STATE OF HAWAII LAND USE COMMISSION

Meeting held on February 5, 2025 Commencing at 10:00 a.m.

Held at

Leiopapa A Kamehameha State Office Tower 235 S Beretania Street, Room 405 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

XI. DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING SB1334 AND HB1015

RELATING TO LAND USE. Authorizes county petition process for review and approval of land use district boundary amendments based on adopted county general plans or county development plans.

XII. DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING SB740 AND H8777

RELATING TO SPECIAL PERMITS. Authorizes the LUC to designate another agency, including the Office of Planning and Sustainable Development, Department of Agriculture, or Agribusiness Development Corporation, to monitor compliance with any restrictions imposed in a special permit

XIII. DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING H8826

RELATING TO HOUSING. Authorizes a county planning commission, by special permit, to permit land uses exclusively providing residential housing for long-term rental or affordable fee simple ownership in an agricultural district, under certain conditions. Repeals 613012035.

XIV. DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING \$81332 AND H81013

RELATING TO IMPORTANT AGRICULTURAL LANDS. Repeals the provision authorizing farm dwellings and farm employee housing on important agricultural lands, amends the provision for priority permit processing to include farm cluster housing, and adopts a new provision establishing farm cluster housing to incentivize the designation of lands as important agricultural lands pursuant to chapter 205, HRS.

XV. DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING SB1099

RELATING TO IMPORTANT AGRICULTURAL LANDS. Authorizes the Land Use Commission to designate important agricultural lands and adopt maps for the designated lands in counties that fail to identify and recommend important agricultural lands by December 31, 2027.

XVI. DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING 5826 AND HB 1451

RELATING TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING. Establishes the Affordable Housing Land Inventory Task Force within the Hawaii Community Development Authority to update the Affordable Rental Housing Report and Ten-Year Plan maps, tier tables, and inventories of state lands suitable and available for affordable housing development. Requires a report to the Legislature. Appropriates moneys.

XVII. DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING SB498 AND H81294

RELATING TO AGRICULTURAL WORKFORCE HOUSING.
Requires the Department of Agriculture to
establish an Agricultural Workforce Housing
Working Group to address the shortage and
challenges of agricultural workforce housing in
the State. Requires reports to the Legislature.
Appropriates funds.

XVIII.DECISION ON COMMISSION'S POSITION REGARDING SB197

RELATING TO PUBLIC NOTICE. Establishes enhanced public notice requirements for changes in land use by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, Department of Land and Natural Resources, or University of Hawaii and boundary changes by the LUC. Requires approval of the project by the community through a referendum of nearby adult residents except for projects within the Mauna Kea science reserve, which require a referendum by all adult residents of the country in which the Mauna Kea science reserve is located. Appropriates moneys.

XIX. ADJOURNMENT

BEFORE:

1	PARTICIPANTS
2	
3	LUC COMMISSIONERS:
4	Dan Giovanni, Chairman
5	Mel Kahele
6	Brian Lee
7	Ken Hayashida (via Zoom)
8	Bruce U'u
9	Myles Miyasato (via Zoom)
10	Nancy Carr Smith
11	
12	LUC STAFF:
13	Daniel Orodenker, Executive Officer
14	Scott Derrickson, Chief Planner
15	Martina Segura, Planner
16	Ariana Kwan, Chief Clerk
17	Miranda Steed, Esq., Deputy Attorney General
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Т	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: It's 10:00 on February
2	6th, and we're going to continue our LUC meeting
3	that started yesterday. This meeting is a hybrid
4	meeting which is physically located at Leiopapa A
5	Kamehameha State Office Tower, at 235 South
6	Beretania Street, Room 405. And it's open to the
7	public, and everything is being recorded on Zoom.
8	We've got a few changes in terms of
9	attendance from yesterday. Today I am Dan
10	Giovanni. I am the chair, and it's my pleasure to
11	be here. Excused from today's meeting is
12	Commissioner Michael Yamane from Kauai and
13	Commissioner Kamakea-'Ohelo from Oahu, who may or
14	may not join us from Zoom during the meeting.
15	Present with me in the room is Commissioner Mel
16	Kahele and Commissioner Brian Lee from Oahu and
17	Commissioner Nancy Carr Smith from Hawaii Island and
18	Commissioner Bruce U'u from Maui. Commissioner
19	Myles Miyasato is joining by Zoom.
20	Welcome back, Commissioner Miyasato. Are
21	you back in your home again?
22	COMMISSIONER MIYASATO: Yes, I am, and no
23	one is with me.
24	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Thank you very much.
25	And I understand that Commissioner

2.

Hayashida intends to join us by Zoom, but has not yet been able to connect. We will not wait for that. And also our Deputy -- LUC Deputy Attorney General Miranda Steed is also joining us from Zoom today.

Also in attendance are LUC Officer -Executive Officer Daniel Orodenker. LUC Land Use
Development Coordinator Arnold Wong is not in
attendance as he was yesterday. LUC Chief Planner
Scott Derrickson, LUC Staff Planner Martina Segura,
and LUC Chief Clerk Ariana Kwan are in attendance.

We are going to pick up with agenda item number 11, was -- correct, or is it 12? 11. We start with agenda item number 11, which is a decision on commission position regarding SB1334 and House Bill 1015. We'll use the same procedure as we were doing yesterday afternoon, in which we will ask for public testimony, and then we'll ask the staff to make a presentation based on their review of the bill. And then we'll -- the commission will hear public testimony a second time, and then we'll deliberate whether we'll want to take a position on that or not.

So, Ms. Kwan, has there been any testimony -- anybody want to do oral testimony at this time on

1	number	11?

2.

2.2

THE CLERK: Nobody on the Zoom has used the Q and A feature to sign up for testimony on this agenda item. But I want to point out we did receive 18 written testimonies at the conclusion of yesterday's meeting that have been posted to the website.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: I did notice that, and I hope all the other commissioners did notice that as well. So thank you for attending to that so promptly yesterday.

Mr. Orodenker, can you please provide us a summary and your assessment and recommendations regarding SB1334 and House Bill 1015?

MR. ORODENKER: I'm going to ask Scott Derrickson, our chief planner, to begin the discussion on this bill.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Mr. Derrickson, please.

MR. DERRICKSON: Yeah. Scott Derrickson, planner, LUC. So Senate Bill 1334 and House Bill 1015 or companion bills, so they're the same. They seek to amend Chapter 205, creating a new section that allows county planning agencies to petition a county land use authority, which in this case is the

2.

planning commissions, to decide district boundary amendments for lands greater than 15 acres with no maximum or ceiling number of acreage when lands conform with county general plan or development plan or community plan.

Staff has identified that this legislation has constitutional issues with regard to due process. It is counter to the Town vs. Land Use Commission Supreme Court decision that required a quasi-judicial process to adjudicate or change property rights. The bill is not limited to just agricultural lands. It could also include rural and conservation lands as well. It raises issues about how public trust concerns are going to be addressed or if they are required to be addressed.

MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. This is -- our position on this is similar to SB36 and SB1157, which we discussed yesterday. It's our belief that given the circumstances, that it -- we should not be testifying on this matter only -- or in support of this matter or -- and only offering technical advice if the bill is heard.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So the technical advice would be to raise the issues that Mr. Derrickson as concerns?

Yes, that is correct. 1 MR. ORODENKER: 2. CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Commissioners, 3 any questions or suggestions? Commissioner Lee, thank you. 4 5 COMMISSIONER LEE: Oh, yeah. Can you just briefly detail what kind of concerns -- I agree with 6 your position, but I just want to hear, you know, 7 what -- what you'll be relaying to them. 8 9 MR. ORODENKER: Well, the due process 10 issues we discussed earlier or yesterday. problem with the -- with having the county have the 11 12 ability to move district boundaries based on the 13 general plans is -- is one of due process. 14 every landowner under the constitution is entitled to due process if their land -- if their interest in 15 land is going to be negatively impacted and -- or 16 you could arque it's positively impacted, but their 17 18 taxes go up. So it's our -- our belief that the 19 bill may not meet those due process requirements. 20 Second of all, as Mr. Derrickson pointed out, one of the issues with this bill, in addition 21 to the other issues raised in SB36, is that it seems 2.2 23 to allow counties to do district boundary amendments 24 on conservation land as well as rural land in

addition to agricultural land, which is of concern.

