that you have been doing with other projects where the infrastructure is within the ten years, then you have approved those types of projects.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral.
- VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. I'm trying
 to come up with a motion, and I'm not a lawyer, you
 know, but --
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral, this is just a status report right now.
 - VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Right, but -- okay.

 Then I don't need to make a motion yet. Okay, then let's move on. Thank you.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there anything further at this time that you want to say, Ms.

 Garson?
- MS. GARSON: No. You know, the
 Petitioner -- I think you have seen from the time

coming before you until now just a tremendous amount of work that has been done to move forward, and there is momentum. And they are committed, and also committed to doing the right thing in this process for the community and, you know, we wanted to be up-front by even pointing out to you what we saw in the conceptual infrastructure master plan, and we want to continue to move forward.

It's a viable project. I think we've shown that to you in the Motion to Amend now. I don't think that there would be any skipping of steps in the process, as Mr. Overton said, we can update any studies to incorporate any of the comments or any kind of scoping or any public comments.

I feel like we're -- the University is basically ahead of square one. There's no reason to go back to square one at all.

This property is in the general plan, Kona Community Development Plan as Urban, it is in the Urban area. This Urban is the proper district classification. And so it doesn't really make sense to revert it and start all over again when we really have come this far.

The Petitioner has demonstrated to you how committed they are to the project. They've shown you

what a good project it is, and we just want to be 1 2 allowed to move forward. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Since I think there's nothing further, I'm 4 going to check in with our Executive Officer, but I 5 6 think it would be a good time to take a break for 7 lunch, perhaps reconvene at 12:45, and then we would take up the Order to Show Cause motion. 8 9 We have until 3:00 o'clock today, then we 10 loose Commissioner Giovanni, and we have one other Hawaii Island matter to address as well. 11 12 Is this acceptable? 13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Yes, Mr. Chair. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's 11:47. We will 15 reconvene at 12:45. Thank you very much. 16 (Noon recess taken.) 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's 12:48 P.M., we're out of recess. 18 19 The Commission will move on to the next 20 agenda item, Hearing and Action meeting on the Order 21 to Show Cause issued March 29, 2019. 22 A02-737 U of N Bencorp OSC: 23 A02-737 University of Nations Bencorp 24 (Hawaii). We are here to hear evidence, deliberate

and take action on the Order to Show Cause.

1 Let me briefly run over our procedure for
2 today.

First, it will be similar to our previous items. First, I'll recognize anybody from the public who wishes to provide testimony on this matter.

Then the Chair will allow for Petitioner's presentation on this matter.

We will allow comments from County of Hawaii and OP on the respective presentations.

Then after the presentations, the Commission will deliberate.

The record for this docket was updated earlier today. Will the parties please identify themselves for the record?

MS. GARSON: Good morning, Katherine Garson and Derek Simon for Petitioner University of Nations.

Also present Julie Anjo and Allen Anjo general counsel for University.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Good afternoon.

MS. MELLON-LACEY: Good afternoon. This is Diana Mellon-Lacey, Corporation Counsel for County Hawaii. Also present is Deputy Corporation Counsel John Mukai, and from the Planning Department Jeff Darrow and April Suprenant is present. Michael Yee may be joining us later.

```
1
                MS. APUNA: Deputy Attorney General Dawn
2
     Apuna on behalf of State Office of Planning, and with
 3
     me is Rodney Funakoshi and Lorene Maki.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Garson, you can
 4
5
     proceed with your presentation.
 6
                MS. GARSON: You want us to call our first
7
     witness?
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You may. Sorry, I
8
9
     went out of order of what I said was going to do. I
10
     apologize.
11
                Anybody who's in the audience as an
12
     attendee who wishes to provide public testimony in
13
      this matter prior to Ms. Garson's case? If so, raise
14
     your hand, using the raise-hand function.
                I'm not seeing anybody, Mr. Garson, we can
15
16
     now call -- oh, Mr. Roger Hamilton will be admitted.
17
      If you will enable your audio and video. Can we hear
18
     you?
19
                THE WITNESS: Are you able to hear me right
20
     now?
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's better, yes.
22
                Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're
23
     about to give is the truth?
24
                THE WITNESS: I do.
25
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
                                                        You
```

1 have two minutes.

2 ROGER HAMILTON

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Aloha, my name is Roger

Hamilton. I work for the Department of Education. I

oversee the English Language Learner Program at the

19 schools in West Hawaii.

This program serves students who speak

English as a second language. I've worked with the

University of the Nations as a community partner for
the past six years.

A few projects we have collaborated on during this time include the tutoring from the YWAM volunteers, Mr. Murakami spoke about that earlier. But they are in numerous (indecipherable) throughout West Hawaii, and they are a valuable asset as we do not have extra funding to provide the tutors to these kids.

We have also partnered -- recently our demographics have changed. We've had an influx of students from China and Vietnam, so we were not set up for translation service in the Cantonese, Mandarin

and Vietnamese, and they have helped us with the communication for the teachers, the parents and administration, so it's been a very valuable partnership.

And then the other big item that we have partnered on is the University of Nations, our West Hawaii multi-cultural speech festival on their campus. That's an event a lot of our students look forward to all year long. It's been held at University of Nations since 2015 and keeps growing bigger and bigger each year. Last year we had over 140 students from ten different schools participating.

Prior to that, we were in a windowless band room in Kealakehe High campus, so quite the upgrade for our students.

As soon as our students set foot on the University of the Nations campus, they immediately felt welcomed and valued. Banners are displayed welcoming the students in different languages. These festivals are opened by a representative of University of Nations.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Two minutes. If you could summarize, please.

