ORIGINAL

1	LAND USE COMMISSION
2	STATE OF HAWAI'I
3	ACTION PAGE
4 5	A83-557 Princeville Development) 7 Corporation (Kaua'i))
6 7	A06-771 D.R. HORTON-SCHULER) HOMES, LLC)) 14 (O'ahu)
8)
9	
10	TDANGCDIDE OF DROGEDDINGS
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	
12	The above-entitled matters came on for a Public
13	Hearing at Conference Room 204, 2nd Floor, Leiopapa A
14	Kamehameha, 235 S. Beretania Street, Honolulu,
15	Hawai'i, commencing at 9:50 a.m. on June 30, 2011,
16	2011, pursuant to Notice.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	REPORTED BY: HOLLY M. HACKETT, CSR #130, RPR Certified Shorthand Reporter
23	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
24	
25	

APPEARANCES 1 COMMISSIONERS: KYLE CHOCK THOMAS CONTRADES 3 VLADIMIR DEVENS (Chairman) RONALD HELLER LISA M. JUDGE 5 NORMAND LEZY JAYE NAPUA MAKUA ERNEST MATSUMURA NICHOLAS TEVES, JR. (Also Present: COMMISSIONER CHAD MCDONALD) EXECUTIVE OFFICER: ORLANDO DAVIDSON 8 ACTING CHIEF CLERK: RILEY HAKODA STAFF PLANNERS: BERT SARUWATARI, SCOTT DERRICKSON DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL: DIANE ERICKSON, ESQ. 10 AUDIO TECHNICIAN: WALTER MENCHING 11 12 Docket No. A83-557 Princeville Development Corporation 13 BENJAMIN MATSUBARA, ESQ. 14 For the Petitioner: CURTIS TABATA, ESQ. ABBEY MAYER VP Princeville 15 BRYAN YEE, ESQ. 16 For the State: Deputy Attorney General MARY LOU KOBAYASHI 17 Office of Planning 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	A P	PEARANCES (cont'd)
2	Docket No. A06-771 D.R. HO	RTON-SCHULER HOMES, LLC
3		
4	For the Petitioner:	BENJAMIN KUDO, ESQ. YUKO FUNAKI, ESQ.
5		CAMERON NEKOTA, VP
6		
7	For the County:	DAWN TAKEUCHI-APUNA, ESQ. Deputy Corporation Counsel
8		TIM HATA, DPP
9	For the State:	BRYAN YEE, ESQ. Deputy Attorney General
10		MARY LOU KOBAYASHI Office of Planning
11		011100 01 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
12	For the Intervenor: Friends of Makakilo	KIONI DUDLEY
13	Triding of manager	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

This meeting is called to CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 1 Good morning to everybody. This is a meeting 2 order. of the Land Use Commission. Today is June 30, 2011. 3 We're here in Honolulu for today's agenda. order of business is the adoption of the minutes. Are 5 there any corrections or changes to the minutes? 6 There being none is there a motion to adopt? 7 So moved. COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: COMMISSIONER TEVES: Second. 9 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any discussion? There 10 being none all those in favor say aye. 11 (VOICE VOTE) 12 Adopted by unanimous decision. Tentative 13 meeting schedule, Dan. 14 Thank you, Chair. We'll be MR. DAVIDSON: 15 in Maui next meeting to begin the Kula Ridge Project, 16 and on O'ahu for the most part, although we just got a 17 Parker Ranch IAL Petition, so there's a chance in 18 September we will be going to Waikoloa. As always any 19 questions about the schedule contact either Riley or 20 Thank you. 21 me. 22 xx23 xx24 xx25 xx

Thank you, Dan. Next item CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 1 on the agenda is hearing on docket A83-557 Princeville 2 Development Corporation to consider the Adoption of 3 Order, Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, 4 Decision and Order dated March 28, 1985. Appearances 5 of the parties starting with Petitioner, 6 Mr. Matsubara. Thank you Mr. Chair, members MR. MATSUBARA: 8 of the Commission. Before I begin just let me express 9 how grateful we are to see all of you here today. 10 Thank you very much. My name is Ben Matsubara. 11 along with Curtis Tabata we represent Princeville 12 Development Corporation. To my right is Vice 13 President Abbey Mayer. 14 Good morning to you all. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 15 Deputy Attorney Good morning. MR. YEE: 16 General Bryan Yee on behalf of the Office of Planning. 17 With me is Mary Lou Kobayashi also with the Office of 18 Planning. 19 Good morning to you. Let CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 20 the record reflect that Ms. Tico has not made an 21 I do not see her in the conference room appearance. 22 23 here today. Moving on, let me update the record. 24

12th, 2011 the Commission voted to grant Petitioner's

Motion for Order Amending Findings of Fact, 1 Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated 2 March 28, 1985 and to deny Intervenor's Motion for 3 Continuance of Hearing on Petitioner's Motion. 4 Written Order Denying Intervenor's motion was filed on 5 June 6, 2001.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

On May 26, 2011 the Commission received OP's amended memorandum from the State Department of Transportation reaffirming that the 18 homesites proposed for the Petition Area did not change its position or comments on this matter.

On June 3, 2011 the Commission received Petitioner's Stipulated Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order as signed by the County of Kaua'i and OP. Intervenor-Concerned Citizens of Anini did not sign the document.

Dan, do we have anyone signed up to give public testimony in this matter?

We have no signups for MR. DAVIDSON: Let me double check. Anybody wishing to Princeville. testify? No.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: At this point we have the form of the Order before the Commission prepared by staff granting Petitioner's Motion for Order Amending the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated March 28, 1985. Before we entertain a motion in this matter, Petitioner, is there anything more you want to add to the record?

MR. MATSUBARA: Nothing further, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Yee?

2.2

2.4

MR. YEE: Nothing further, thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Is there a motion to approve the form of the Order in this matter.

COMMISSIONER HELLER: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioner Heller.

COMMISSIONER HELLER: Yes. Before

proceeding further with this there is a disclosure I want to put on the record. It came to my attention subsequent to our last meeting that Jeffrey Stone owns some form of interest in Princeville Development Corporation. It's my understanding that he also has an interest in Ko Olina Development, LLC and Resort Management Company, LLC. Those two entities are involved in litigation adverse to the Association of Apartment Owners of Beach Villas at Ko Olina. And I'm representing the Association of Apartment Owners in that other litigation.

I thought I would make that disclosure and see if any of the parties has any objection to my participation.