25

out concerns.

I -- I think that that those two issues are 1 2. paramount. 3 MR. DERRICKSON: Yeah. I'd like to also add too that there's already a process if the 4 5 counties want to come to the commission or a district boundary amendment covering a large area 6 7 that's, say, covered by their growth boundary and their general plan or the development or community 8 9 plans, they can do that under current law. And in 10 fact, they have done that in the past. 11 COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay, yeah. Just --12 just want some clarification because both of these 13 bills are part of the governor's package. 14 there's no direction down the line through DBEDT and 15 to you folks to support it? MR. ORODENKER: We -- when this bill was 16 17 being discussed, we made our concerns clear. And as 18 was pointed out yesterday, while this is an administrative measure, this is an independent body 19 20 so that we have the ability to formulate a position. As in conformance with the governor's office's 21 2.2 directions with regard to testimony, we would not be 23 testifying in opposition. We would just be pointing

1	Chair.
2	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Thank you.
3	Mr. U'u.
4	COMMISSIONER U'U: I wanted to ask, what
5	is the county's process? Because you said there is
6	a process that the county can utilize.
7	MR. ORODENKER: The counties can apply to
8	the land use commission for district boundary
9	amendments the same way an individual landowner can.
10	COMMISSIONER U'U: That might be some of
11	the issues. And so one, I'm so glad we're having
12	these discussions even though sometimes I don't want
13	to have the discussions. You can see the disconnect
14	between and I always saw that between the land
15	use, which is us, I'm a part of it, and the state
16	reps who introducing some of this. And and I
17	know our process all takes time. Every process is
18	time consuming and costly, regardless what we want
19	to say, right?
20	But if you look At UHero Stats, Hawaii is
21	the most over regulated land use in a nation.
22	Second to Jersey is second. But we winning by a
23	third. Like, we winning by we winning first
24	place by a mile. But I understand the legalities
25	sort of speak, but and again, I think everyone's

2.

2.2

looking for a solution, and I read every testimony last night. Some -- a lot of them were duplicate though. I read everyone but just to get on sense of where everyone's coming from. And my sense is that we in a panic mode for housing. We had flight risk, right?

And people looking at solutions for this process that is lengthy, long, expensive, costly, and we part of it. And again, that's why I think this deliberation we have it and you guys commenting on bills and we are, as a whole, as a group, with state leg, with governor, hopefully you find some solutions because I'm not okay with a project taking eight years to 15 years to build.

And I heard about saving and saving land and our grandchildren and children. None of them's here at the same. So respectfully, I think that's what we're looking at and I think we've been over protected. That's my personal feeling. And that's why it takes nine people to make the decisions here. When 6 percent of Maui is zoned urban, that's it, 6 percent. We got enough -- we got enough lands in ag. We hear about ag farming. We farm. I farmed for years, my family, and a lot of people talk about it, but don't do it. I just find it to be

2.

2.2

hypocritical.

But it's just my frustration and my own of what my intent here is to make a difference. And sometimes it goes against the grain of what was here prior or how it's been handled. But I really feel like every step of the process, if we can mitigate or expedite in the right way, I think will be beneficial for all people. The people I represent. Thank you.

MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. Oh, go ahead. COMMISSIONER U'U: No, no, I'm good.

MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, if I -- if I can share a little bit. I agree with you that some changes need to be made. I think that one of the problems with the -- with what's happening right now is that it's not a community-based discussion.

About five or six years ago, was it, that Senator Schatz introduced a sweeping legislation to change land use in Hawaii. And it was the result of a lot of community discussion. It wound its way through the legislature. There were compromises made at different hearings and so forth and so on. And at the nth hour, it died mainly because of, believe it or not, pressure from the developers. You know, they -- they didn't want to change the process that

much.

2.

2.2

And so I think that that would be successful. You know, that type of a process where the community was involved in making the changes and they didn't feel like they were left out. When I say the community, I mean the agricultural community, the, you know, everybody, you know, but these bills are flawed. And yeah, I mean that's -- that's the problem that staff has with them is that they're flawed.

COMMISSIONER U'U: And again, hence that's why I like the discussion out of all of this that we can have the discussion, this round table or square table discussion, and again you guys comment to the appropriate people introducing the bill. So we kind of -- regardless, we're kind of on the same page and maybe at different perspectives. But I like this part.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So I'd like also to respond to your comments, Commissioner U'u. First of all, your comments are very welcome, and it's very useful to know where you're coming from. We're all coming from a place where we're trying to make the processes better and fairer for everyone. I want to speak specifically about the housing and

2.

2.2

where I'm coming from.

I have heard remarks similar to the ones you made about being heavily regulated, and the regulations are the -- that are so great in Hawaii is a real impediment to moving forward on a -- on a timely basis. In fact, the mayor of Honolulu last night gave a speech about being the most heavily regulated state in the nation, similar to the one you have. I can tell you though that the citation for that comment of -- that the politicians are making, like the mayor of Honolulu last night, Mr. Blangiardi, stems from a UHERO analysis of what are the costs of housing. And the UHERO analysis concludes that close to 40 to 50 percent of the process for and the cost of housing is associated with quote, unquote regulations.

So I confronted UHERO. I said, tell me what's inside the box for what you call regulations? Because every time somebody studies why don't we have housing, including the report that was shared with us at the last meeting, they say the number one obstacle is always infrastructure, infrastructure. Who's going to pay for the upfront infrastructure? So I asked through UHERO directly, Mr. Bonham. I said, where do you -- I don't see where you capture

```
the cost of infrastructure as an impediment.
 1
 2.
    says, oh, I call that regulation. I said, what?
 3
    The dollars that are required for a developer to put
    on -- to build a sewer, you call that regulation?
 4
 5
             That's not -- that's not the way I
 6
    interpret it. Because you need money to build
    infrastructure. So where's that money going to come
 7
           In Hawaii today, it's all in the back of the
 8
 9
    developer. And that's the impediment. And that's
10
    -- it may be that's the only way to get the project
          But in my personal view, until we get the
11
    done.
12
    money, not the regulation, but the money in the
13
    hands of counties to build infrastructure, we're
14
    always going to have a problem building affordable
15
    housing. Yeah. So I just want to make -- that's
    where I'm coming from.
16
17
             Go ahead.
18
             COMMISSIONER U'U: And I agree.
19
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 I love this
20
    discussion.
21
                                No, no. And I 100
             COMMISSIONER U'U:
2.2
    percent agree with you because it takes everything,
23
            It takes some of the regulation.
24
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Sure.
25
             COMMISSIONER U'U: It takes some of the
```

2.

2.2

infrastructure because infrastructure definitely is a barrier. 100 percent, the cost of infrastructure is -- is crazy. And it is put on the backs of the developer, so I 100 percent agree with you on that.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So I think what's happening is that when we approve a petition for a project, we have a condition that says the developer got paid for infrastructure. So that's -- UHERO's picking that up like a regulation. But there's no other way for the infrastructure to be built in Hawaii because there's no tax money to do it.

Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Thank you. This is a great discussion. I have to say though that, and I've been around this for a long time too. UHERO is not the only one that points to Hawaii. MIT has a study where they're saying it's 58 percent of the cost is regulation, and they compare this worldwide. And all projects have infrastructure costs, so we're still comparing the same thing. Why is Hawaii's infrastructure cost higher?

At HCDA, they had infrastructure business improvement districts where the state issued bonds or community facility district type taxation to provide infrastructure. And that's a lot cheaper

because if the state issues bonds for 1 2. infrastructure, it costs 5, 6 percent interest. 3 make a developer do it, he's got to put a 30 percent profit margin on that infrastructure, so there are 4 5 other ways. But this bill that we're talking about 6 now, yes, the counties do do it, but this one says 7 that the counties alone decide. It doesn't go to 8 9 the state LUC. Yesterday, we couldn't even agree to 10 have more than four votes that it still goes to the LUC. But instead of six votes we have five and only 11 12 for five years. We couldn't even agree on that to 13 -- to pass that. So how are we going to now say yeah, we support something that takes the LUC out of 14 15 it completely with zero votes? You know? 16 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: I agree. 17 COMMISSIONER LEE: Thanks. CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So I think any -- so I 18 19 -- I'm going to try to move this thing along with a 20 -- my assessment of the general feeling of -- of the commissioners is to follow the guidance of or 21 2.2 recommendation of the director and his staff, which 23 says this bill has some problems. We can't support 24 it as written, but we -- and we'll show up and 25 answer questions and -- about our concerns.