THE WITNESS: Moving forward, we hope to

partner with the University of the Nations in 1 2 creating an outreach program to service our at-risk 3 students providing at the eight separate low income 4 housing communities throughout Kona. The University of the Nations is a valuable 5 6 asset to our keiki and our community. Without 7 reservation, I fully support the University of 8 Nations (indecipherable.) 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there questions 10 for the witness starting with the Petitioner, Ms. Garson? 11 12 MS. GARSON: No questions, thank you. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County? 14 MS. MELLON-LACEY: Diana Mellon-Lacey speaking for the County. Thank you, Mr. Hamilton, 15 16 for your testimony. We have no questions. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. OP? 18 MS. APUNA: No questions. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, any 20 questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Hamilton, for 21 your testimony today. We appreciate it. 22 Anybody else in the audience wishing to 23 testify on this matter? Otherwise we will proceed

Ms. Garson, you have a witness to call?

with Ms. Garson's presentation. Seeing none.

1	MS. GARSON: We're going to call Leina'ala
2	Fruean.
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I see her. I will
4	promote her to be a panelist. I'm going to step away
5	from my camera for one moment.
6	Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're
7	about to give is the truth?
8	THE WITNESS: I do.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Please
10	proceed, Ms. Garson.
11	LEINA'ALA FRUEAN
12	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
13	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
14	and testified as follows:
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	THE WITNESS: My name is Leina'ala Fruean.
17	I reside here in Kailua-Kona, Hawaii. Address is
18	73-4541 Kukui Street.
19	BY MS. GARSON:
20	Q Can you explain your connection to the
21	University of Nations Kona?
22	A My connection actually started in '86 as a
23	young girl, and I believe I was about eight years old
24	with my affiliations and did many of the different
25	vouth training courses. As a voung child went into

youth, did many of their mentorship programs, as well as serve the community in that capacity. And moved along and did many of their courses. And today I would say I have a masters degree in intercultural studies through University of Nations.

Q Do you have responsibilities with the University of Nations campus? I understand that you are the Director of Haleo Hawaiian language program?

A So my responsibilities first and foremost is Hawaiian cultural as well as advising and monitoring. And we have a program called the Haleo Hawaiian language class that was developed in 2009, and started this first course for the community. And that course started actually from the desire of a kupuna that presented the program to University of the Nations and her name is Kupuna Mary Boyd Kamahele. And she was one that proposed to University of Nations how University of Nations could allow Hawaiian language to be taught, but allow Hawaiian natives to learn their language for free, and how this program would assist with many natives who desire to learn the language.

And some of them might not want to go to university or school, but these are a course that they could use the language for free. And since 2011

we have been successfully running courses at
University of Nations. And many Hawaiians that have
come to the program and learned Hawaiian language,
and out of that, several of the teachers are in the
program that actually graduated, speak fluent now,
and also emergent language speakers.

So one of the schools (indecipherable) said their teachers who haven't spoken and are working on their teaching degree, they sent them over to us at University of Nation to learn through that program, because what they found was many of the students and people from the community that came was actually speaking faster, and it was successful to integrate this through their campus.

Q At some point did the University of Nations reach out to the University of Hawaii to talk about perpetuating the Hawaiian language by providing these distinct learning opportunities?

A I believe in 2002, May, I was one of them that actually went to University of Hilo in Ke'elikolani College and was learning Hawaiian at that time. And I reached out to Dr. Kalena Silva and asked how we could have Hawaiian language be taught at the University of the Nations and allow for University of Hawaii Hilo to provide distant learning

for those that were interested in the community. And what I found is many of the people in our community, the youngest was 14, and the oldest that would actually take the course that was provided would have been about 79 years old.

So at that time the university advised me to go ahead and find people in the community that had the AA degree, and when they get the AA degree, to come back and see what kind of programs they could offer in helping with distant learning --

Q So was.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may, at this time if -- I thought that we were not doing evidence today, but really presenting argument.

MS. GARSON: Sorry, that's why I asked should I call my first witness, and you said, yes, call your first witness. And so I'm calling my first witness. I misunderstood.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So what is the relevance of this witness towards the OSC proceedings in front of us?

MS. GARSON: Actually, it is about the establishment of the Waiaha, the Waiaha Community

Advisory Committee, which was the Ka Ohana Advisory

Committee. It's about reaching out to the university

regarding the College of Hawaiian Language. It goes
to the conditions in the 2003 amendment, 2003 D&O.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So, please -- when
you say you have witnesses, you have multiple

witnesses you were hoping to call today?

MS. GARSON: Yes. If we are in the OSC proceedings, then, yes, we do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are in the OSC proceeding. Please give me an outline of what you're planning to do, because if the intention is to call witnesses and present evidence, I'm not sure that we have the time scheduled today for what was anticipated to be primarily argument.

MS. GARSON: Okay. I apologize to Ms. Fruean for calling her then, because -- I'm sorry, I misunderstood, Chair. I thought you called the OSC and we were proceeding with the OSC.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are indeed on the Order to Show Cause.

MS. GARSON: Okay. And so we're presenting evidence on the Order to Show Cause, or you just want an opening statement?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What is the outline of what you were hoping to present today under your understanding?

1	MS. GARSON: We have Paul Childers
2	available. He's the COO. He's going to explain the
3	history of the United Nations, what they
4	University of Nations. He's going to explain what
5	has happened between 2003 and today.
6	We have our financial officer Martin
7	Rediger available to testify as to the financials up
8	to this point.
9	We have who else? We have Peter Harris
10	who can talk about the affordable housing project,
11	which is the Kamaaina Hale.
12	We have Jeff Overton again to talk about
13	what is in the Motion to Amend, and all the work that
14	has been done with the Motion to Amend to further
15	establish good cause not to be reverted.
16	Paul Rechtman to talk about the
17	archaeological work that has been done on the
18	property.
19	Or we would entertain
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: One moment. Mr.
21	Okuda, Commissioner Okuda.
22	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23	If it's appropriate, I would like to make a

Motion to Bifurcate these Proceedings. In other words, to deal first with the question whether or not

the Order to Show Cause proceeding should continue forward or not.