1	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you for that
2	disclosure. Parties have any objections or concerns
3	with that disclosure by Commissioner Heller?
4	MR. MATSUBARA: Mr. Chair, if Commissioner
5	Heller feels that that will not influence his decision
6	on this matter in regards to the adoption of the
7	proposed Decision and Order, obviously we would have
8	no objections to your sitting on that matter.
9	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioner Heller?
10	COMMISSIONER HELLER: I do not think the
11	unrelated litigation would have any effect on my
12	decision in this matter.
13	MR. MATSUBARA: Thank you. Then we have no
14	objections, Mr. Chair.
15	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Matsubara, you also
16	understand it's just approving the form of the Order.
17	MR. MATSUBARA: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: That's the matter before
19	the Commission.
20	MR. MATSUBARA: Yes. Thank you.
21	
. 22	concerns or objections to the disclosure by
23	Commissioner Heller?
24	
25	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: There being none, is there

1	a motion?
2	COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Mr. Chair.
3	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioner Contrades.
4	COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Move that in the
5	matter of A83-557 Princeville Development Corporation
6	that we adopt the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of
7	Law, Decision and Order granting the Motion for Order
8	Amending Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and
9	Decision and Order dated March 28, 1985.
10	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Is there a second?
11	COMMISSIONER TEVES: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any discussion? There
13	being none call for the vote.
14	MR. DAVIDSON: Motion to approve Order,
15	Commissioner Contrades?
16	COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Aye.
17	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Teves?
18	COMMISSIONER TEVES: Yes.
19	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Matsumura?
20	COMMISSIONER MATSUMURA: Ask to be excused.
21	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Chock?
22	COMMISSIONER CHOCK: Yes.
23	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Lezy?
24	COMMISSIONER LEZY: Yes.
25	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Makua?
ر یے	

	And And
1	COMMISSIONER MAKUA: Aye.
2	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Heller?
3	COMMISSIONER HELLER: Yes.
4	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Judge?
5	COMMISSIONER JUDGE: Yes.
6	MR. DAVIDSON: Chair Devens?
7	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes.
8	MR. DAVIDSON: Motion passes 8-0 with one
9	abstention.
10	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Anything else for the
11	record from the parties?
12	MR. MATSUBARA: Nothing on this particular
13	docket, Chair. But I recognize that this is the last
14	day of your term. And on behalf of us we'd like to
15	thank you for your public service in regard to the
16	Commission. I have nothing further pending before you
17	so I feel at liberty to say a few things.
18	I thank you for the personal integrity
19	you've displayed throughout your conduct as a
20	Commissioner and the Chair and your exemplary handling
21	of all matters that have arisen before you. Thank you
22	very much. And I wish you well.
23	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Matsubara.
24	Those are very kind words from you. Also I'd like to
25	thank you and your firm for the professionalism and
	1

courtesies you've extended to not only me but the Commission as a body throughout the last four years. Thank you very much. Mr. Yee, anything you want to add to the record on this matter?

MR. YEE: No. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much. That will conclude the matter on this docket. We'll take a short break and move on to the next matter.

(Recess was held.)

We're back on the record. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: The next item on the agenda is A06-771 D.R. This is an action meeting Horton-Schuler Homes, LLC. to amend the Agricultural Land Use District Boundaries into the Urban Land Use District for approximately 1,553.844 acres of land at Honouliuli, 'Ewa District 6 O'ahu, Hawai'i Tax Map Key Nos. 9-1-17:4; 059 and 072, 7 9-1-18: 1 and 4 to consider.

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are four items on the agenda this First is Petitioner's Motion for Leave to morning. File its Second Amended Petition to Cure the Deficiency of its First Amended Petition.

Second item is Petitioner's Motion for Determination its Second Amended Petition to Cure the Deficiency of its First Amended Petition and is Ready for Processing.

Intervenor Friends of Makakilo's Third. Motion to Close the Case of the Petition of D.R. Horton-Schuler, LLC Without Further Consideration; or in the Alternative to Reject Their Second Amended Petition as a Cure for the Deficiencies in Their First Petition and that the Petition Property Be Removed from Redistricting Availability Until 2061.

The last item is Petitioner's Motion to Consolidate for Hearing Purposes the above listed

three motions. Can we have the appearances of the 1 parties at this time, starting with Mr. Kudo. MR. KUDO: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner, 3 Ben Kudo representing D.R. Horton-Schuler Homes. With 4 me is my associate Yuko Funaki. And to her right is 5 Cameron Nekota who is vice president of D.R. Horton-6 Schuler Homes. Morning. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 8 MR. HATA: Tim Hata, City and County 9 Department of Planning and Permitting. 10 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Morning. 11 MR. YEE: Good morning. Deputy Attorney 12 General Bryan Yee on behalf of the Office of Planning. 13 With me today is Mary Lou Kobayashi from the Office of 14 Planning. 15 Morning. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 16 DR. DUDLEY: Good morning. Dr. Kioni Dudley 17 from the Friends of Makakilo. 18 Morning to you all. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 19 Commission's been informed and I need to note for the 2.0 record that Haseko informed the Commission that they 21 were going to withdraw from this docket. So we would 22 note that for the record. 23

the Commission received Petitioner's Second Amended

2.4

25

Let me update the record. On May 18th, 2011

Petition for land use district boundary amendment and Exhibits 16A, 17A, 19A and 20 through 24.

3 | Petitioner's Motion for Leave to File its Second

4 Amended Petition to Cure the Deficiency of its first

5 | Amended Petition and Petitioner's Motion for

6 Determination that its Second Amended Petition to Cure

the Deficiency of Its First Amended Petition and Is

8 | Ready For Processing.

On May 25th, 2011 the Commission received written correspondence from the City and County, David Tanoue, stating that the Department of Planning and Permitting has no objection to the Petitioner's motions.

On June 1, 2011 the Commission received

Intervenor The Friends of Makakilo's Motion to Close
the Case of the Petition of D.R. Horton-Schuler Homes,
LLC Without Further Consideration; or In the
Alternative to Reject Their Second Amended Petition as
a Cure for the Deficiencies in Their First Petition;
and That the Petition Property Be Removed from
Redistricting Availability Until 2061.

On June 7, 2011 the Commission received the State Office of Planning's Statement of No Objections to Petitioner's Motion.

On June 9, 2011 the Commission received

24

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

DPP's Opposition to Intervenor the Friends of
Makakilo's Motion to Reject Petitioner's Second
Amended Petition.

2.3

On June 13, 2011 the Commission received the following: Petitioner's Motion to Consolidate for Hearing Purposes:

- 1. Petitioner's Motion for Leave to File Its Second Amended Petition to Cure the Deficiency of Its First Amended Petition.
- 2. Petitioner's Motion for Determination that Its Second Amended Petition to Cure the Deficiency of its First Amended Petition and is Ready for Processing.
- 3. Intervenor Friends of Makakilo's Motion to Close the Case of the Petition Without Further Consideration; or in the Alternative to Reject Their Second Amended Petition as a Cure for the Deficiencies in Their First Petition; and That the Petition Property Be Removed from Redistricting Availability Until 2061, and the Memorandum in Support.

And Petitioner's Memorandum in Opposition to Friends of Makakilo's Motion.

On June 16, 2011 the Commission received OP's Statement of No Position to the Friends of Makakilo's Motion.

Between June 20th and June 29, 2011 the Commission received written correspondence via mail and/or e-mail from approximately 380 individuals or groups whose names are in the file.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

On June 20, 2011 the Commission received a Notice of Intent to File Petition to Intervene from the Sierra Club.

On June 21st, 2011 the Commission received DPP's Statement of No Position on Petitioner's Motion to Consolidate for Hearing Purposes the pending motions.

On June 22, 2001 the Commission received

Intervenor Friends of Makakilo's Reply Memorandum

Responsive to Petitioner's Memorandum in Opposition to
the Friends of Makakilo's Motion.