1	Commissioner Carr Smith.	
2	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Thank you. It	
3	seems to me that this is what OPSD talked about when	
4	they came and gave us a presentation, and they	
5	talked about perhaps the county doing exactly this,	
6	and it was limited to certain areas. They were very	
7	specific about that and I I thought that that's	
8	what this was, but I could be wrong. Am I wrong?	
9	COMMISSIONER LEE: I think that was the	
10	1.6 percent, and they were supposed to come back to	
11	us because Commissioner Miyasato asked could you	
12	give a breakdown by island where that was it's	
13	only regarding 1.6 percent of the land that's also	
14	in the county growth district. So it's not a, like,	
15	fling the doors open, you know, and do whatever you	
16	guys want at the county. But I I want to be	
17	clear though, that I I think that, yeah, Dan	
18	should provide comments, but just want to clarify	
19	that that doesn't mean he's going to say that we're	
20	opposed to it, right?	
21	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: No, we're not opposed	
22	to it.	
23	COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay. Thank you.	
24	MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, to answer your	
25	question, Commissioner Carr Smith, this bill doesn't	

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
say what I think Mary Alice thought it said or it
changed when -- after she made her presentation
because she was talking about specific land areas.
And this is a broad --
         COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: This is a broad,
yeah, broad stroke. Okay. I -- I -- again, I think
the intention is good. I agree that the
conservation land and important ag lands shouldn't
be a part of it and that it should be more confined
to certain areas, so I hope that you will address
that.
      And then the other thing is, you know, we
keep saying how the county doesn't have due process,
but they do. I mean, they have almost as equally
complex process as we do, and so I just don't want
to discount that.
         MR. ORODENKER: I don't disagree with you,
but the difficulty with these bills is that they --
they don't -- they allow the counties to bypass that
due process procedure. And that's where we have the
          I mean, if this bill -- and we talked.
concerns.
just mentioned the Schatz bill that laid out in
detail how the county was supposed to handle DBAs.
If that language was in this bill --
         COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Got it.
So a suggestion that more definition be put in the
```

process would be helpful. 1 2. MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Thank you. THE CLERK: Chair. 4 5 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioner Miyasato. 6 COMMISSIONER MIYASATO: Yeah. Real quick. 7 I know you want to move along, but just to clarify, when I asked Mary Alice about that 1.6, which it 8 9 does mention in section 1 of this bill, I asked if 10 that was grandfathered just for that specific lands that were already within that urban design, and she 11 said no. So it's a wide open, as our executive 12 13 director had pointed out this -- it's wide open and open for the future that the county will have 14 15 jurisdiction over all of the -- everything mentioned in this bill. 16 17 And I guess just the other concern to keep in mind is if it goes to the county, usually goes to 18 19 the council after the planning commission. And then 20 that's where I -- I guess I have a little bit more concern because then it becomes political rather 21 2.2 than -- sometimes it becomes political rather than 23 just being based on a really good presentation where 24 I've seen good presentations come out and it passed. 25 The planning commission goes before the council, 200

```
people show up in opposition, and council reverses
 1
    their decision at the final hearing because they
 2.
    want to get re-elected. So just a couple of more
    concerns with turning things over to the county.
 4
 5
    Thank you.
 6
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Thank you,
 7
    Commissioner. That was very welcome comments and
    very enlightening, and I think we're on board.
 8
 9
    Thank you.
             So, Commissioners, I think we got a clear
10
    direction on this one. If -- if anyone feels
11
    differently, let me know. We'll move forward.
12
13
             Okay. Next bill is item agenda -- pardon
        Any more -- anybody want to do public testimony
14
15
    on this one?
16
             THE CLERK: Seeing none in the O and A
    feature, Chair.
17
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Then we'll move
18
19
    forward. So agenda item number 12 decision on SB740
20
    and companion bill HB777. Any public -- anybody
    wanting to do public testimony on these?
21
2.2
             THE CLERK: Seeing none in the O and A
23
    feature, Chair.
24
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Thank you.
25
             Mr. Orodenker, will you and your staff
```

```
please summarize this bill and express your concerns
 1
    and recommendations?
 2.
             THE CLERK: Chair, do we want to put on
 3
    the record that Ken Hayashida joined us at 10:15
 4
 5
    a.m.?
 6
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Oh, great.
             Welcome, Ken. I didn't -- I have to
 7
    apologize. I didn't notice. The screen is very
 8
 9
    small here.
10
             COMMISSIONER HAYASHIDA: Sorry about that.
    I'm in my office with nobody else in here with me.
11
12
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Okay. Thank you for
13
    clarifying and welcome.
14
             So just for the record, we now have all
15
    but two commissioners in attendance, so a super
16
    quorum.
17
             So back to item number 12, Mr. Orodenker.
18
             MR. ORODENKER:
                             Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19
    These bills, these two bills, are actually fairly
20
    simple and to a certain extent welcome.
21
    authorizes us, the Land Use Commission, to designate
2.2
    another agency, including but not limited to the
23
    Office of Planning and the Department of Agriculture
24
    or Agribusiness Development Corp to monitor
25
    compliance with any restrictions imposed on a
```

special permit. We don't have any problem with this 1 bill. We welcome it. 2. 3 I think that what we may hear OPSD and the Agribusiness Development Corp say is that they don't 4 5 have the staff to do this, but the intent of the bill we're fine with. It doesn't impact us really. 6 7 It just gives us the ability to have somebody else watch over the special permits. My advice on this 8 9 would -- would be to testify that we support the 10 intent, but we defer it to the other agencies with regard to their ability to conform their operations 11 to do this. 12 13 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. So you 14 recommend we support the intent of the bill but we 15 defer to other agencies that would be called upon to 16 implement the measures in the bill? 17 MR. ORODENKER: That is correct. Okay. Commissioners, 18 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: 19 comments? 20 Commissioner Carr Smith. 21 COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Was LUC involved at all in -- in this bill? 2.2 23 MR. ORODENKER: No, we are not. 24 COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Okay. And how 25 is it done now? How is the enforcement taken care

of? 1 2. CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: This is monitoring, 3 not enforcement. COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Monitoring. 4 5 MR. ORODENKER: Monitoring. We don't have the staff to monitor. And so what happens is that 6 7 we rely on either the counties who are there or neighboring landowners are interested parties to 8 9 tell us when there's been a violation. 10 COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Thank you. 11 COMMISSIONER U'U: I just wanted to 12 mention, I know on counties, the planning commission 13 on Maui monitors the special use permits, so. 14 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: And a lot of times 15 it's that they provide -- this is Chair. A lot of 16 times it, you know, the -- it comes from a complaint 17 by a neighbor or somebody that might be affected by -- or someone who has a personal interest in a 18 19 condition, and they'll bring it to our -- to the 20 attention of either the county or the state Land use Commission. And that's what raises the -- the flag, 21 2.2 so to speak. But there's no proactive monitoring. 23 It's always been -- that's -- that's not 100 24 percent.

Sure.

COMMISSIONER U'U:

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioner Lee. 1 2. COMMISSIONER LEE: Thank you. Yeah. Just 3 to clarify, this bill doesn't do enforcement. It's just to monitor compliance, right? So let's say the 4 5 pharma ag tells us, hey, these guys are not in compliance, what would the next step be? 6 MR. ORODENKER: 7 The next step would be for us to schedule a hearing to -- well, special permits 8 9 don't technically have the order to show cause 10 provision in them, but what we can do is we can revoke the special permit. 11 12 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Could you ask for a 13 status? 14 MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, we -- we would ask 15 for a status conference and then give the petitioners the opportunity or the landowner the 16 17 opportunity to explain to us why or -- why or why 18 they are not in compliance with the decision and 19 Since special permits are -- have -- have a 20 limited time frame anyway, I mean, we have the 21 ability to shorten that time based on the evidence 2.2 that's presented to us. So this is an area that is 23 sort of in the twilight zone of land use. And in 24 Hawaii, most of the time in the past when special 25 permits have been violated, this resulted in a