And if, No. 2, a decision is made to move forward with the Order to Show Cause proceeding, whether it would be then appropriate to schedule a time when there could be, you know, more fuller record presented. But that would be my either motion or suggestion. I leave up to you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Okuda.

Commissioner Wong.

commissioner Okuda's motion, I would like to move to executive session to talk to our legal counsel about the rights, responsibilities and issues of, you know, legal issues regarding this docket.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There is a motion in front of us to go into executive session. Is there a second?

VICE CHAIR ACZON: I will second.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commission Aczon -- a motion has been made by Commissioner Wong and seconded by Commissioner Aczon to move into executive session to consult with our attorney regarding this matter.

1 COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, when we move 2 into executive session, can we ask staff to work out 3 the details of how, you know, we go into executive session ZOOM room, or whatever we have to do. I 4 mean, do we do it like last time? 5 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So if the motion 7 before us succeeds, I would ask Mr. Orodenker to send a ZOOM meeting invitation to a separate ZOOM room. 8 All the Commissioners would exit this room, and then 9 10 follow the instructions to enter into a new ZOOM room 11 with our Deputy Attorney General Ms. Julie China. This meeting would continue in recess until 12 13 we are done with executive session. 14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just sent out an email link for that ZOOM. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there discussion 16 17 on the motion, Commissioners? If not, Mr. Orodenker, will you do a vote for those who have not 18 19 participated since we moved into ZOOM, so it's clear 20 what our votes are? Do a roll call vote on this, Mr. 21 Orodenker. 22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 23 Commissioner Wong? 24 COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye. 25 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Giovanni?

1	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye.
2	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
3	VICE CHAIR ACZON: Yes.
4	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Chang?
5	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Yes.
6	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Ohigashi?
7	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes.
8	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
9	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
10	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
11	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
12	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
14	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
15	the motion unanimously passes.
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: As I described
17	earlier, Commissioners will be leaving this room,
18	going into a different room for executive session.
19	This room will remain open and we will return to this
20	room.
21	(Executive session.)
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It is 1:47 P.M. We
23	are out of executive session.
24	Ms. Fruean, I know you are on the stand as
25	a witness right now, but I'm going to actually ask

you to step down and move you into the audience temporarily.

I'm going to first assess where we are in our proceeding.

Just for everybody's benefit, including the benefit of people who are listening in as attendees, based on the Commission's action on October 7 of 2019, the LUC issued Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order in this matter extending the Order to Show Cause proceedings. The Petitioner agreeing to not conduct any development activities that essentially might be construed as substantial commencement, agreeing that substantial commencement has not occurred.

They agreed to come before us within six months of that proceeding with a status report which they have done. And at that status conference, we asked for additional information which we have received today, substantial new information.

Because of the history, that is why we first heard the status conference, the OSC process will continue until this moment which brings us to where we are, if we were to continue, if we were to choose to continue as LUC with this OSC hearing, we would actually schedule this for evidentiary

procedures. We have been briefed by the County, OP 1 2 and the Petitioner on this matter. 3 So I just wanted to overview and assess where we are in our proceedings today. 4 Commissioner Okuda. 5 6 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 Based on the Chair's summary, which I agree on what the situation is, I withdraw the prior motion 8 9 I made or suggestion to bifurcate. I don't believe 10 it was seconded. 11 So I withdraw that, and instead I make a motion to dismiss the pending Order to Show Cause 12 13 without prejudice. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral, are you seconding? 15 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes. I would like to 16 17 second Commissioner Okuda's motion so elegantly put. 18 Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There's a Motion to Dismiss the OSC proceedings without prejudice. It's 20 been made by Commissioner Okuda and seconded by 21

Commissioner Cabral. We are in discussion. Do you wish to speak

22

23

24

25

to your motion, Mr. Okuda?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Mr. Chair, thank you.

I would like to say that we take orders to show cause very seriously. We take very seriously the conditions that are set forth in Land Use Commission orders, decisions and orders, that deal with boundary amendments.

We take very seriously the admonition of the Hawaii Supreme Court in a number of cases, which I believe in Bridge Aina Lea which makes clear that one of the functions of the Land Use Commission is to prevent people from simply getting boundary amendments, for example, Agriculture to Urban and then not carrying out their responsibilities, but instead speculating on the value of land which frankly does not help our community.

We take those admonitions, those duties very seriously.

We also take very seriously testimony that is given, especially when the testimony comes across from people who have commitments to the community, who come across as credible, and who have the background to give that testimony.

And I believe that we heard from Mr. Oda, from educators in the community, grounds to indicate that, given the present situation, at this point in time, an order to show cause may not be in the best

interest of land use or the community. And for those reasons, and other good reasons in the record, I have made this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Okuda. We are in discussion.

Commissioner Cabral?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I would speak to my second of that motion and agree with my fellow Commissioner Okuda; and further I would like to thank the Petitioner, the University of Nations as well as attorney Garson and the various experts and community people for coming forward, because it's clear as our Chair Scheuer just reiterated that we met with them earlier in this year, and we gave them clear instruction as to what we needed, and they've came forward. So I totally appreciate their willingness to participate in our duties.