On June 27, 2011 the Commission received

OP's Statement of No Objection to Petitioner's Motion
to Consolidate for Hearing Purposes the Pending

Motions.

Before we proceed and explain the procedure for today, Mr. Kudo, I wanted to ask if your client is aware of the reimbursement policy and if they're going to abide and adhere to the policy.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ KUDO: We are aware of it and we agree to pay the expense.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much.

Wanted to explain to the audience that the motions that we have on the docket today relate more to a procedural matter where Petitioner is seeking leave to file a Second Amended Complaint to cure a deficiency.

We also have Makakilo's motion that basically is opposing that attempt.

Therefore, we will open the hearing up to public testimony. But in the first phase of the

1.0

2.1

Therefore, we will open the hearing up to public testimony. But in the first phase of the hearing we wanted to limit the public testimony to address those motions that we need to hear first.

'Cause depending on how the Commission votes on those motions, this matter may or may not go any further than today.

After we rule on the motions, the Commission votes and hears the arguments, we will then take further public testimony on the matter to give everyone a chance to say what they want to say here today.

Are the parties agreeable to proceeding in that matter?

MR. KUDO: Yes, we are.

MR. YEE: Office of Planning has no objection.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Dr. Dudley?

DR. DUDLEY: I'm afraid I really don't understand the distinction. All right. So at the very beginning we're going to take testimony on the motions that are before the Commission. And then we're going to do what? And then we have the public? I didn't get that.

2.2

2.4

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We definitely would want to give the public a fair opportunity to give whatever testimony they want in this matter. What I'm trying to do is narrow down the first phase of the hearing to give public testimony as it relates to the pending motions.

Because without a decision on the pending motions we don't know if this matter is going to go further or not, depending on how the Commission votes on those particular pending motions.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Does that make sense?

DR. DUDLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Okay. Depending on how that goes we will open it up for public testimony after that. But it will have a clear picture as to what issues, where the proceedings are going at that point. Is that agreeable to you?

DR. DUDLEY: I think so.

	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Okay. Thank you. With
1	that, is there any public testimony that wants to
2	address the specific motions are pending? If so we
3	can have you step forward. But let me first ask
4	can have you step forward. But leave Senator, did
5	Senator Hee, I know may have to leave, Senator, did
6	you want to present your testimony since it may be a
7	while before we come back in the afternoon?
8	SENATOR HEE: If I'm permitted.
9	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes, sir.
10	SENATOR HEE: Thank you.
11	MR. DAVIDSON: We have your written
12	testimony.
13	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Senator Hee, if I can
14	swear you in.
15	SENATOR CLAYTON HEE,
16	being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined
17	a control ows:
	THE MITTHESS. Yes.
18	GUATRMAN DEVENS: Please state your name and
19	
20	THE WITTNESS. My name is Clayton Hee,
21	appearing as a member of the Senate, Hawai'i State
22	
23	
24	
2	SENATOR HEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good

morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Land Use Commission. I'm Clayton Hee. I'm a member of the State Senate. I'm the chairman of the Committee on Judiciary and Labor. I'm before you appearing as a member of the Senate and as the chairman of the Judiciary and Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I had my staff send in the testimony to you. I presume that you folks have circulated the testimony. With your kind indulgence I would speak extemporaneously but follow the pattern of the testimony.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And we will make that part of the record.

SENATOR HEE: Okay. I would like to speak on the merits of the amended -- the Second Amended Petition and whether or not the Petitioner has cured the deficiency. It is my view that Second Amended Petition is deficient and defective. It is my view that the Commission, should they agree -- (microphone static) -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman. You make me nervous.

(Audience laughter).

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You make me nervous.

(Audience laughter).

SENATOR HEE: Okay. I would presume that if

1.8

1.9

2.0

the Land Use Commission were to agree with my position that you would have no other alternative but to ask the Petitioner to either submit a Third Amended Petition or to deny.

2.3

The basis of deficiency in my opinion is in reading the Amended Petition, The Second Amended Petition, the presumption is that rail will be built to the extent that Transit-Oriented Development is also a part of the Petition.

That is a presumption that in my opinion this Commission cannot...cannot turn away from because of the public statements and the public actions taken prior to this hearing and during this hearing.

The first of which, as I'm sure all of you are aware, is the complaint filed by a group of citizens, among whom are former Governor Cayetano and others, that seeks to stop the rail project and will be, I presume, litigated.

The second is, and it's in today's paper yet again, is the intent of Bombardier to appeal the decision of the award given to Ansaldo for the construction of the rail cars and the consideration of Sumitomo to do the same. And, finally, the public posturing of the mayor of the City and County of Honolulu who indicated prior to his veto that if the

1 council overrode the veto that he would, in fact, file 2 a lawsuit.

2.4

Well, in fact the council overrode the veto unanimous -- by a unanimous vote and are fully prepared to litigate this matter before a court of law.

These are only three examples of the importance of the assumption and presumption made by the Petitioner that the rail is presumed to be built. There are other states, New Jersey is the latest, of which the largest public works project was stopped by the governor of New Jersey.

This is a Project that can be stopped virtually at any time. And it is a project that is my opinion the cost and delays will escalate to the point where people will begin to seriously consider the rise in taxes.

For these reasons the Petitioner should have offered a plan that did not include the buildout of the rail. By doing so the Petitioner would have provided this Commission the opportunity and the full knowledge that if, in fact, the rail is not built the Petitioner, based on a different set of assumptions, is prepared to proceed.

That's the basis of my discussion on the

```
merits, Mr. Chairman. I'm not -- I fully appreciate
   and I want to thank Mr. Davidson for explaining to my
2
   staff the Petition and the rules before you this
3
              So I fully understand that the discussion on
   morning.
4
   prime ag land that is profitable, traffic and other
5
    issues are not a part of the discussion on the merits.
              CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Let me see if there's any
7
    questions from the parties, senator.
8
                            Thank you, Mr. Chair.
              SENATOR HEE:
9
                                Mr. Kudo, any questions
              CHAIRMAN DEVENS:
10
    for the senator?
11
              MR. KUDO: No questions.
12
                                City?
              CHAIRMAN DEVENS:
13
              MR. HATA: No questions.
14
              CHAIRMAN DEVENS:
                                Mr. Yee?
15
                        No questions.
              MR. YEE:
16
              CHAIRMAN DEVENS:
                                Doctor?
17
              DR. DUDLEY:
                           No.
1.8
                                Commissioners, any
              CHAIRMAN DEVENS:
19
                                There being none, thank
    questions for the Senator?
20
    you for taking the time to be here today, Senator.
21
              SENATOR HEE: Mr. Chairman, just one last
22
    point is that if you could direct your executive
23
    director that in my discussion with the senate
24
    president yesterday it is my intention to file as an
25
```

1	intervenor, and that it is my intention that the
2	former Deputy Attorney General who is on staff to the
3	Committee on Judiciary, would represent me as a member
4	of the Senate. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much,
6	Senator. Are there any other witnesses that want to
7	address the pending motions? Ma'am, if you can raise
8	your right hand we can swear you in.
9	VICTORIA CANNON,
10	being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined
11	and testified as follows:
12	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
13	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Can you please state your
14	name and address.
15	THE WITNESS: Victoria Cannon, Makakilo 23
16	years.
17	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do you have an address?
18	THE WITNESS: 92-102, Oloa Place in
19	Makakilo.
20	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you.
21	THE WITNESS: I submitted written testimony.
22	I'm assuming you folks received it all.
23	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We'll make it part of the
24	record.
25	THE WITNESS: Thank you. I'd like to thank

you for the opportunity. My testimony -- my in-person testimony has changed, so please forgive me. I too want to base my opposition to both of these motions, the Motion for Determination as well as the Motion for Leave based on No. 1: The litigation regarding the This is obviously not going anywhere any time rail. soon.