```
lawsuit, and we weren't even involved, so.
 1
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioner Lee.
 2.
 3
             COMMISSIONER LEE: Thank you for the
    explanation. I'm wondering, why don't we just
 4
 5
    support the bill? Why just support the intent?
             MR. ORODENKER: Well, because we don't
 6
 7
    want to step on the other agency's toes. You know,
    if Mary Alice, for instance, of Office of Planning
 8
 9
    and Sustainable Development is going to come in and
10
    say, you know, we just don't have the staff to do
    this, or ADC is going to say the same thing. That's
11
12
    not our call.
13
             COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay.
                                       Thank you.
14
             MR. ORODENKER: Yeah.
15
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: I got a question,
16
    Chair.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Sure. Commissioner
17
18
    Kahele.
19
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: Yeah, so which
20
    agency would they be looking at in -- in accomplish
    this -- this goal? Are we looking at funding this
21
2.2
    agency or funding the agency is going to be
23
    monitoring?
24
             MR. ORODENKER: That's up to the
25
    legislature.
```

```
1
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: So we're looking at
 2.
   monies.
            We need monies.
 3
             MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. I mean, if -- if I
    were Mary Alice, for instance, or ADC, and I was --
 4
 5
    and the bill was moving, I would tell the
    legislature that I couldn't do it unless they gave
 6
 7
    me some money.
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE:
                                   Thank you.
 8
 9
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Mr. Derrickson.
10
             MR. DERRICKSON: If I might maybe just a
    little bit more context. Remember that special
11
12
    permits that are more than 15 acres go through the
13
    county first, and the county generally puts
14
    conditions on that special permit. One of those
15
    conditions often is a -- a condition that if things
    are not being done consistent with the special
16
17
    permit, that the county can revert the special
18
    permit. Also, chapter 205-12 puts the enforcement
19
    authority for things that are going on in the
20
    agricultural district on the counties. So that's --
21
    that's where usually the action, as Dan was
2.2
    indicating, takes place. Oftentimes, there would
23
    have to be a lawsuit to enforce.
24
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So it's not explicitly
25
    monitoring, but it -- isn't it often the provision
```

```
to stay abreast of the progress by a condition
 1
 2.
    requiring annual reports?
 3
             MR. DERRICKSON:
                              Yes, exactly, right.
    again, the annual reports are on the petitioner, the
 4
 5
    applicant, to -- to do, to give to the counties, to
    give to Office of Planning and the -- and the Land
 6
    Use Commission. But then the responsibility for
 7
    doing, you know, any fact checking of what's put in
 8
 9
    those annual reports, that's kind of the
10
    question mark. And that -- that goes to the
    monitoring.
11
                                 But if the annual
12
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
13
    reports are delinquent, that's a red flag that --
    there's probably something not going forward and,
14
15
    and that would come to our attention and we could
16
    ask for a -- a hearing to show progress or a status
17
             Is that right?
    report.
18
                              Right, that's correct.
             MR. DERRICKSON:
19
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: And the county could
20
    do the same?
21
             MR. DERRICKSON: The county could do the
2.2
           Yeah.
    same.
23
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Thank you.
24
             Anything further on this one before I try
25
    to summarize?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
So we agree with the intent of this
         Okay.
-- our position is we agree with the intent. We're
not going to specifically say that we are in support
or in opposition in part because it -- it does
require other agencies to actually put -- to
implement the provisions, and it's up to them to
make their own case or if they're able to do that.
But increased monitoring of the -- of a decision and
order's requirements is something that we would
welcome, and we empower the -- we authorize the
executive director to make that case.
         MR. ORODENKER:
                         Thank you, Chair.
         CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                             Okay, fair enough.
      So I didn't mention that we will be taking
about a five-minute break on an hourly basis just
for biomedical reasons, but we're going to lose some
commissioners here in the early afternoon.
                                            So even
though we've arranged for lunch, we're going to try
power through, okay? See if we can --
         So I know that Commissioner Carr Smith,
your -- your stop is at 1:30. Is that correct?
1:45.
         Anybody have a stop before 1:45 today?
Hearing none, we'll. We'll shoot for 1:30 and --
and see if we can do that. Thank you.
```

Next one is item number 13, which 1 Okay. 2. is House Bill 826. Ms. Kwan, does anybody want to 3 testify on that one? 4 THE CLERK: Seeing none in the O and A 5 feature, Chair. 6 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Thank you. Mr. Orodenker, please give us a summary of 7 this bill and your recommendations on testimony, if 8 9 any. 10 MR. ORODENKER: This is an Amendment to Chapter 201H but it references Chapter 205, and it 11 12 authorizes HHFDC to work on projects. It doesn't 13 talk about funding, so I don't -- I don't know what 14 the interconnection is here -- to develop 15 residential housing for long-term rental or workforce fee simple ownership, and they may be 16 17 permitted by a county planning commission under this 18 section provided that the project area is no larger than 100 acres immediately adjacent to the urban 19 20 district on lands with soil classified CDERU and 21 identified on maps for only residential use in a 22 county comprehensive general plan. 23 And it says that all applications to the 24 county planning commission shall include written

concurrence from the executive director. I'm not

25

2.

sure whether that references the executive director of the Land Use Commission or the executive director of HHFDC has reviewed the project and his agreement that the proposal is solely inclusive of residential housing for long-term rental or workforce fee simple ownership. And then it says that applicants shall be -- applications shall be reviewed pursuant to the process set forth in section 205-6, which is our special use permit process, and that section 91-9 which requires a contested case hearing shall only apply at the point of county planning commission review.

This is another one of those bills where I -- I don't know what to make of it. It's kind of a chop suey bill. It impacts a lot of different areas without specifying how it's going to work. My -- my feeling on this measure is that until it moves on and there may be some amendments that we should stay out of it. I don't think that allowing special use permits for -- my main problem with the bill is that allowing SUPs to be used for permanent housing is inconsistent with chapter 205. But, you know, I -- I don't -- I can't get my arms around this bill because it doesn't make a lot of sense.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So you adequately

confused me. 1 2. MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. My suggestion on 3 testimony is that we testify that -- the way I would testify on this bill, if the commission agrees, is 4 5 that we're very supportive of any efforts to increase the amount of workforce housing and senior 6 7 housing. However, there are some serious flaws with this bill that would need to be ironed out before we 8 were comfortable with it. 9 10 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. And give me a 11 -- so --MR. ORODENKER: Well, it's unclear as to 12 13 14 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Give me an example of 15 a flaw. MR. ORODENKER: Okay. It's unclear as 16 17 whether -- as to whether the executive director is -- refers to the executive director of HHFDC or the 18 Land Use Commission, number one. 19 20 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Give me another 21 flaw. 22 MR. ORODENKER: Okay. No, it doesn't. 23 So, yeah, that's -- that's why it's unclear. It's also unclear whether this is intended to result in a 24 25 district boundary amendment using the SUP process or

```
it's whether it's going to result in a special use
 1
 2.
    permit for residential housing. I'm not sure
 3
    whether or not the legislature intends either one of
    those things. It's unclear.
 4
 5
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Commissioners,
 6
    questions?
                Suggestions?
 7
             COMMISSIONER U'U: I like most of what you
    said, but I would, I would err the side of we have
 8
    issues or concerns instead of saying major concerns.
 9
10
    I just -- minus the one prior to concerns, I think
    we find.
11
12
             MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, I don't actually --
13
    I -- I shouldn't have used the word major. We never
    -- we never use the word major when we draft
14
15
    testimony. We just say we have concerns.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioner Carr
16
17
    Smith.
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: I echo that, and
18
19
    I just encourage you to lead with the support part.
20
             MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, we always do.
21
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH:
                                       Okay.
22
             MR. ORODENKER:
                             I mean, the --
23
                                 Support, the intent.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
24
             MR. ORODENKER: Yes.
                                   Yeah. The -- the
25
    difficulty with some of these bills is that they are
```