So I second this motion, and I'll be voting $\mbox{in favor.} \mbox{ Thank you.}$

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners -Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, I'll be speaking in favor of this motion. I just do have some concerns of the status report, and hopefully the

staff can meet with the Petitioner on some of the issues that came up during the status report. And I don't know if we should direct the staff, or how we should do this, because I just had some concerns on those things.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you want to elaborate?

commissioner wong: You know, there were some issues regarding -- there's a possible 343 out there. The EIS issue, and a possible amendment issue. And, you know, how to do the process on dealing with this? What comes first? How do we get everything done properly so we don't have another Bridge Aina Lea case?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioners? Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I, like Commissioner Wong, do have some concern.

Quite frankly, I was very pleased with the presentation today, as it gave me greater reassurance that the University is committed to this new project.

However, there are some outstanding issues before us, Motion to Amend, the 343 question, and to avoid sort of a situation like today where witnesses

were brought, but we weren't prepared to proceed with them. And then closer coordination with perhaps amongst the parties themselves and then with LUC staff, that that would help to facilitate any future proceedings before us.

But I am inclined to vote in favor of this motion. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Giovanni.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Thank you, Chair.

So I'm the newest Commissioner on this

Commission and this case was very difficult for me to

understand with its long history. But I think the

Commission's notice to show cause has served a great

purpose to bring clarity and a path forward that I

think makes a lot more sense to me. And I'm going to

speak in favor of the motion, because I think it

served its purpose, and all parties can go forward

together with a lot less confusion and history.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to indicate that I believe that we are in our position today because of a failure over the years of

following these various projects. I am very pleased, and I give our staff tremendous credit that we are able to now bring these issues to light.

I am reluctant in supporting this motion because I believe that this is a totally new dba, unlike Petitioner's counsel has indicated, I was trying to calculate what the actual percentage of use, what you call that, educational purpose was originally, it was ten percent. That's what my figures come out, about ten percent, maybe 15, maybe 17. A large portion of it was as a money maker for the University so that they can rely on a dedicated source of income.

that this matter may fall within Chapter 343, and the fact that that disclosure is now on record, and whether or not a determination is made by the Petitioners to not go forward under 343, because they don't feel that it applies, it is on the record and will be subject to review. The determination will be subject to further review.

Given that fact, I think, and the scope of the -- I think that a motion to amend hearing will encompass almost all the issues that would be necessary in issuing an additional dba.

1 Therefore, reluctantly, I will support this 2 motion. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi. 4 Commissioners, is there anything further? 5 6 Commissioner Aczon. 7 VICE CHAIR ACZON: Mr. Chair, like Commissioner Ohigashi, I will be reluctantly 8 9 supporting this motion. I have a major concern about 10 this project. There is from 2003 up to a couple 11 years ago, nothing happened, and still I still have some real concerns on how this project is going to be 12 13 moving forward. 14 But maybe after this, in a motion the Petitioner can -- the foregoing proceedings can 15 16 convince me that I was wrong. So just to kind of get 17 this project moving along with the proceedings, I 18 would be reluctantly supporting this motion. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 20 Commissioner Aczon. 21 Commissioners, is there anything further? 22 The Chair, I really share in what I thought 23 was a very articulate expression by Commissioner

Ohigashi. I'm reluctant to support this motion, but

probably the best path forward at this time.

24

25

For me it's really necessary to note we're just living in unprecedented times right now, global pandemic, global economic depression, and incredible civil unrest. Personally for me, this is a time in which I try to retreat into the law to make our procedures and everything we do as clear and as by the book as possible, because it's sort of the bedrock that we have to turn to in uncertain times.

So I've heard great things about this new plan. I'm really counting on the Petitioner to follow through to do full disclosure, to take seriously the comments I and other Commissioners have made about impact, a meaningful analysis, so we can fulfill our duties given to us by the people of Hawaii to ensure that land use entitlements are done with the thought that not only advances the goals of the State, but protects the public trust resources (indecipherable).

The comfort I have in the motion is that it is without prejudice, so that should this not occur, I will have no problem going forward with another OSC motion, if there is not meaningful timely progress on this matter.

Anything further, Commissioners, on this motion? If not, Mr. Orodenker, please poll the

1	Commission.
2	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
3	The motion is to dismiss the pending Order to Show
4	Cause without prejudice.
5	Commissioner Okuda?
6	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
7	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
8	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
9	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
10	VICE CHAIR ACZON: Aye.
11	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Ohigashi?
12	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes.
13	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Chang?
14	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Yes.
15	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Giovanni?
16	COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Aye.
17	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
18	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
19	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
21	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Mr. Chair, the motion
22	passes unanimously.
23	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: As suggested by the
24	Commissioners in deliberation, Ms. Garson, I would
25	(indecipherable).

1 MS. GARSON: Thank you very much for your 2 time today. We really appreciate it. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's 2:03. We will do a five minute recess to 2:08 to allow the next 4 5 party to come in on DR20-69 and DR20-70, Rosehill, et 6 al. 7 (Recess taken.) CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Reconvening at 2:09, 8 9 and we have to finish our proceedings today at 3:00 10 o'clock. We'll see how far we get. VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I have a hurricane 11 heading towards me. 12 13 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: Chair, I'm 14 confirming I have a hard stop at 3:00 o'clock. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Got it. Thank you 16 very much. 17 (Recess.) DR20-69 DR20-70 18 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's 2:10 P.M. Our 20 next agenda item are the continued proceedings on the 21 consolidated Declaratory Orders, DR20-69 County of 22 Hawaii, and DR20-70 Rosehill et al. 23 Before we begin, I would like again take a 24 moment to explain what these proceedings are about 25 and how certain things have to be handled in order to ensure we are in compliance with Subchapters 5 and 14 of our rules, as well as all of the relevant statutory requirements with regard to public meetings.

First, I ask everyone to keep in mind that this is a request for a Declaratory Ruling. That means the Commission is being asked to interpret a statute, rule or document and not to make a determination on a factual dispute.