And No. 2 the fact that what has been submitted to you by the Petitioner in this Second Amended Petition as phasing and all of what they want to do now, is totally not in line with what they are presenting to the public. We're talking two different things here.

And you folks really cannot find it in your own Hawai'i State Statues, Revised Statues in your Administrative Rules to vote on something that is coming to the public as one thing and being presented to you as another.

Therefore you're gonna be voting oranges to apples and not apples to apples. And I as a citizen and a taxpayer don't appreciate that.

I do have one other issue I would like to bring up. You can stop me if it's not part of the motion. You folks have an Administrative Rule 15-15-77 which is under your decision-making criteria

for boundary amendments, paragraph B5. That you are to be aware of the Petitioner's financial status. 2 as of Tuesday at 5:30 in the morning I got a phone 3 call from Standard & Poors in New York City telling me 4 that D.R. Horton, who trades as DHI on the stock 5 market, has been downgraded once again from a 4 to a 6 Now it's a 2. This was as of June 27th, this 7 3. week's Tuesday morning. 8

There are some very spurious issues going on with their financial status. And I really want you folks to investigate that before you grant them the ability to pursue zoning change which will eventually enable them to simply turn around and sell the land and it will never become Ho'opili by D.R. Horton.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Ma'am, let me see if there's any questions from the parties. Mr. Kudo?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: City?

MR. HATA: No questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Yee?

MR. YEE: No questions.

DR. DUDLEY: No questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There being none, thank you very much for coming today.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any other witnesses that want to address these pending motions? Sir, if we can swear you in.

STUART SCOTT

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: With all my heart and soul.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Please state your name and

address.

THE WITNESS: My name is Stuart Scott. My address is 2801-N2, Lai Road, Honolulu. It's in Palolo Valley. I'm a subsistence farmer, one of the many things I do. I have much comments I'd like to make about the merits of the subdivision but I'll try to limit myself, as you've asked, to the motions.

And I'll ask the Commissioners to please find it in your hearts, find it in your wisdom and logic to set aside the developer's motions. I'll make -- since much of what I was going to say has been already said by Senator Hee and Victoria Cannon before me, I won't reiterate the points that they made.

But I will add one point of law, point of constitutional law I would say. Let me read what I wrote. The Hawai'i State Constitution in Article 11,

Section 3, states, "The state shall conserve and protect agricultural lands, promote diversified agriculture, increase agricultural self-sufficiency and assure the availability of agriculturally suitable lands."

So if only on that constitutional grounds I would ask you to set aside the developer's motions.

We live in a very uncertain world. Climate change is a very real thing despite some very well-funded attempts to label it as still a question.

What the next several decades will produce based upon what we have seen recently, the incredible electricity storms, is just one thing that should wake everyone up to the fact that we are in a changing world.

We survive on 85 percent of the food we eat is brought from abroad. We cannot erode further our ability to produce food for our children. That is the ultimate need we have, that and water. I would ask you to please on humanitarian grounds, forward thinking grounds, to set aside the developer's motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Let me see if there's any questions from the parties. Mr. Kudo?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

1	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: City?
2	MR. HATA: No questions.
3	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: OP?
4	MR. YEE: No questions.
5	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Dr. Dudley?
6	DR. DUDLEY: No questions.
7	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There
8	being none thank you very much for your testimony.
9	Any other witnesses relating to the pending motions
10	that want to give testimony? Swear you in, ma'am?
11	PEARL JOHNSON,
12	being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined
13	and testified as follows:
14	THE WITNESS: I do.
15	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your name and address,
16	please?
17	THE WITNESS: Pearl Johnson, 2404 Kaneali'i
18	Avenue, Honolulu, 96813. I ask the Commission to
19	reject the Petition because there is very grave doubt
20	as to whether D.R. Horton can perform as it states in
21	the position. Ms. Cannon has already said its
22	financial situation is very grave. It has billions of
23	dollars in unsecured debt.
24	Therefore just based on the fact that the
25	Petitioner, D.R. Horton, will not be able to fulfill

1	what it says it will do in the next 10 years, the
2	Commission should reject its position.
3	Furthermore, if the Commission should decide
4	that you need to consider the Petition, then we should
5	take about 50 years to consider whether we really can
6	give up this farmland. Thank you for your attention.
7	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you, ma'am. Any
8	questions from the parties?
9	MR. KUDO: No questions.
10	MR. HATA: No questions.
11	MR. YEE: No questions.
12	DR. DUDLEY: No questions.
13	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There
14	being none, thank you very much. Ma'am, if we can
15	swear you in.
16	CANDACE FUJIKANE,
17	being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined
18	and testified as follows:
19	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
20	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your name and address.
21	THE WITNESS: Candace Fujikane, 1733 Danagho
22	Road, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822.
23	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And you just gave our
24	clerk some handouts that you want added to the record?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Okay. We'll add it to the record.

1.9

2.4

THE WITNESS: So I'm here to say that I find the Second Amended petition deficient. And I urge the Land Use Commission to approve the Friends of Makakilo's Motion to Close the Case Without Further Consideration. I am concerned -- (inaudible, microphone static interruption) -- misleading information on the edible crops that will be taken out of production.

The Second Amended Petition does not address the question of edible crops. And that's my concern of protecting -- I think we need to make a distinction between edible crops and nonedible crops.

And in the Petitioner's statement they quote the Department of Agriculture quote, commenting that, quote, "The 1,497 acres of leased agricultural land in the Project site is 13.7 percent of the 10,900 acres of farmland reported to be available on O'ahu."

And that is a large number. But if you ask of that 10,900 acres of farmland how much of that is actually in edible crops the numbers are actually quite different. And that's not addressed in the Petition.

When we make a distinction between those

Ph/Fax (808) 538-6458

crops, edible crops is actually only 4,800 acres on
the Island of O'ahu. And that represents 32 percent
of land in edible crop production on O'ahu. Statewide
edible crops total only 11,400 acres. The Petition
Area represents 13 percent of the statewide edible
crop acreage.

so I made a pie chart. And in the pie chart you can see the state numbers for vegetables for the entire state, 5,500 acres -- 6 percent of statewide production. And fruit there's 5,900 acres in production which is also 6 percent. The other 88 percent is made of seed crops, feed and forage crops, flora culture, coffee and pineapple. When we look at the O'ahu numbers --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I apologize for interrupting, but you may be going a little further out than the issues we have with the motion.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

1.5

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: But you'll certainly have that opportunity to present that testimony later on. Is that okay?

THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We will definitely make what you presented part of the record. Any questions for this witness, Mr. Kudo?

MR. KUDO: Can we get copies? 1 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Sure. I'm sorry. 2 Parties, have any questions for this witness? There 3 being none -- Dr. Dudley. 4 DR. DUDLEY: I do wonder if she could 5 summarize in one sentence or two sentences what the 6 rest of her testimony was going to be? Was she headed 7 somewhere with what she was doing? She'll have a chance to CHAIRMAN DEVENS: come back later. I think she was going beyond the 10 issues that we need to decide first with the pending 11 12 motions. Thank you. 13 DR. DUDLEY: CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners, did you 14 have any questions for the witness? There being none, 15 16 thank you very much. KIKA BUKOSKI 17 being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined 18 and testified as follows: 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 Name and address. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 21 THE WITNESS: My name is Kika Bukoski. 22 Address is 560 North Nimitz Highway, Honolulu, 96817. 23 Good morning, Chair, Vice Chair, members of the 24 Commission. My name's Kika Bukoski. I represent and

am testifying on behalf of the Hawai'i Building and Construction Trades Council. The council is comprised of 16 construction trade unions and represents the interests of over 32,000+ members.

2.4

I realize that the most important issues at hand right now are the motions before you. And I'm assuming that you're going to hear a lot of comments regarding the merits of the Project. And I ask for your consideration and for your -- to focus on the motions at hand. And I guess it's a little hard not to speak to some of the merit.

I kind of wanted to address some of the comments that were made initially by Senator Hee. Respectfully I disagree. And I'm hoping that the opponents of this Project are not trying to insert the successes or failures of a separate issue, the rail transit and the TOD, which is not a part of this Petitioner's property.

It is, I understand, a component or potential component of the Project. But as I understand it my opinion is that the Project's success or failure is not hinging on the success or failure of the issues raised by Senator Hee.

The issue at hand here as far as the Building Trades is concerned, as I mentioned, this

represents thousands of jobs in a time of economic straits. Our members need work. Our community needs work. It's also, in my opinion, due process in the spirit of transparency, public debate.

2.4

I think that this Petition, if the deficiencies were cured in the Second Amended Petition, that is incumbent on all of us to at least allow this Petition to move forward so that the merits of this Project can be discussed in open debate and in transparency.

And for those reasons I sincerely ask this body to please vote in the affirmative on the Motions to Accept the Petition with the cured deficiencies and is to please deny the motion to not allow this Petition to move forward.

I think if this Petition was not allowed to move forward it would be a travesty to open debate and transparency.

This is not the time to discuss the merits.

It's the time to accept the Petition if the deficiencies were cured. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness from the parties?

(MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA now present)

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions.

MR. YEE: No questions.

DR. DUDLEY: No questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There being none, thank you very much. Any other witnesses? Let me swear you in first, ma'am. Do you swear to tell the truth in this matter?

THE WITNESS: I'm an active Quaker and we do not swear on the Bible or off the Bible.

TARA HANDS

was examined and testified as follows:

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do you have a name and address that you can give us?

THE WITNESS: My name is Tara Hands. And my address is 440 Lewers Street, Honolulu, 96815. I would encourage you to vote against the project that's all the motions' on. I would like to quote something that was in the "Honolulu Weekly."

A 17 year-old person named Joshua Scott is active with a group called "I March" -- I Matter March." And he petitioned the reinforcement of Article 11 section 1 of Hawai'i's Constitution which says, "The state must conserve and protect Hawai'i's natural beauty and all natural resources for the benefit of all the people."

I would also like to take us back in time to current things. The basic issues for survival is air is No. 1. No. 2 --

MR. DAVIDSON: Ma'am, could I interrupt you one second? The Chair has attempted to set ground rules on testimony. Thus far we've been pretty liberal -- you're supposed to be talking to the merits of the motion. And it appears that you're going immediately into the merits -- (loud audience applause) -- we're just trying to keep -- we're trying to enforce some ability here so the Commission can actually deal with the motions. So if you can try to stick to the motions.

THE WITNESS: All right. I would just like to say air is first, water is second and third is food.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Is there any questions for this witness?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions.

MR. YEE: No questions.

DR. DUDLEY: No questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? Thank you very much for your testimony. Let me also clarify for the record that when we ask someone to swear to tell

the truth it is not on the Bible. It is to take an oath to swear to tell the truth before this body as a legal oath.

So I don't want any misunderstanding that there's any religious overtones involved when we ask for someone to be truthful to take the oath to be truthful before this Commission.

With that, any other witnesses that want to testify regarding the motions that are pending?

DONNA WONG,

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Give us your name and address, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Donna Wong, executive director of Hawai'i's Thousands Friends.

Our address is 25 Malunui Avenue, Suite 102 No. 282

Kailua.

I'm here to speak on the Petition that the Petitioners say that they have cured all the questions that the Commission had asked before. Hawai'i's Thousand Friends does not believe that your recommendations have been cured.

Let's just start off with what they say in

2.4

their phased development, that Phase 2 will take 11 to 20 years. We don't believe that that was the intent of the Commission to just -- first of all, it's beyond 10 years. So we don't quite understand where they came up with 11 to 20 years.

What that leads us to believe is that the Petitioner will be satisfied -- because they spent a lot of time talking about Phase I in the segments, we believe the Petitioner will be satisfied with all the land in Phase I being reclassified to urban.

The rationale is that once Phase I is reclassified to urban the remaining agricultural lands will be surrounded by development. And changing the designation on the last piece of A and B agricultural land should be relatively easy.

We go through our testimony, and I won't read it all, that they talk about how their connection, their infrastructure is connected with UH West O'ahu, which will come online sometime for the sewers, sometime for the waterlines, agreements will be made at "sometime". They rely on the non-potable water or BWS creating or constructing a water tank at "sometime".

They have been meeting extensively, they say, with DOT yet they have not come, they did not

present anything in the Petition to show how the infrastructure would be phased in.

So their phasing project continues on like this with these ambiguities. It also goes on to say that phase or segment 1A, where that will be developed first, and then will put up for sale or will go to a subcontract. So that leads us to believe that the developer has probably no intention of developing any of these segments, any of the phases.

But once it's got the urban designation, once it goes through the zoning the land is worth a lot more than it is now as on the market as highly productive agricultural land.

In closing, the Petitioner did not answer your request, did not give a starting date or ending date for any of their infrastructure, for any of their segments and for their Phase I. So we think it's deficient, hasn't been cured and should be denied.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you. Parties have any questions for this witness?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions.

MR. YEE: No questions.

DR. DUDLEY: No questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There

being none thank you very much. Any other witnesses on the pending motions? Besides this gentleman, are there any other witnesses that would like to testify on the motions? One, two. Sir, if we can swear you in.

JOSHUA SCOTT

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Give us your name and address, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Joshua Scott, 2801
N2 Lai Road, just like my father, 96816. I come
before this board today to ask you to deny the
developer's motion based on the constitution Article
11 Section 3.

"The state shall conserve and protect agricultural lands, promote diversified agriculture, increase agricultural self-sufficiency and ensure the availability of agriculturally suitable lands."