```
works in progress and without being clear on what
 1
    the intent is, you know, by the drafter of the bill,
 2.
    I don't know how to tell them to fix it, you know,
    or how to assist them in fixing it, so.
 4
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So, commissioners,
 5
    anything further? So what I'm hearing is that, and
 6
    I'll attempt to summarize, that we ask you to
 7
    testify saying that we appreciate and support the
 8
 9
    intent of the bill to the extent that we can
10
    understand it and that operationally, we have a
    number of concerns the way it is written, and that
11
12
    has to be cleaned up before it -- it could put -- it
13
    be put into effect.
14
                             That is correct.
             MR. ORODENKER:
15
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Good with that.
16
    Okay. Anybody want to testify, Ms. Kwan?
17
                        Nobody has used the Q and A
             THE CLERK:
18
    feature for testimony.
19
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Okay, great.
                                                So we'll
20
    move on to agenda item number 14, which is a
    decision on the Commission's position regarding SB
21
    1332 and Companion Bill HB 103.
2.2
23
             Ms. Kwan, does anybody want to testify on
24
    these two?
25
             THE CLERK: Nobody on the Zoom has used
```

2.

2.2

the Q and A feature to testify.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Mr. Orodenker, will you give us a summary of this bill and your recommendations, how to testify, if any?

MR. ORODENKER: The summary that's contained on the -- on the agenda is pretty accurate. This is an attempt to circumvent the lawsuit that is currently up at the Supreme Court with regard to important agricultural lands. I understand what they're trying to do, and I -- I actually agree with it.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Explain it to us.

MR. ORODENKER: Okay. So when the City and County of Honolulu came in with their important agricultural land designation proposal, there were a number of issues that were raised during the course of that hearing, one of them being notice because it took eight years for them to complete it. And -- but another big issue that was raised -- I'm not sure if it was legitimate, and that's why we're waiting for the -- to hear from the Supreme Court, is that the land -- designating land IAL changes the landowner's interest in their land because the IAL statute could be read to say that only people associated with farming the land could live on the

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

property. I think that was an inaccurate interpretation, but the courts are going to tell us whether that's correct or not.

So what this bill does is it tries to clarify that -- actually, it removes the -- the language in the IAL section of our statutes. the implication would be that the designation of IAL lands does not change the provisions of Chapter 205 with regard to regular agricultural land that would allow housing and people to live on the property. We're kind of dancing around on the head of a pin This is an attempt to fix that. here. think we have a problem with the intent, but most of the legislators are aware that this is up at the Supreme Court, so I'm not sure this bill is going to have any legs. My proposal on testimony is that we're just -- we support the intent, but we're there to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So I'd like to just take a moment and share with my fellow commissioners my recollection of this hearing that we had on IAL land that was brought forward by City and County Honolulu. I understood at the time that the counties independently could do, through a planning study, and designate IAL lands in their county and

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

then bring that to the Land Use Commission that says, we've done this study, these maps, this analysis, and we're going to make these lands IAL.

The Land Use Commission denied or rejected their plan. After -- and they worked really hard on It took years. They didn't meet the deadlines, it. they'd come in late, all that stuff, and the other counties haven't even done it. They've been letting Honolulu go first. It was rejected on the base -on two bases that I recall. One was that the affected landowners on Honolulu did not get proper notification. There were -- there was an attorney that represented a thousand landowners that said my thousand people didn't -- never got noticed that this was even going on, so we couldn't interact with the -- with the City and County Honolulu to make our case, number one.

And number two, it was rejected because it appeared, based on the criteria that was used, that it was very much in favor of large landowners. But the small landowners, the small farms were, like, being forced to kind of go along, and they weren't getting adequate hearing, so it was out of -- out of balance. So it was rejected with the -- with the suggestion go fix those problems and come back to us

2.

2.2

and -- and then maybe we can, you know, make sure everybody gets a notice, make sure everybody gets an opportunity to say what they want about their land.

And then there was these other items like this one about, could you live on the land if it's designated. It was very confusing to all of us, right? But it was rejected, and nothing's come forth since then. Now you got this lawsuit. Is that correct?

MR. ORODENKER: That's correct. I mean, this is type of thing that attorneys just love, you know, because it's --

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Lawsuits.

MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. It's the issue with whether or not you could live on the property was directly connected to the constitution and -- the U.S. Constitution and rights and property. And so the argument was that this is a due process issue and that landowners are entitled to a due process hearing before they can -- things can be designated IAL. The difficulty that the county had, and I happen to agree with the county on this one, is that, you know, the IAL statute -- and -- and I was actually involved at the legislature when this was being promulgated.

The IAL statute was an attempt by the
legislature to deal with the Supreme Court's
continual reprimanding of of the legislature
because they didn't implicateimplement Article 11
of the Constitution, which requires important
agricultural lands to be protected, so they came up
with this process. It was recognized at the time
that it was voted on on the floor that it was flawed
and that it needed it was going to need further
review. The legislature never took it up again.
And so we're stuck with something that really
doesn't work all that well.
CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: My personal sense was
that if we at the time, if the Land Use
Commission would have accepted the Honolulu City and
County Honolulu plan, it would have been a thousand
lawsuits.
MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, yeah.
CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: To follow. And
nothing would happen. It was a mess.
MR. ORODENKER: In my personal opinion,
the IAL statute would have been much better
because the IAL what the IAL statute was really
intended to do was to be a planning tool. It was
supposed to give the counties the ability to

2.

2.2

designate where the most important agricultural lands were in the state so they could be preserved in compliance with the Constitution. It wasn't intended to change anybody's interest in land.

And so the County and Land Use Commission staff were taken aback by this argument that, well, you know, if you -- if you change what the criteria for living on the land, then it's a due process issue. The statute would have been much better, and this is kind of what this bill intends to do, if they hadn't mentioned the residential issue at all and just left it as part of 205-4.5 with regard to general agricultural land, then it wouldn't have been an issue at all. But because the statute contains that provision, there was an argument that there was a due process.

COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: This one?

MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. No, no. This bill. Yeah, yeah. This bill would take out that separate section in the IAL statute on housing so that it would go back to 205-4.5, which would solve -- maybe solve one of the problems with the IAL statute. But I mean, personally, I believe that we should wait until the Supreme Court renders the decision. But I mean, I -- I don't -- what, what this bill is

```
attempting to do, we don't have a problem with, and
 1
 2.
    we actually support.
 3
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 So you are
    recommending that you would testify --
 4
 5
             MR. ORODENKER:
                             In support.
 6
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: -- in support?
             MR. ORODENKER: In support with concerns.
 7
                                 In support with
 8
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
 9
    concerns.
10
             MR. ORODENKER: And the concern would be
11
    that the matter is up in front of the Supreme Court,
12
    and anything that the legislature does may get
13
    undone.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So the cart before the
14
15
    horse argument?
             MR. ORODENKER: Yes.
16
17
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioners,
18
    anything further?
19
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: I've got a guestion.
20
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Go ahead, Commissioner
21
    Kahele.
2.2
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: When you refer to
23
    farm cluster housing and there's going to be an
24
    incentive, is the incentive going to be for the
25
    actual worker or it's going to be for the owner of
```

Τ	the farm?
2	MR. ORODENKER: For the landowner?
3	COMMISSIONER KAHELE: The landowner.
4	Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioner Carr
6	Smith.
7	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Yeah. Just for
8	the record, I I like most of what I read here. I
9	think it sounds great and addresses housing issues.
LO	Sustainability in terms of our food production,
11	might make that easier. I just think there's a lot
L2	of things about this that are good.
L3	MR. ORODENKER: In a vacuum, we would just
L4	support this bill flat out.
L5	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Yeah.
L6	MR. ORODENKER: But because of the Supreme
L7	because it's up at the Supreme Court.
L8	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: It's a cart and horse.
L9	Cart and horse.
20	MR. ORODENKER: We have to warn the
21	legislature that, hey, look, you know
22	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: That's out of
23	our control, the Supreme Court. But we can
24	MR. ORODENKER: Yeah.
25	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: We can support

1 this. 2. MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. 3 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. So our position is that we would support this bill. However, it's 4 5 complicated because there's an active Supreme Court case that could render it moot, and we should wait. 6 7 Our position is wait till that clarifies, and then the bill might be considered at that time. 8 9 makes sense. 10 MR. ORODENKER: That's correct, yes. 11 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. 12 MR. ORODENKER: That's what I'm 13 suggesting. 14 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Ms. Kwan, any further 15 public testimony on this item? 16 THE CLERK: Seeing none in the O and A feature, Chair. 17 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay, great. We'll 18 19 move forward to our next item. We'll take this one, 20 and then we'll take a break. This is decision on commission planning SB, Senate Bill 1099. Anybody 21 2.2 sign up for testimony on 1099? 23 THE CLERK: Nobody's used the Q and A 24 feature, Chair. 25 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Mr. Orodenker,

23

24

25

82243 would you give us a summary of Senate Bill 1099 and 1 2. your recommendations? 3 MR. ORODENKER: We would strongly support this measure except for the fact that there's no 4 5 money with it. The counties haven't been able to -or have not -- chosen not to undertake the IAL 6 7 designation process, and that's a concern. CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: What is the bill. 8 9 MR. ORODENKER: Oh, I'm sorry. The bill 10 is to --authorizes the Land Use Commission -- it's very simple. It authorizes the Land Use Commission 11 12 to designate the lands as important agricultural 13 If the county fails to identify IAL lands by 14 December 31, 2027. Like I say, the counties haven't 15 done it. They view it as an unfunded mandate, and to a certain extent they're correct. It takes a lot 16 17 of staff and effort to do this. We welcome the opportunity to undertake it. But I would point out 18 19 to the legislature that we currently don't have the 20 staff to undertake it and that we would need funding and positions to do it. 21

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So basically it's not being done. The deadline will likely be approached, but this bill would then shift the responsibility to Land Use Commission. Land Use Commission would

welcome it provided that it is funded to do so. 1 2. MR. ORODENKER: And there's a two-year 3 time frame for the counties to come forward. So, I mean, one of the things about this bill is that if 4 5 it does pass, we have two years to work the legislature for funding. If the counties don't --6 7 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Then you should raise 8 that issue now anyway. 9 MR. ORODENKER: Yes, we'll start now. 10 takes at least two or three cycles before we get 11 money, so. 12 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Commissioners, 13 questions, comments? Hearing none, then we would concur with your recommended approach, which is to 14 15 support the intent of the bill because the IAL is not being done by the counties and they may not make 16 17 that deadline. If they don't, it would shift to us, but we wouldn't have the resources to do it. 18 there needs to be some companion legislation to 19 20 provide dollars, correct? That is correct. 21 MR. ORODENKER: 22 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. 23 I got a question, COMMISSIONER KAHELE: 24 Chair. So we are actually -- Dan is actually going 25 to go up and support the bill?