Mhile certain facts may be important to making an interpretation of law, in this type of proceeding the facts are not really in dispute. The Commission is taking the basic facts as undisputed. What we are here to decide is the very limited issues presented by the Petitioner County of Hawai'i and the Petitioners Rosehill, et al.

Therefore, this is not, nor can it be, a contested case hearing where evidence is presented, where witnesses are provided and allowed to be cross-examined. I would remind everyone of that.

Again, the facts are not in dispute. The application of law to accept facts is being heard today.

Next, I would like to impress upon everyone that under Subchapter 14 of our rules, the only true

parties to these proceedings are the declarants or Petitioners, the County of Hawai'i and Rosehill, et al.

Everyone else, including the Office of Planning, are in effect public witnesses. After the witness has completed their testimony, the County of Hawai'i, Rosehill, et al, and the Commissioners will be given the opportunity to ask questions.

Also, after all public witnesses have had a chance to speak, including OP, the representatives for County of Hawai'i and Rosehill, et al, will be given as much time as they reasonably need to complete their cases.

Let me just say, due to the late time and the hard stop at 3:00 o'clock, I expect that we will have to continue this proceeding yet again to August 12th.

Upon completion of all testimony, the Commission will ask questions and come to a decision.

Will the petitioning parties for Docket DR20-69 and DR20-70 please identify themselves for the record?

MR. MUKAI: Good afternoon, John Mukai,

Deputy Corporation Counsel on behalf of County of

Hawai'i. Also present is Diana Mellon-Lacey, Deputy

Corporation Counsel, also Planning Director Michael
Yee and April Suprenant, Deputy Director.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Mukai.

MR. CHIPCHASE: Good afternoon, Chair,
Commissioners, Cal Chipchase, and off camera is the
ever present Chris Goodin for the Rosehill
Petitioners.

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:} \quad \mbox{Let me update record}$ on this matter.

On June 25th, 2020, the Commission agreed with the Stipulation to Consolidate signed by the representatives of the Hawaii County and Rosehill, et al, and began proceedings to hear the argument of the Petitioners.

During the proceedings, additional information was requested for the Petitioners by the Commission.

Between June 26 until this morning, the Commission received the County of Hawaii's Supplemental Submission and Petitioner Rosehill, et al's proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order.

Written public testimony from Kurt Wollenhaupt.

The Office of Planning's Supplemental

```
Response to County's and Petitioner Rosehill, et al's
1
2
      Petitions for Declaratory Order.
 3
                Response by Petitioners in Docket No.
      DR20-70 to the County of Hawaii's Supplemental
 4
      Submission filed July 10, 2020, and other filings
5
 6
      which we received again as late as this morning, and
7
     have been posted to our web.
                The Commission mailed the July 22 and 23,
8
9
      2020 Notice of Agenda to the Parties, to the
10
      Statewide, O'ahu and Hawai'i regular and email
11
     mailing lists.
12
                Sorry, one moment while I look at
13
      something. Thank you.
14
                I will now note, as I did before, that
      there was written testimony received from Kurt
15
16
      Wollenhaupt. And then I believe we're going to
17
     proceed with presentations starting with the County.
                Is that right, Mr. Orodenker?
18
19
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: That's correct.
20
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Go ahead, Mr.
21
     Orodenker.
22
                EXECUTIVE OFFICER: That is correct, Mr.
23
      Chair.
24
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Mukai, are you
```

25

ready?

1 MR. MUKAI: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The County of Hawaii has petitioned this

Commission for Declaratory Order that farm dwellings

may not be used as short-term vacation rentals.

Initially, the County would like to first clarify

something.

The County agrees with the State that there must be agricultural use or activities within the confines of a farm dwelling, should the agriculture be related to the farm dwelling. And a farm dwelling can only be operated in connection with agricultural use, and not simply for residential use as outlined in HRS Section 205-4.5.

The County would urge the Commission to simply look at whether farm dwellings to be occupied exclusively by a single family which obtains income from agricultural activities on a farm, that the same family owns in fee or leasehold, and a determination that farm dwellings may not be used as short-term vacation rentals pursuant to HRS Section 205-2, Section 205-4.5, and Section 15-15-03 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules.

A short-term vacation rental is defined in Chapter 25-1.5 of the Hawaii County Code as a dwelling unit where the owner or operator does not

reside on the building site, has no more than five bedrooms for rent on the building site, and is rented for a period of 30 consecutive days or less.

The County is not arguing about the duration of the farm dwellings being rented for 30 days or less, or whether the owner of the farm dwelling not needing to reside in the dwelling, but the use, we would stress the use of the farm dwelling is essential in determining whether the Rosehill Petitioners may use their farm dwellings as vacation rentals.

Hawaii Revised Statute 205D(7) specifically defines farm dwellings as an agricultural with accessory. And in turn farm dwellings as defined in HRS Section 205-4.5(a)(4) notes that is within the Agricultural District, A) Section 4, farm dwelling is defined as follows:

It's defined as employee housing, farm buildings, or activities or uses related to farming and animal husbandry.

Farm dwelling, as used in this paragraph means a single-family dwelling located on and used in connection with a farm, including clusters of single family farm dwellings permitted within agricultural parks developed by the State where agricultural

activity provides income to the family occupying the dwelling.

A farm dwelling's purpose is to be a bona fide agricultural service and use which supports and is an accessory to agriculture activities.

The purpose of a short-term vacation rental is to grow transient accommodations or housing that will be temporarily rented for a period of 30 days or less.

A short-term vacation rental is equivalent of like a resort or hotel accommodation which provides lodging for visitors or transients for the purposes of tourism or vacation.

