McCORRISTON MILLER MUKAI MacKINNON LLP CLIFFORD J. MILLER 1406-0 <u>miller@m4law.com</u> JONATHAN H. STEINER 6084-0 <u>Steiner@m4law.com</u> 500 Ala Moana Boulevard Five Waterfront Plaza, 4th Floor Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Telephone: (808) 529-7300 Facsimile: (808) 524-8293

JOHN S. RAPACZ 4408-0 <u>rapacz@hawaii.rr.com</u> P.O. Box 2776 Wailuku, HI 96793 Telephone: (808) 244-6955 Facsimile: (808) 244-6956

Attorneys for HONUA'ULA PARTNERS, LLC 60536

BEFORE THE LAND USE COMMISSION

STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of the Petition of)	DOCKET NO. A-94-706
)	
KAONOULU RANCH)	HONUA'ULA PARTNERS, LLC'S
)	MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION
To Amend the Agricultural Land Use District)	TO MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION,
Boundary into the Urban Land Use District)	INC., SOUTH MAUI CITIZENS FOR
for approximately 88 acres at Kaonoulu,)	RESPONSIBLE GROWTH and DANIEL
Makawao-Wailuku, Maui, Hawai'i)	KANAHELE'S PRE-HEARING MOTION
)	IN LIMINE REGARDING SCOPE OF
)	EVIDENCE; CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
)	
)	Hearing:
)	Date: November 1 and 2, 2012
)	Time: 10:00 a.m.
)	

2012 OCT 30 A 8.5

HONUA'ULA PARTNERS, LLC'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC., SOUTH MAUI CITIZENS FOR RESPONSIBLE GROWTH and DANIEL KANAHELE'S PRE-HEARING <u>MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING SCOPE OF EVIDENCE</u>

I. INTRODUCTION

Honua'ula Partners, LLC's ("Honua'ula"), by and through their attorneys, McCorriston Miller Mukai MacKinnon LLP, submits this Memorandum in Opposition to Maui Tomorrow Foundation, Inc., South Maui Citizens for Responsible Growth and Daniel Kanahele's Pre-Hearing Motion in Limine Regarding Scope of Evidence, dated October 24, 2012 ("Motion in Limine"). While Honua'ula agrees that the evidence presented to the Commission should be limited to material relevant to the Order to Show Cause, Honua'ula disagrees entirely with Intervenors' application of that rule to the evidence offered by Honua'ula The Motion in Limine should be denied as to the exhibits and proposed testimony submitted by Honua'ula.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Material Presented to the Commission in Support of the Petition for Land Use District Boundary Amendment by Kaonoulu Ranch is Relevant.

The Motion in Limine seeks to exclude Honua'ula Exhibits 2 and 3, both of which consist either of materials submitted to the Commission as part of the Original Petitioner's request for a boundary amendment, or testimony to the Commission as part of that request. Honua'ula respectfully submits that the materials submitted to the Commission by the Original Petitioner Kaono'ulu Ranch are <u>directly relevant</u> to the issue of whether Condition 15 of the Decision and Order has been violated. Condition 15 of the Order provides as follows:

15. Petitioner shall develop the **Property in substantial compliance with the representations made to the Commission.** Failure to so develop the Property may result in reversion of the Property to its former classification, or change to a more appropriate classification. (Emphasis added.) The materials submitted by the Original Petitioner which Intervenors seek to preclude contain the representations made to the Commission. It is those representations with which the development must substantially comply. This evidence is clearly relevant.¹

B. Exhibits Regarding Honua'ula's Annual Compliance Report May be Relevant

Intervenors have introduced many exhibits related to the proceedings related to the Wailea 670 project, and are expected to make that project a significant part of their case. Honua'ula Exhibits 6 and 8 are Honua'ula's annual compliance reports, and contain potentially relevant material to rebut the claims of Intervenors with regards to that project. They are potentially relevant, and their admissibility should be determined when they are offered into evidence.

> C. Exhibits Regarding Compliance with Zoning and the Community Plan May be Relevant.

Honua'ula Exhibits 9 and10 are copies of testimony of witnesses who are expected to testify herein for the Department of Planning, County of Maui. Honua'ula has submitted these exhibits as past statements of those witnesses, which may prove cumulative depending on how said witnesses testify. Whether they should be admitted or not should be determined when they are offered into evidence. These two exhibits relate to whether the proposed development complies with the current zoning and the Kihei-Makena Community Plan. Intervenors have attempted to assert both of these issues into this proceeding, and these exhibits rebut Intervenors' evidence.

¹ Ironically, two of Intervenors' exhibits, I-1 and I-3, are materials submitted to the Commission as part of the original Petition, and would be excluded under the rationale in the Motion in Limine. In fact, some of the material in Intervenors' Exhibit I-3 is identical to that which they seek to exclude.

Finally, Honua'ula Exhibit 7 relates directly to school impact fees on the Island of Maui, an issue which has been raised by the State Office of Planning. Intervenors articulate no reason why this exhibit is not relevant or should be excluded.

III. CONCLUSION

ŧ

For the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set for the in by the Department of Planning, County of Maui's Memorandum in Opposition to Intervenors' Motion *In Limine* Regarding Scope of Evidence, the Motion in Limine should be denied.

Dated: Honolulu, Hawai'i, October 30, 2012.

CLIFFORD J. MILLER JOEL D. KAM JONATHAN H. STEINER

Attorneys for HONUA'ULA PARTNERS, LLC

BEFORE THE LAND USE COMMISSION

STATE OF HAWAII

)))

In the Matter of the Petition of

KAONOULU RANCH

To Amend the Agricultural Land Use District)Boundary into the Urban Land Use District)for approximately 88 acres at Kaonoulu,)Makawao-Wailuku, Maui, Hawai'i)

DOCKET NO. A-94-706

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THE UNDERSIGNED HEREBY CERTIFIES that on this date, a true and correct copy

of the foregoing document was duly served upon the following party via U.S. Mail and

electronic mail, addressed as follows:

TOM PIERCE, ESQ. <u>tom@mauilandlaw.com</u> P.O. Box 798 Makawao, Hawaiʻi 96768

Bryan C. Yee <u>Bryan.C.Yee@hawaii.gov</u> Deputy Attorney General Department of the Attorney General 435 Queen Street Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

Jesse K. Souki, Director <u>Jesse,K.Souki@dbedt.hawaii.gov</u> Office of Planning State of Hawai'i Leiopapa a Kamehameha, Room 600 235 South Beretania Street Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

William Spence, Director <u>William.Spence@co.maui.hi.us</u> County of Maui, Office of Planning 250 S. High Street Kalana Pakui Building, Suite 200 Wailuku, Hawai'i 96793 Jane Elizabeth Lovell, Esq. <u>Jane.Lovell@co.maui.hi.us</u> Michael Hopper, Esq. <u>Michael.Hopper@co.maui.hi.us</u> Corporation Counsel County of Maui 200 South High Street Kalana O Maui Building, 3rd Floor Wailuku, Hawai'i 96793

Dated: Honolulu, Hawai'i, October 30, 2012.

CLIFFORD J. MILLER JOEL D. KAM JONATHAN H. STEINER

Attorneys for HONUA'ULA PARTNERS, LLC

Ð