I assume that this is meant for the future and it should be. Because that's, that's what our entire -- everything is based -- everything we do is, we do is for the future for the success in the future.

Developing the lands in question, turning it

from agriculture to homes would be bad for the future
really because the uncertainty of the world. We have
nuclear reactors melting down, radiation, troubles
abound, climate changes as well.

If anything were to happen such as if there
was a disaster at food production on the mainland
where we get our food from, 85 percent from inputs, of

was a disaster at food production on the mainland where we get our food from, 85 percent from inputs, or if, say, any method which we use to import these foods --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I'm sorry to interrupt, but we need you to address the issues in the pending motions. You will have a chance to address other matters later. But is there anything you want to add to the issues that are being raised in the motions that are pending before us other than what you've already said?

THE WITNESS: I guess not. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Let me ask the parties if they have any questions for you.

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions.

MR. YEE: No questions.

DR. DUDLEY: No questions. Commissioners? There being none, thank you very much.

25 xx

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

GLENN SHIGEFUNA 1 being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined 2 and testified as follows: 3 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 4 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Name and address. 5 THE WITNESS: Glenn Shigefuna, 52-210 6 Kamehameha Highway, Hau'ula, Hawai'i 96717. 7 You know, just like Ms. Wong had just 8 mentioned about the no start date and no end date, it 9 reminds me of the Turtle Bay thing that we're going 10 Twenty-five years and no progress through right now. 11 on that side. You know, I come from a labor family 12 and I understand our families need work. But I also 13 feel that we need to balance it out. We need to make 14 sure that we do is correctly. And that's all I want 15 to say, thank you, at this point. 16 Thank you. Parties have 17 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: any questions for this witness? 18 MR. KUDO: No questions. 19 MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions. 20 MR. YEE: No questions. 21 DR. DUDLEY: No questions. 22 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There 23 being none, thank you. Next witness. 24

25

xx

ROSIE GOO,

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined
and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your name and address.

THE WITNESS: My name's Rosie Goo. My address is 44-622 Kuonu Place, Kaneohe, Hawai'i. I happen to be a lawyer by profession. So the failure to cure the deficiencies in the Petition bring me here in the first place. But I also happen to be a mother. And recognizing that people need to have jobs and ways to care for their families is important.

But for the fact that I think we have to have a long-term vision, I might be sitting here with Mr. Kudo who's a former partner of mine representing D.R. Horton. But really I've chosen a different path in life. And that is to recognize that our children and their children deserve a future where a body like yours takes note of those deficiencies and is not blinded by strategy and lawyering. And just stick to the facts. The Petition is deficient. So I respectfully ask that you deny it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness from the parties?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions. 1 MR. YEE: No questions. No questions. DR. DUDLEY: 3 Commissioners? CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 4 being none thank you very much. Any other witnesses? 5 There being no other witnesses -- I'm sorry, one more? 6 Ma'am, if we can swear you in. 7 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. CHOON JAMES 9 being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined 10 and testified as follows: 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: If we can have your name 13 and address, please. 14 Choon James from La'ie, 15 THE WITNESS: I host a show called the Country Talk Story. 16 17 And I've had the fortunate opportunity to meet a lot of people throughout the island. And also have had 18 the fortunate opportunity of people just stop me that 19 I don't know and tell me their feelings about what's 20 going on in land use issues in O'ahu. 21 I testify against this Petition today not 22 because I'm against development --23 MR. DAVIDSON: Excuse me, ma'am. Maybe if 2.4 you could come back after we deal with the motions 25

here. We're going to the merits.

THE WITNESS: Let me tell you the motion. I think that is very important that we comb through the motion with an uku comb because when we have loose ends in any motion, as some of the testifiers have said, it lays the groundwork for a lot more controversy.

And also it lays the groundwork for the citizens not being able to pin down on many issues that are important.

And so I hope that you would consider that there has in such a big projects like this there cannot be a lot of loose ends because it just opens up opportunities for so many other uncontrolled circumstances in the future. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you. Any questions from the parties for this witness?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions.

MR. YEE: No questions.

DR. DUDLEY: No questions.

22 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There

23 being none, thank you.

24 | xx

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25 | xx

ANTHONY AALTO

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined
and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Name and address.

THE WITNESS: Anthony Aalto, 3946 Lurline

Drive, Honolulu. Sir, I'm the secretary of the O'ahu

group of the Sierra Club. I'm here to speak on behalf

of 5,000 paid up members and supporters we have an

O'ahu.

The first thing I'd like to say is we filed Notice of Intent to the Petitioner. And so we should have received all of the Petitioner's documents and we have not yet received them. As a result I'm unable to make a detailed presentation.

But from the general observation, what we've been able to look at, we consider there are several phasing issues that have not been cured. Number 1 is the issue of water.

The last time this issue came up at the hearing the Petitioner talked about the possibility of needing desalinization of their water, that they might be short 5 million to 15 million gallons of water a day. They were supposed to sort that out with the Board of Water Supply.

From what we've been able to be ascertain from their Petition that has not been resolved.

There's no phasing plan for the introduction of this water.

2.4

Secondly, there are problems with access to H-1. They talk about having had conversations with the Department of Transportation but we do not see any details on the phasing of how those issues are supposed to be resolved.

Third. In their public comments they talk about how they're setting aside land for farmland for those who are going to be living in this community. But we don't see in the documents, from what we've been able to judge, because we haven't heard the detailed submission yet, that those are phased. We don't see them linked to this Petition by the Petitioner.

So for those reasons we do not believe that the Petitioner's filing and the deficiencies from the last time they filed have been cured. We respectfully ask you to send them back to get them to do their homework and to come back with a serious plan that seriously cures these deficiencies. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness?

1	MR. KUDO: No questions.
2	MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions.
3	MR. YEE: No questions.
4	DR. DUDLEY: No questions.
5	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There
6	being none, thank you very much. I believe that's the
7	last witness. What I'd like to do before we take a
8	break is at least take up the first motion. And the
9	first motion I'd like to take up is Petitioner's
10	Motion to Consolidate the three other motions. Has
11	there been any objection or opposition filed to the
12	motion, Mr. Kudo?
13	MR. KUDO: No objection filed.
14	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do any of parties have any
15	objection or opposition to the Motion to Consolidate?
16	City?
17	MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No, no objection.
18	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Yee?
19	MR. YEE: No objection from OP.
20	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Dr. Dudley?
21	DR. DUDLEY: I really do have a slight
22	change to it that I would like to see. But I think
23	that it's probably the intent of the Commission to do
24	it as I would think. In the first place, I think that
25	it makes sense to consolidate their motions and our

motions.

What doesn't make sense would be to take their motion for leave to return, which we are in opposition to, that's it's first part of our motion -- and the second part which is the cure of their petition. To put those together would be a problem for us because we have a prob -- we really want to address their motions separately.

So what I'm saying, then, is if we were to put the Friends of Makakilo's motions with their motions and to take their first motion first and separately and then their second motion, then we would agree to that.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Wait. Try that again. (Laughter)

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. For us to discuss their motions and our motions together is fine and makes plenty of sense. But we would want to discuss their first motion, which is Leave to Return. We have objection to that as we put in both of our motions.