We have also reviewed the Office of Planning's Supplemental Submission, and we would direct the Commission to page 5, the first full paragraph which reads:

If the Petitioners are able and willing to provide facts demonstrating or acknowledging that their dwellings meet all of the STVR elements, and at least one of the farm dwelling options, then the Commission could determine that Petitioners were operating their farm dwellings as STVRs pursuant to HRS 205-4.5(a)(4).

We can assume that the Petitioners meet the

three elements of the STVR rental, but the Petitioner failed to demonstrate that their farm dwellings are either located on and used in connection with a farm, or are located where agricultural activity provides income to the family occupying the farm dwelling.

It's the County's position that under a scenario where a farm dwelling on agriculturally zoned property can qualify for a vacation-type rental, that it would be governed by the short term overnight accommodations as agricultural tourism as defined pursuant to HRS Section 205-2(d)(12). The County believes that the Commission should not or cannot combine the definitions of short-term vacation rentals and farm dwellings as they are, we believe, separate and distinct uses.

And we would -- after this, we would ask

Ms. Apuna if she could clarify the Office of

Planning's position on this matter. But based on our submissions and the law, we submit that the County requests that the State Land Use Commission uphold the intent of its State Land Use law by finding in favor of the County of Hawaii, and declaring that a short-term vacation rental is not a permitted use of a farm dwelling in the Agricultural District.

Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Mukai. 2 Commissioners, questions for Hawaii County? 3 Commissioner Okuda. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much, 4 5 Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Mukai. 6 Mr. Mukai, can I call your attention to the 7 response filed by the Rosehill Petitioners, which was filed July 21, 2020, at 6:42 A.M., and specifically 8 9 calling your attention to Footnote 1 on page 3 which 10 quotes or recites from the transcript, which was 11 attached, I believe, to that filing as Exhibit 1, 12 which was the colloquy that I had between -- or with 13 your Planning Director Michael Yee. Do you see that Footnote 1? 14 15 MR. MUKAI: Yes, Commissioner. And in 16 fact, at this time I would -- if you wish, I can have 17 Mr. Yee, who is here, clarify the position. 18 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Can I ask an initial 19 foundational question? 20 Was that testimony, which was given under 21 oath, was that accurate testimony, or was that not 22 accurate testimony? 23 MR. MUKAI: We believe it is accurate. 24 fact, I can have Mr. Yee explain in context what was

being said and his responses.

25

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'll leave it to the Chair whether that's --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is it necessary at this time, Commissioner Okuda, for your purposes?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yeah, maybe, because I just want to find out -- let me just say this.

It seems like what the County is stating now is contradicted by that statement, which is laid out in Footnote 1.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So narrowly, let's allow Mr. Yee to qualify. He was sworn in earlier.

MICHAEL YEE

Having been previously called as a witness on behalf of the County of Hawai'i, was previously sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

MR. YEE: Michael Yee, Planning Director.

When you look at that citation, you can see that I clearly stated that we consider it to be a farm dwelling unit. And so, you know, we're committed to the agricultural activity that has to occur, but as I had said that day, that administratively it's problematic to try to have every property with the first farm dwelling unit to

show they have ag activity when they're ready to build their first home on it.

So it's not to say that agricultural activity isn't important, but equally we feel like somebody should be able to build their house first on a property.

So I don't see it being in conflict, because the use as a farm dwelling as for somebody residing in it is much different than trying to have people reside in it or occupy it as vacation rental 24/7.

was telling you up-front, I have no intention on conducting any farm activity. I'm going to build my McMansion on the property. I'm not going to farm. There's not going to be any agricultural activity. Will you still allow me to build my mansion when I'm telling you absolutely not, there will be no agricultural activity?

And when -- let me clarify, when I say will you let me build, I'm asking, what is the County's position?

MR. YEE: I'm still going to say that it's still a farm dwelling unit. And people right now have to sign a Farm Dwelling Agreement with us on

1 that unit.

And although they may say that they're going to not perform agricultural activities, it doesn't necessarily take away from residing in that house.

When you place a use like a vacation rental, you certainly eliminate that option.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So even if I tell you straight up-front that there will be no agricultural activity, you will still grant me the permit to build the dwelling?

MR. YEE: It's still going to be a farm dwelling unit.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And even if I told you I'm putting some deed restrictions on my deed to say there will be no farming activity on this property, you would still give me a permit, you, meaning the County, to build the dwelling?

MR. MUKAI: No, you cannot do that, because by ag, by it's very nature, it would have to have agricultural activities connected to the property.

This is John Mukai, sorry.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I understand that, but -- okay. Thank you very much. I heard your responses. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 2 Commissioner Chang. 3 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Mukai, Mr. Yee, I have the same line of 4 5 questioning as Commissioner Okuda. 6 Mr. Yee, as I understand your explanation, 7 you are of the opinion that they can build the farm dwelling first before they actually start a farming 8 9 activity. Is that correct? Is that what you're 10 saying? 11 MR. YEE: That is correct. But right now people fill out a Farm Dwelling Agreement when they 12 13 want to build that first one. 14 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Is there a time period upon which you have to do the farming, according to 15 16 you? 17 MR. YEE: Realistically, no, we don't. COMMISSIONER CHANG: So I guess the 18 19 question I have for you is: 20 Couldn't the plaintiffs come forward and 21 say we're going to -- we're planning on doing 22 farming, we haven't started it yet. And it's -- I 23 mean, how can you then deny that that's not a farm 24 dwelling? Because you have no time period if they 25 tell you, they complete the form, and they say, oh,

but we're going to do farming in the future. Not just yet. That's just --

I'm having a really difficult time understanding your chronology of the use of the land.