```
CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: The intent. Yeah.
 1
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: The intent of the
 2.
 3
   bill.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Correct? Or would you
 4
 5
    want to be stronger than that?
             MR. ORODENKER: I think it amounts to the
 6
    same thing. You know, I mean, we're supporting the
 7
    bill, but we're saying we'll do it, but give us
 8
 9
    money, so.
10
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Ms. Kwan, anybody want
11
    to testify on this?
12
             THE CLERK: Seeing none in the O and A
13
    feature, Chair.
14
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. So we've got --
15
    I think we've got four left. Let's take a five-
    minute break, and we'll come back at 11:01 or 11:02.
16
17
    Take a recess.
18
             (Recess taken from 10:56 to 11:02 a.m.)
19
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. We'll go back
20
    in session. It is 11:02. So the next order of
    business is item 16 in our agenda, which is a
21
2.2
    decision on Commission position regarding SB 26 and
23
    HB 1451.
24
             Ms. Kwan, has there been anybody that
25
    signed up for oral testimony on this one?
```

```
THE CLERK: Seeing none in the Q and A
 1
 2.
    feature, Chair.
 3
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Thank you.
 4
             Mr. Orodenker, will you give us a summary
 5
    of this bill and your suggested approach to
    testimony for this bill?
 6
 7
             MR. ORODENKER:
                             Thank you, Mr. Chair.
    -- the only reason we're involved in this bill is
 8
    that the executive director of the LUC is one of the
 9
10
    named members of this task force. Absolutely no
    problem what this task force is attempting to
11
12
    accomplish, and we would testify in support.
13
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Do you see any
14
    concerns in the details?
             MR. ORODENKER: Well, studies are studies.
15
16
    All right. I don't see any, any difficulty.
17
    mean, there are -- it doesn't lay a lot of costs on
18
    us and OPSD because we both already have GIS
    programs, and it also appropriates a million dollars
19
20
    to fund staff positions and for contractual
21
    services. I mean, we would support this -- this
22
              I -- I think that that fact that it has a
    measure.
23
    million dollars attached to it is going to make it
24
    problematic at the legislature.
25
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Who would lead this
```

```
What agency would lead it?
 1
    study?
 2.
             MR. ORODENKER:
                             Excuse me?
 3
                                 What agency would lead
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
 4
    it?
 5
             MR. ORODENKER: The agency is -- that is
    designated as the lead is HCDA, but it's an attached
 6
 7
    task force.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Task force within the
 8
 9
   HCDA?
             MR. ORODENKER: No, it's -- it's only
10
    attached to the HCDA for administrative purposes.
11
    The chair is the -- the head of OPSD.
12
13
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: I'm confused. So the
14
    summary says a task force within HCDA.
15
             MR. ORODENKER: That's kind of inaccurate.
    Because if section 1 of the bill provides there is
16
17
    -- says there is -- established the Affordable
    Housing Land Inventory Task Force to be placed in
18
19
    the Hawaii Community -- Community Development
20
    Authority party for administrative purposes.
21
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 But for --
22
             MR. ORODENKER: Similar to the way we're
23
    attached to --
24
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. But for
25
    execution, it's OPSD?
```

1	MR. ORODENKER: Yes, that's correct.
2	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay.
3	MR. ORODENKER: I mean, I
4	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: That should be cleaned
5	up, right?
6	MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. Yeah. And I expect
7	OPSD to testify to that effect.
8	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Commissioners,
9	questions, concerns, suggestions?
10	Hearing none Carr Smith.
11	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Yeah, it looks
12	like there's a hearing on this tomorrow.
13	MR. ORODENKER: I haven't I've been
14	here, so I haven't been checking.
15	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Yeah, yeah.
16	Yes. So just pointing that out in case you didn't
17	see that.
18	MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. I mean, our
19	testimony would be irrelevant to this because all we
20	were going to say would be, "We support."
21	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Yeah,
22	understood.
23	MR. ORODENKER: You know, and OPSD is the
24	one we would expect to take the lead on this.
25	COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Yeah. Thank

1 you. Okay. So the quidance 2. CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: 3 is that our position is we would support it, ask you to support it, subject to -- and attend the hearing 4 5 if you can. MR. ORODENKER: Yes, that's correct. 6 7 we would -- our testimony would -- if we -- I don't think we have time to get it in. But if the bill --8 9 if the bill moves forward, our next -- at the next 10 hearing, our testimony would be that we support the measure, and we defer it to OPSD with regard to any 11 technical issues. 12 13 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Good with me. Anybody else? Yeah, we'll go forward with as -- as 14 15 you suggest. Ms. Kwan, has anybody signed up to testify 16 on this? 17 THE CLERK: Seeing none in the Q and A 18 19 feature, Chair. 20 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay, great, 16. one is 17. 17 is a decision on Commission's 21 2.2 position regarding SB 498 and House Bill 1294. 23 Ms. Kwan, anybody want to testify on this 24 one?

THE CLERK: Seeing none in the Q and A

25

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

feature Chair.

CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Thank you.

Mr. Orodenker, please summarize this bill, these bills, and your recommendation.

MR. ORODENKER: This again is establish a workforce housing group. This one attached to the Agricultural ADC, The Agricultural Development Corporation. Once again, the reason that we're involved is the -- we're named -- the executive director is named -- or the chairperson, actually in this case, so would be -- of the Land Use Commission is directed as a member of the task force, the mayors, the County Planning Department, the Hawaii Farm Bureau, the Hawaii Aq Foundation, Hawaii -- I mean, the intent of this bill is very good, but its -- its implementation will be near impossible because it's so unwieldy. And it also appropriates \$100,000 for the task force, and the task force is located within the -- I think it's -- am I -- am I reading this, correctly, Scott, within ADC? Oh, no, the Department of Agriculture. Yeah, yeah.

We don't have a problem with this, and we're more than happy to participate. I think my testimony would be to suggest that with regard to the section that calls for the chairperson, the Land