And then we'd like to discuss that first.

Then we would like to go to their second motion which is to declare their Petition cured. We would like to handle that in a different way with a whole different set of testimony.

And so as long as we were to take their two motions in order and separately, we would agree to the putting together of our motions with their motions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: No, no, I think I understand what you're saying. Right now we just have the Motion to Consolidate so that we can hear all the motions together, which I think makes sense.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay.

I'm still not clear?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And you'll have a chance to argue against each of the motions.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. So we will take their two motions separately, is that correct?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Well, if they're consolidated we're going to hear everything together. But it probably makes sense, I would expect Mr. Kudo's going to first address the Motion to Leave and in that order. Mr. Kudo, is that the way you had planned to go?

MR. KUDO: That's correct. What we wanted to avoid was separate hearings for all the different motions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I understand. So we will take everything up. But before we can do that we have to pass on the Motion to Consolidate. I just wanted

to make sure that there was no objections. It doesn't 1 sound like you're objecting --2 DR. DUDLEY: No. 3 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: -- to it. Is that 4 correct? 5 DR. DUDLEY: Yes. No, we are not objecting. 6 It will be fine. 7 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners have any 8 comments on this Motion to Consolidate? There being 9 none the Chair's going to move to grant Petitioner's 10 Is there a second? Motion to Consolidate. 11 COMMISSIONER HELLER: Second. 12 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any discussion? 13 being none, call for the vote, Dan. 14 MR. DAVIDSON: Are there any objections by 15 Commissioners to the Chair's Motion to Consolidate? 16 17 Nine ayes. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: At this point we'll take a 1.8 short 5-minute break. 19 (Recess was held.) 2.0 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioner Judge. 21 Thank you, Chair. COMMISSIONER JUDGE: 22 like to request that we go into an executive session 23 for the Commission to consult with the board's 24 attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the 25

board's powers, duties, privileges, immunities and
liabilities.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: All right. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Second.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any discussion? There being none, all those in favor say aye.

VOTING: Aye.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Unanimous. What we'll do we'll leave the room for the exec session and be right back. Thank you.

(10:45 recess)

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Before we get into the oral arguments I wanted to introduce and recognize our newest Commissioner Chad McDonald who's sitting here to my left. He was nominated by Governor Abercrombie and will be starting his term as of July 1st. So we welcome him aboard.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Since the Motion to

Consolidate was granted and passed upon by the

Commission before the break, the motions are

consolidated. And we'll now take oral argument on the

motions in the order we had talked about earlier.

Mr. Kudo, if I may ask, in making your oral

argument your first motion is asking for leave to file the second amended Petition. But I also note that an amended pleading was filed on May 18th, 2011 and you refer to it as a second amended Petition.

MR. KUDO: Yes.

1.2

1.4

UNIDENTIFIED PUBLIC SPEAKER: Excuse me.

Could you repeat that, please, what you said we should do when we're speaking?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: No, I was just talking to, asking a question of Mr. Kudo.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So sorry.

Your argument, Mr. Kudo, if you could just address the issue. I thought that if you filed for leave you need to get the leave first and then you would come in and file the Second Amended Petition. But it appears that the Second Amended Petition has already been filed before leave was granted. And I just want to make sure we get the procedural --

MR. KUDO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: -- process correct
whichever way the Commission decides on this, to avoid
any kind of issue on something that seems more
procedural than substantive. If that makes sense.

Does that make sense as to what I'm asking?

MR. KUDO: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Anyway, let's go ahead with the oral arguments. Mr. Kudo.

MR. KUDO: Before I start the oral arguments on the motions I just wanted to make one comment. One of the speakers from Sierra Club mentioned that they had not received yet the papers, the record on this particular docket.

We are preparing those materials. As you can imagine after seven months of hearings we have quite a bit to copy. We're putting it on a CD disc for them. We received the notice last week. So we are trying to get that to them in time for their hearing on the actual Petition to Intervene, which hasn't even been scheduled yet. So we are doing that.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you.

MR. KUDO: We are asking the Commission this morning for leave or permission to file the Second Amended Petition. The Rules 15-15-43 provide that we must first ask the Commission for permission to do so because there's a deadline for filing amended petitions and that deadline has passed. We believe that there's good cause for the ability to file the second Petition.

By way of a little short history on this and

why we're here today for those Commissioners who are new to the Commission: We filed our Petition in this particular docket in 2007, almost four years ago. We had an EIS process that went on for about seven or eight months and then finally hearings on this particular docket began two years later in 2009.

1.9

2.4

We went through approximately seven months, six or seven months of hearings on the Petitioner's case before a motion was filed to find the Petition to be defective. And this Commission voted that the Petition was defective in September of 2009 because we had not provide a phasing plan, and also a map that clearly outlined how we were going to proceed with the development in terms of construction.

Since 2009 we have worked with the Office of Planning and other government agencies to make sure, as well as the Land Use Commission staff, to make sure that whatever we filed before you today was going to address the concerns of the Commission.

We looked at some of the filings that were filed in the Koa Ridge application, which was very similar in terms of the phasing plan and the phasing map, and we tried to emulate what was provided in the Koa Ridge Petition to satisfy the Commission.

In addition, we did have several meetings

with the Office of Planning to make sure they were also satisfied with the type of information that we were providing.

The information that we're providing doesn't change the Project. All it is is as per request of the Commission it provides more details about what specifically we're going to be doing from a construction standpoint, in which phase, which block we're going to be developing, where the infrastructure's going, when we're going to do it, all that kind of things with approximate timetables.

Because as you know in the land use process because we have multiple permits to go through over the years -- remember we filed this Petition in 2007, we still have to go through permits and zoning with the county.

So trying to predict when we'll be actually out of the land use permitting process can be a bit challenging sometimes. So in terms of planning and providing for construction timetables we have to provide general guidelines of the timetables that we expect to be in the ground.

So the phasing plan attempts to do that, but it's with the caveat that we really can't control the future and we're trying our very best to move forward

as quickly as we can to obtain all the permits and approvals that we need to from the various governmental bodies.

1.8

Therefore we believe that there is good cause, which is a requirement of 15-15-43, to file our Second Amended Petition. And we ask this Commission to grant us the permission to file the Second Amended Petition.

We did file the Second Amended Petition.

And we didn't want to be presumptuous but we felt that for consolidation purposes and for efficiency purposes that if this Commission were to grant the permission, that the Second Amended Petition would be before you and we can proceed forward in one hearing. But it was not meant to be presumptuous in terms of our expectation of this Commission.