When I read 205, it would appear as if the farming comes first. And there needs to be some agricultural activity, and that the dwelling is associated -- is connected to that, not that there's a dwelling first, because what is the guarantee that they'll ever do farming or agriculture?

MR. YEE: One way I take a look at this is, we're also looking at the uses that occur on an agricultural lot. So somebody could build a farm dwelling unit, their first one. And they can say we are doing X, Y, Z. As long as it's not a use that's unrestricted, they can proceed. So it may not be a vacation rental.

Say somebody takes up another activity on their agriculture that is not a permitted use. We would go in and say this is not a permitted use, and issue a violation. That's why we're asking for Declaratory Ruling on this to understand is this a permitted use, just like we wouldn't allow a junkyard to occur on ag land, we would site someone for that, and if not, then there's a problem.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I guess I'm still
having a difficulty with your clarification, because
I will have to admit, I see the County's position
today to be contradictory to the line of questioning
that the Commission had at the last hearing. You
appeared to be very adamant that you don't have to do
any farming activity, you could have a single family

dwelling on the property and do no farming,

So I'm really grappling because if there is no time limit on when you do the agricultural activity, who's to say that they're not in compliance with farm dwelling? If they tell you they intend to do it, but they never do it? How do you enforce and judge that if they say they intend to do it, and it's 30 years later?

MR. YEE: It's still considered a farm dwelling unit.

I'm trying to think in my mind if somebody builds a single-family dwelling unit and say they didn't use it and they created a commercial activity in it, then they'd be in violation, and we might not even find out ten years down the road. Ten years down the road it changes hands, and it's an illegal use of it. We would enforce then.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: What if there is no

- illegal use, but there's still no farming, no

 agricultural use five years, 10 years, 15 years, but

 there is no other illegal activity, but there is a

 dwelling on it, but they never use it for
 - MR. YEE: I'll keep going back that it's still a farm dwelling unit though.
 - COMMISSIONER CHANG: I think your explanation is -- that's your explanation, all right. Thank you.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
 Commissioner Chang. Commissioner Ohigashi.

agricultural purposes?

- understand what you're trying to say. Correct me if I am wrong. You're trying to say that, look, we're going to authorize the building of single family dwelling or a dwelling on the property. And they're going to sign this agreement and say it's a farm dwelling.
- So the only use on that property is an agricultural type of use. The only use that the dwelling has is that allowed use, your question is, whether or not a STVR is allowed use like agriculture?

MR. YEE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand your position. You're going to allow dwellings on there, so long as they sign this dwelling agreement, that's It's up to them to pursue what is legal on the property. And the question is, is agricultural use legal, yes. So they can do it. Is STVR legal on the property? That's what you're asking, whether or not an agricultural zone is legal to do? MR. YEE: That's correct, is that use

MR. YEE: That's correct, is that use allowable.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to understand your position. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi.

Commissioners, I would note -- I would note for Mr. Yee, that his counterpart on Maui County actually thinks a junkyard is an allowable use on agricultural lands according to our proceedings two weeks ago, even on important agricultural land.

Is there anything further right now from the Commissioners, questions for the County?

If not, Mr. Chipchase, there's time for you now. You could use some of it now. I don't know how much time you want or need. We are not going to get through all our proceedings today during the extended

143 conversations we have had on all of our agenda items. 1 2 What is your preference? 3 MR. CHIPCHASE: My preference would be to reserve the comments for the meeting on August 12th. 4 5 We timed out my presentation today without the 6 additional things I have to say now in response to 7 County. I was at 30 minutes this morning, I'm probably at 35 minutes now, so that takes us just 8 past 3:00 o'clock and, of course, there will be more 9 10 time for questions. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I would rather not 12 have to remember all the things that I wanted to ask 13 you over the next few week's time. 14 MR. CHIPCHASE: You can ask now, so I have 15 two weeks to prepare them. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I could, but I will 17 not. 18 My preference, Commissioners, is to close 19 this hearing. 20 We have one agenda item, Agenda V, that was 21

on our agenda to talk about continued operations during the COVID-19 pandemic, which was -- Sorry, Commissioner Ohigashi, you raised your hand. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Just for procedural concerns, I hope everyone remembers it's going to be

22

23

24

25

1 Mr. Chipchase's turn. He starts off the meeting the 2 next time.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That will be correct. There will be time for closing arguments by the County and Mr. Chipchase after hearing from OP.

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, I would like to just ask everybody. I know everybody is working until the last minutes, just if you are going to get us information that you want me to read before I'm sitting here, get it to me at least 24 hours ahead. I'll do everything at midnight and 2:00 A.M., but it's hard if something gets sent to me 8:30 in the morning and no time to read the information.

So it really, really -- I think you have a good point, anybody involved at any time, get it to us so we can absorb it before we have to act like we read it. Thank you.

And I have a hurricane coming towards me, so I'm most happy to end as soon as possible. Thank you.

MR. CHIPCHASE: If I may, Chair, just very briefly on that point.

I totally respect that comment that Commissioner Cabral just mentioned, fairly directed

at me. We filed it technically late yesterday, but you didn't receive it until this morning. That was because we hadn't received OP's supplemental public testimony, and that was we didn't see it until yesterday. We didn't receive a copy of it. We noticed it on the website.

If I could ask everybody to, if you email everyone a copy of it, as we have at the time we submit it, that would help us respond as quickly as possible so that no Commissioner is scrambling to read and attend the hearing on the same day.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Duly noted. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

With that, Commissioners, if there's no objection, what I would like to do is to end discussion on this agenda item with the understanding that on August 12th the same agenda we are also again taking up Hawaiian Memorial Park, we will take up this matter. And I would like to offer us, I believe it is agenda item V, Mr. Orodenker?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would just like a couple things that I would like to talk to the Commission about, our operations.