```
Use Commission, to -- to participate, I would just
 1
    add the words "or his designee." So the chairperson
 2.
    isn't overburdened with this.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioners, any
 4
 5
    comments, questions?
             Hearing none, I think there is agreement
 6
    to support the intent of the bill, but to clarify
 7
    the respective role of the EO to be himself or his
 8
 9
    designee, although you might comment that it looks a
10
    bit unwieldy as it's currently drafted. Yeah.
11
             Okay. Ms. Kwan, anybody want to testify
    on that?
12
13
             THE CLERK: Seeing none in the Q and A
14
    feature, Chair.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Excellent. So we'll
15
    move on to item number 18, which is a decision --
16
17
    our decision -- our position regarding SB197.
             Ms. Kwan, anybody want to testify on 197?
18
19
             THE CLERK: Seeing none in the Q and A
20
    feature, Chair.
21
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Mr. Orodenker, please
2.2
    give us your summary of this bill and
23
    recommendations on testimony.
24
             MR. ORODENKER:
                             This bill would require
25
    enhanced notice if we were going to do it -- as it
```

1	applies to us, if we're going to do a district
2	boundary amendment. Within 30 days of filing of a
3	permit application we have we would have to
4	provide public notice. And within four months of
5	the filing
6	of a permit application, we would have to conduct no
7	fewer than three public meetings or hearings. This
8	is where I think it it kind of comes off the
9	rails,
10	and that's Section 3. Before proceeding with the
11	project, obtain the community's approval of the
12	project through our referendum. Notice of the I
13	mean, I I don't think I need to read much more of
14	this. I mean, this would bring development to a
15	screeching halt.
16	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: This this sounds
17	like something that will upset Commissioner U'u and
18	me.
19	MR. ORODENKER: Yeah.
20	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: This is going in the
21	opposite direction of making progress and and
22	streamlining the process.
23	MR. ORODENKER: I I cannot in good
24	faith support this bill because I think it'll have a
25	very negative impact on the amount of time it takes

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
to process permits and applications. I mean, this
doesn't just apply to us. It applies to UH, and it
applies to -- what's the other agency that it
applies to? DHHL, yeah.
         CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So who's sponsoring
this bill? Who -- where'd it come from?
         MR. ORODENKER: Kurt Fevella.
         COMMISSIONER U'U: Fevella had submitted
it before.
         MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. This -- yeah.
                                               Ι
mean, I'm -- yeah, it's -- it's -- the chances of
this having to testify on this bill are very low.
         CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                             But assuming you -- it
does make it to hearing, are you recommending we
testify in opposition?
         MR. ORODENKER: We're not -- if this
commission authorizes me to do so, I will draft
testimony in opposition. But absent that, what I
would do is I would express that we are -- the
testimony will read that we are in favor of measures
that increase transparency. However, this bill is
-- has significant flaws and make reference to that
specific section and would say this would result in
projects being delayed for many years.
```

COMMISSIONER LEE: Chair, I'd like to send

1	a stronger message than that. I'll make the motion
2	to oppose this bill.
3	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: So I'm we're in
4	discussion right now. I'm not calling for motions,
5	but I think your point is well taken, Commissioner
6	Lee. I think we have a choice. Choice is to
7	proceed with raising red flags and cautions about it
8	as being something. But we also have the option to
9	send a stronger message, which is to explicitly
10	oppose it. I want all commissioners to understand
11	those options. And now I'll call for a motion.
12	So, Mr. Lee, would you like to make a
13	motion?
14	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, Chair, I move that
15	we oppose SB197 and/or authorize the executive
16	director to submit testimony opposing SB197.
17	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Do I have a second to
18	that?
19	COMMISSIONER KAHELE: I have a couple of
20	questions.
21	CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: You'll have
22	opportunity, but I need a second first before we
23	even get there.
24	Does anybody second the motion to formally
25	authorize executive officer to oppose?

1 COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: I'll second it 2. for discussion. 3 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. Now we have So first, maybe answer your question, 4 discussion. 5 Mr. Lee. Why do you want to send a stronger 6 message? I think just to be 7 COMMISSIONER LEE: consistent with all our discussions up to this date, 8 that if we just get a little bit weaselly about it, 9 10 then it doesn't send the right message on our intent and our feelings about this. I think this is just 11 12 -- just an outrageous bill. It would just shut down 13 development completely, as was mentioned earlier. 14 And I don't think we -- that's the position that we 15 should take. I think we should send a strong message if this gets heard to the legislature that 16 17 we oppose something like this and make it clear so that it shows where -- or if that's our position. 18 19 CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: And the -- if I hear 20 you correctly, I'm just trying to get clarity here. 21 It would add more bureaucracy to the process and 2.2 string out the approval process. 23 COMMISSIONER LEE: Yeah, I can't think of 24 any project that would be approved if this was to 25 pass.

```
CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Commissioner Kahele,
 1
 2.
   you had questions?
 3
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: Yes, I got a
    question. You know, we -- well, according to all of
 4
 5
    the bills and many of the bills that's already been
    addressed by the -- whether the state or the -- or
 6
 7
    by the the senators or to the House, we've always
    taken a position to stay neutral. So in this bill,
 8
 9
    Senate Bill 197, if the vote is taken, and it's --
10
    and the motion's passed, what would be the
    director's testimony when he goes out there or
11
12
    submit testimony that he was -- he was given the --
13
    the authority by the commissioners to oppose the
14
    bill, or is he going to be speaking on behalf of
15
    just the department?
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Speaking on behalf of
16
17
    the commission.
             MR. ORODENKER: Yeah. Our testimony would
18
19
    be that the Land Use Commissioners -- the Land Use
20
    Commission has voted to oppose this measure so long
    as it contains -- I mean, it would be longer than
21
2.2
    this, but in a nutshell, so long as it contains
23
    Provision 3.
24
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: All right, thanks.
25
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Provision 3?
```

```
MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, that's the one that
 1
 2.
    requires the referendum.
 3
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Okay. Got it,
    got it.
            I don't know. I -- we haven't said an
 4
 5
    absolute no to anything. I'm not sure that I feel
    that we need to. That's kind of my feeling about
 6
    the matter. I think we can make comments without
 7
    necessarily being super strong on this, but I -- I
 8
 9
    hear where you're coming from, Brian, but I'm not
10
    sure that we need to.
11
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Okay. Mr. U'u?
12
             COMMISSIONER U'U: Same -- same thought
13
              I think we can be diplomatic about this.
    process.
14
    You know, I -- I don't know if it can grow legs or
15
    not, but we can see what happens. I agree with
    Brian, and I agree with Nancy that I think we don't
16
17
    need to put ourselves out there to -- to oppose
18
    something that potentially might not have any legs
    to crawl on, so -- and it's kind of being respectful
19
20
    at the same time, while not being blunt, so.
21
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 I like that.
                                               So
2.2
    anybody on -- or anything from them? I don't see
23
    it.
24
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: I got a comment.
25
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Mr. Kahele.
```