One of them is that I think the staff would

request a little understanding on the part of the Commissioners. The only reason that we're able to do these ZOOM meetings is because of the governor's emergency proclamation.

We don't know from month to month that whether or not that emergency proclamation will continue. Once that is lifted, we will no longer be able to do these ZOOM meetings in the manner that we are doing them.

I would also like to note for the Commissioners that staff is in the office more often now. We are pretty close to full-time, so that you can reach us here if need be.

The only other issues that I have is that with regard to COVID-19 operations is that my intention, as long as the Commission is in agreement, is to suggest for next legislative session that there be an amendment to whatever chapter needs to be amended to allow us to continue to do these ZOOM meetings, rather than having to do the old fashion videoconferences at the State offices with the archaic system and all the rest.

I will be talking with you further about that as time goes on, but that's my intention.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there questions

for Mr. Orodenker regarding our continued operation during ment COVID-19 pandemic?

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So, Mr. Orodenker, did you want some people -- of course, it wouldn't be me -- but people who might be able to make inquiry to governor's staff about doing something about this, that way the issue doesn't slip through the cracks? In other words, we don't have the ability going forward to do ZOOM conferences when we need to.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: I am in close communication with the Attorney General's office, in particular, Bill Wynhoff and his staff, and the other attorneys with regard to this issue, so I'll be working with him closely.

you and the rest of the staff. I think you folks have done a tremendous job with ZOOM. One of the good things coming out of this pandemic, it shows technology, which can help encourage public participation, especially as the Chair pointed out, we had two people in motor vehicles who were able to give very important, insightful testimony, that clearly wouldn't be able to be done under other

1 circumstances.

2 Thank you, Chair.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I would like to also commended the staff, obviously Riley and Dan, everybody for the opportunity of gathering together. And I would like to commended our Chairman, because I rarely give a compliment to Jonathan. But he's got to be working so hard. It takes a lot for us to pay attention when we don't have all of the personal body language and the visual to really see who's talking when.

And then every time the screen changes, sometimes people change where they were sitting before. I don't know, those type of things, and for Jonathan to be tracking on that, I have to commended you, Jonathan, and remind people to identify themselves. Thank you, thank you.

And, Jean, I don't know if she's still on board there, but the fact that she can even take minutes. I'm exhausted just thinking about it.

So aloha to all of you folks for putting up with this for the good of our government and our State and our community. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
Commissioner Cabral.

Commissioner Giovanni. 1

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: I want to add my 3 two cents to my fellow Commissioner in commending staff and our Chair in making the ZOOM work effectively. I greatly appreciate it. I don't think we have diminished much at all, in fact, there's 7 actually been some efficiencies built from the whole 8 process.

I do have a question. I don't know if it is appropriate, if inappropriate, I'll accept no answer.

Mr. Orodenker, have there been any formal complaints on the record about the process of our using Zoom? I've heard nothing but good things. Have there been any negative things?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Haven't been any complaints. In fact, the one thing we have gotten is compliments.

COMMISSIONER GIOVANNI: That's what I would have expected.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: That would be so if we don't vote in favor of somebody, then the complaints will come.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I give my four cents being Bo Checkers than Bobo.

I would like to commend Dan and the staff, except for the unpaid one sitting next to him. I would like to say that, Jonathan, your problem is that they're going to be make you for life chairman if you don't watch out.

And last thing I like to say is that I want everybody to be safe because we have a hurricane coming.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Ohigashi.

I was just going to share that I'm going to vote for the presidential candidate who promises drone strikes against high level cable executives because they have been the biggest problem with ZOOM for me.

So I think if you're promising drone strikes against cable executives, I will endorse your candidacy.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I too will well echo my fellow Commissioners. What I have really appreciated about the opportunity to do ZOOM is just looking at the attendees, it is more than those who can physically come to the meetings. We have had

people coming from different islands. If anything I think ZOOM has created a broader opportunity for participation.

For me personally, it has raised my level of comfort that I'm not having to travel, which has been really reassuring, as well as tremendous amount of saving time, half the time we'd be waiting at the airport trying to get on an earlier flight.

But, indeed, Jonathan, you have demonstrated great leadership and patience in these proceedings and always being mindful and thoughtful to the attendees. And I think, I know on behalf of myself being as a member of the LUC Commission, you have conducted with great professionalism, and the staff likewise. Hats off to you, Dan, and all the staff in keeping us going, and we haven't quite missed a beat.

We've probably been able to do more, but thank you very much to all of you who have participated in asking us to keep up the hard work. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much, Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER WONG: I just wanted to tell us, because I do sit in other state agencies, other

1 ZOOM conferences, and they're not as proficient as 2 our staff, especially when they're using the mic. 3 And when they go into executive session, I still can 4 hear them. 5 So the way that our staff is doing it is 6 the correct way, you know, that we're doing it very 7 proper, and to me it's better for everyone involved 8 as well. 9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: I would also note, Mr. 10 Chair, that the reason we are able to do that is because of Arnold's comments here. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. 13 Orodenker. 14 If there is nothing further, want to thank you all. I know that our dockets have been very long, 15 16 and I really thank the parties, Mr. Chipchase, Hawaii

County, OP, our Deputy Attorney General for their assistance in these matters.

If there is nothing further, Commissioners, we can adjourn and rush to Costco if you want to.

Anything further? If not, I am happy to declare this meeting adjourned. Thank you everyone, and be safe.

(The proceedings adjourned at 2:52 p.m.)

25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF HAWAII) SS.
3	COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on July 23, 2020, at 9:03 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 23rd day of July, 2020, in Honolulu,
16	Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	/s/ Jean Marie McManus
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	