COMMISSIONER KAHELE: You know, and and
most of the bills that's on the list and I got to
agree with with Commissioner Carr. I don't think
we should be getting involved and and now making
one strong position. I understand where Brian's
coming from. You know, he wants to send a strong
message and which is great. But, you know, I got
to agree with Mr. U'u, Commissioner U'u. You know,
might grow legs. We don't know. You know, we're
dealing with some people here that strongly feels
that that we should go through this process that
that's in this bill. But if it's if this bill is
passed, which I don't think it's going to go
anywhere, I mean, we ain't going to get no projects
completed because everybody's got this this
belief that it shouldn't be in my backyard. You
know, we're getting problems down in in my
hometown, you know, with the development going over
there with
CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER KAHELE: You know, I just
want to leave it at that. And I just wanted to add
that comment. Thank you.
MR. ORODENKER: Sure. I
CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: One second.

```
Commissioner?
 1
 2.
             MR. ORODENKER: I just want to point out
 3
    that this bill is actually aimed at Mauna Kea.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 It's what?
 4
             MR. ORODENKER: It's actually aimed at
 5
 6
    Mauna Kea. We just got swept up in it.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: The mountain?
 7
             MR. ORODENKER:
 8
                             Yeah.
                                    TMT.
 9
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Chair, I think
10
    Myles has his hand up.
11
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Okay. I'm going to go
12
    first the Commissioner Lee, and then, Myles, calling
13
    on you.
14
             Commissioner Lee.
15
             COMMISSIONER LEE: Thank you, Chair.
16
    Yeah, I hear what the folks are saying, and -- and
17
    you guys might be surprised, but I can be diplomatic
    sometimes. Everyone's laughing, but, yeah, I mean,
18
19
    if it would help, I could amend the motion to say
20
    just we authorize to oppose Section 3, but, you
    know, if -- the language that all nearby residents
21
2.2
    would do a referendum is just insane, you know.
23
    all residents of the county, but just the nearby
24
    neighbors. I mean, that's the definition of YIMBY,
25
    you know, so. But, you know, if it -- if it helps,
```

```
I'd be open to amending it and -- and just saying to
 1
 2.
    oppose Section three, but I'll defer to everyone
 3
    else's opinion.
 4
                                 Okay, Mr. Miyasato.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
 5
             COMMISSIONER MIYASATO: Thank you, Chair.
    Yeah.
         You know, this definitely has concerns, and I
 6
    think -- well, I know that there's going to be a lot
 7
    of entities to point out the flaws, and I think
 8
 9
    it'll be a great number of entities that are going
10
    to come forward, if this is ever heard, to point out
    the flaws in this. And with that said, I believe
11
12
    that would send a strong enough message and us not
13
    having to take a hard position. Thank you.
14
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                 Thank you,
15
    Commissioner.
             I concur with the -- the consensus I'm
16
17
    hearing from the preponderance of commissioners.
                                                       Wе
    can send a very strong message without, and we can
18
    authorize Dan to -- to send a stronger message
19
20
    without taking a formal position of opposition to
21
               That would be my vote. So I will be
    the bill.
2.2
    voting against the motion.
23
             Commissioner Carr Smith.
24
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: I would actually
25
    encourage you to just withdraw it. I mean, we
```

```
1
    haven't --
 2.
             COMMISSIONER LEE: I was just going to get
 3
    to that. So I withdraw my motion.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
 4
                                 Thank you,
    Commissioner Carr Smith.
 5
             Thank you, Commissioner Lee.
 6
             So the consensus is, Mr. Orodenker, of
 7
    this commission, that we don't like this bill as
 8
 9
    drafted. We're not going to stand in formal
10
    opposition to it, but we encourage you to very
    strongly point out its flaws. And I would earmark
11
12
    this bill that if it does get legs, you bring it
13
    back to the commission for another discussion and
14
    agenda.
15
             MR. ORODENKER: Most certainly will,
16
    Chair.
17
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Is that -- is that
18
    fair, everyone?
19
             UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.
20
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. So, Ms. Kwan,
    anything further in terms of public testimony on
21
22
    this bill?
23
             THE CLERK: Seeing none on the Q and A
24
    feature.
25
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay, great.
                                                Wow.
```

1	It's it's we're getting to the point where
2	we're going to adjourn this meeting, but I want to
3	speak about our next meeting which is February 19th
4	in Maui. So this is a status report. We expect it
5	to last only a couple of hours. So we've made
6	arrangements to schedule the meeting at 9:30 to
7	start, which is gives all the neighbor island
8	folks a time to connect and get there and by 8:45
9	and 45 minutes to then relocate to the meeting
10	location. We're going to continue that meeting.
11	We're going to bomb through because there are a
12	number of commissioners that have hard stops about
13	1:30. So we're going to go four hours with breaks,
14	but we're going to try to adjourn the meeting at
15	1:30 or sooner, which we think we'll be able to do.
16	So please make personal plans accordingly. And I
17	will not be making a lunch request for this meeting.
18	And if all goes well, we'll get to the airport a
19	little early. We can have lunch on our own time at
20	the airport to go home.
21	Is that is that okay with everybody?
22	COMMISSIONER KAHELE: Sure. I just want
23	to make an announcement. I know I made a commitment
24	to attend these meetings we apparently had
25	scheduled,

```
1
    which I wasn't aware of. I got some trust fund
 2.
   meetings I need to attend, so I may not be able to
    come out to these meetings for the 20 and the 21st
    or 19 and the 20th.
 4
 5
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: It's only -- only 19.
 6
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: Yeah. Oh, it's only
 7
    the 19th. Yeah. I'm going to be --
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Let us know.
 8
 9
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: Yes, I will let you
10
    know.
11
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Is it a hybrid
12
    meeting, Ms. Kwan?
13
             THE CLERK: It's an in-person meeting.
                                 It's an in-person
14
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
15
    meeting. So let us know. We'll have a quorum.
16
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE: Yeah, I'll let --
17
    I'll confirm with Ariana.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: It's a status meeting.
18
19
    You could review the -- the Zoom recording after if
20
    you cannot make it.
21
                                   Yes.
                                         Thank you,
             COMMISSIONER KAHELE:
    Chair.
2.2
23
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Okay. So we will not
24
    ask for lunch at that meeting, and we'll ask for a
25
    9:30 start. And let me encourage all -- everybody
```

```
to make travel arrangements to be there by 8:45 and
 1
 2.
    assuming a 1:30 or sooner.
 3
             Commissioner Lee, you had your hand up.
 4
             COMMISSIONER LEE:
                                Yeah.
                                       You kind of
 5
    answered my question. I was wondering why this
    can't be a hybrid meeting.
 6
 7
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Why can it not be a
    hybrid meeting?
 8
 9
             COMMISSIONER LEE: Just equipment issues
10
    or?
11
             THE CLERK:
                         It can.
                                  It's just I'm not
12
    sure if the MACC Internet will go in and out at all,
13
    and it's just to prevent less technical difficulty.
14
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: We have had
15
    difficulties there.
             THE CLERK: Yeah. So that's why I prefer
16
17
    in person. But if the commission wishes, I can do
    it hybrid, and we'll just have to adapt as we go.
18
19
             COMMISSIONER LEE: Understood. I'll make
20
    -- I'll try to make it in person. Thank you.
21
                                 Yeah, so will I.
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                                                    So,
2.2
    yeah, we did check flight schedules from all
23
    neighbor islands, and you can get there. And if we
    adjourn at 1:30, you might even be able to get a
24
25
    direct flight home, depending what island you're
```

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
going to, so. And, of course, Mr. U'u will be
driving down the road. Yeah.
                               So okay.
         COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH:
                                   Chair, can I
make a comment or two?
         CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI:
                            Absolutely.
         COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH:
                                   I just wanted to
say that I really appreciate the conversation over
these bills the last two days. I know that there
was some pushback about whether to even do this, but
I think it was really beneficial for all of us to go
through the process and learn more about things.
                                                  Ιt
brought up a variety of things that I think were
good for us.
         CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Well, good. Good to
hear that. You know, it wasn't easy. You heard my
comments at the outset that I really don't want to
turn this into a lobbying organization or anything
close to it. But I do think it's helpful to have an
understanding of what's going on and to have the
dialogue that we did among us. I, for one, am not a
proponent of the provisions of the Sunshine Law that
doesn't let us talk with each other on common issues
except in parties of two or less. I understand it,
but it just really hamstrings --
```

Understood.

COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH:

```
CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: -- our ability to make
 1
 2.
    progress. So in that basis, I felt it was very
 3
    worthwhile.
 4
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: Yeah, yeah.
 5
             MR. ORODENKER: Yeah, I -- I would also
    like to take a moment to thank the commissioners for
 6
 7
    the discussion. I think that it was very healthy,
    and staff appreciates it.
 8
 9
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Well, good. Thank
10
    you.
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: My other comment
11
12
    was that I appreciate the staff. I know that the
13
    whole testimony thing is a bit bizarre.
14
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Very bizarre.
15
             COMMISSIONER CARR SMITH: And a lot. And
16
    I wanted to wish Miranda Steed a happy birthday.
17
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: Oh, happy birthday,
18
    Miranda.
19
                            Happy birthday.
             UNIDENTIFIED:
20
             CHAIRMAN GIOVANNI: I'm not singing
    though. I can't sing. Okay. Anybody have any
21
2.2
    last-minute comments or questions? If not, I'm
23
    going to move -- I'm going to adjourn. Okay.
24
    meeting is adjourned.
25
             (Meeting concluded at 11:27 a.m.)
```

I, Leslie Gordon, do hereby certify that
the proceeding named herein was professionally
transcribed on the date set forth in the certificate
herein; that I transcribed all testimony adduced and
other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter;
and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a
full, true, and correct record of such testimony
adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole
thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 20th day of February, 2025.

Leslie Lordon

Leslie Gordon