We are respectfully asking this Commission to consider the Leave to File the Amended Petition and to consider our Second Amended Petition and the exhibits that we have filed to address the issues that the Commission wanted to see in 2009.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Kudo. If I can ask you one question. Do you see any procedural defect that could be raised later by the fact that the Motion to Leave wasn't granted yet, yet you've already

filed the Second Amended Petition? 1. MR. KUDO: No. We thought about that 2 because we felt that if this Commission felt that we 3 did not have permission to file that, then the Second 4 Amended Petition would be terminated or withdrawn by 5 So the effect is that it wouldn't be before you. us. We just did it because we thought it was the 7 most efficient way to proceed forward. And we didn't want to come back for another hearing with this 9 Commission to consider the Petition at another time. 10 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: So you don't see it 11 raising any kind of procedural --12 MR. KUDO: -- we don't see it raising any, 13 14 no. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: All right. Thank you. 1.5 16 City? MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: The City takes no 17 position on Petitioner's motion. 18 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you. Mr. Yee. 19 MR. YEE: If I understand this correctly 20 we're addressing all three motions at this time? 21 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Actually we just started 22 with the first motion. 23 MR. YEE: Just the first motion. 24 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes. They're consolidated 25

in the sense we're going to hear all of 'em today.

2.3

MR. YEE: Okay. With respect to the Motion to Amend, the Office of Planning has -- Leave to File the Second Amended Petition -- the Office of Planning has no objection.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Dr. Dudley.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. Procedurally as I understand that would be my time to make my objections to what they said, is that correct?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You can add what you want to in terms of argument. If you're opposing the motion or supporting the motion whatever arguments you want to make at this time.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. Mr. Chairman, the Friends of Makakilo opposes the Motion for Leave to Return. First of all, I need to point out that even though the Commission acted on my motion back in 2009 to declare the Petition deficient, one must realize that my motion, all but a few lines of my motion were really caution saying don't declare the Petition deficient, there are problems here. And these problems need to be cleared before the Petition is declared deficient.

Unfortunately, however, the Commission acted contrary to the rules that I warned about in my

Petition. And the Commission could have waived the rues, as I said that they really needed to waive, before doing anything. However, if you go back and check the transcript there was no waiving of the rules. And the Commission just went ahead and acted.

So I think what we've got now is the Commission acted contrary to its rules. And I'll go through those rules in a little bit here. But now we're in a situation where if we take the Petitioner coming back and we accept his return, then we're going to be going through the same problems with the rules in declaring the Petition cured.

And I think the Commission is at a point right now where there have been actions by the Commission that open the case to appeal. And we are about to move into actions again that further exacerbate this situation.

And so that is why The Friends of Makakilo recommends that the Commission just simply close the case, lay aside the case or decline to reopen the docket, whatever the terminology is that one wants to use.

I'd like to point out the problems that were encountered in the past and which will be encountered in the future if we move ahead today. The first

problem is that the schedule and the map for incremental phasing are part of the Petition. And they needed to be presented as part of the Petition when the Petition was filed. Now, the Petition was filed on September the 26, 2008. Okay.

The requirement for the schedule and map occurs in subsection C-19 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules and in Section 15-15-50 -- of Section 15-15-50. It's titled "Form and Contents of the Petition." It was already too late for them to be added by any means when the Commission declared the Petition to be deficient in August of 2009.

So what I'm saying is, you know, they had their chance before the hearing started. Once the hearing started it was really too late. They had to be filed, the cured Petition had to be filed when the Petition was filed back in 2008.

Now, then there's a second part, a second problem. The second problem is that amending the Petition to add the schedule and map needed to be done 45 days prior to the first hearing. And that's Section 15-15-43 Amended Pleadings.

In the amended pleadings it says very clearly, "All pleadings may be amended at any time until 45 days prior to the hearing date set pursuant

to Section 15-15-51."

2.4

Later on it says, "All parties shall have the opportunity to provide any further response to address the amended pleading up to 30 days prior to the hearing date set pursuant to 15-15-51. No amended pleadings shall be filed after 45 days prior to the date of the hearing. And no responses shall be accepted less than 30 days prior to the hearing date unless," unless "a stipulation is reached by all parties or unless good cause is shown."

Now the thing is that, you know, it was contrary to the rules for the Commission to declare this Petition deficient because it should have been done 45 days before the hearing.

Now, the possibilities for how they get around that: We could have -- we could have had a stipulation among all the parties, but none of the parties was asked for a stipulation.

The other thing is good cause needed to be shown. Now, the question about good cause -- let's go into that for a couple minutes. Let's be really clear about what we're talking about. Good cause. What good cause needs to be shown?

Well, we are talking about curing a deficiency. That deficiency is a lack of a required

phased development plan and phasing map. What's the reason that we're missing the phasing development plan and the map? The reason is because the Petitioner refused to give that to us.

2.2

And let me go back and take a look. The Petitioner was asked again and again. On January 24, 2007 the Petitioner filed its Petition with the Land Use Commission along with an Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice.

On February 22nd, the Land Use Commission

Executive Director Anthony Ching wrote Mr. Benjamin

Kudo commenting on many things that needed to be

addressed in the EIS, including the need for a

schedule for development of phasing increments and a

map pursuant to 15-15-50(c). So that's the first time

he was asked. This is back in February of 2007.

On March 27, 2008 the Land Use Commission

Interim Executive Officer Rodney Maile in comments to

Mr. Vincent Shigekuni on the Draft EIS, noted that the

Final EIS needed to include a development timetable

and a map of incremental phasing.

And on April 8th, 2008 the Office of
Planning wrote to Mr. Vincent Shigekuni requesting the
same. That's the third time they were asked. No
timetable or phasing map was included in the Final

EIS, however.

The Office of Planning noted the lack of development schedule in its oral comments to the Commission on the proposed FEIS. The Office of Planning brought the topic up again in a meeting with the Petitioner and believed the Petitioner had agreed to submit an incremental development schedule and plan. OP states, "The Petitioner believed otherwise."

On October 28, 2008 counsel for the Office of Planning repeated the request and expressed his opinion that an incremental development schedule and plan was necessary for a complete Petition. The Petitioner replied with a polite refusal.

On December the 16th, we're up to the sixth time they were asked, the Office of Planning filed a Motion to Declare the Petition Deficient. Pretty serious. The Petitioner asked the Office of Planning to withdraw its motion, however, and promised to bring the Office of Planning an explanation and a phasing and the map.

The Office of Planning withdrew its motion.

But when the phasing material arrived the Office of Planning found it to be minimal and deemed it to be unsatisfactory.

On December the 24th Imanaka Kudo and

Fujimoto, attorneys for the developer, filed D.R.

Horton Homes' response to the Office of Planning's

Motion to Declare the Petition deficient, a 61-page

document. This response argued that the Petitioner

was not required to submit the schedule and map. Its

broad reasoning I explained last time in 2009.

On April 16, 2009 the Commission voted to defer the hearings. Remember when we stopped the hearings for a couple of days to give the Petitioner time to regroup and to come back?

At that time Chair Kanuha noted, "The question has been raised in my mind as whether or not this should more appropriately be an incremental Petition." He asked the Petitioner to give some consideration during the regrouping period. Nothing came of it.

On June 5th, the closing date for the Petitioner's direct, several people asked about a schedule of phasing. Commissioner Wong brought up 15-15-19. Mr. Benjamin Kudo answered him giving great detail about the historical background for the site.

Mr. Kudo then asked Mr. Mike Jones to tell how incremental districting of the Project would affect his ability to proceed. Mr. Jones spoke of the delay for much needed housing and jobs and the costs

of those delays, and the need to be flexible for 1 This was the end of the direct questioning. transit. 2 Mr. Bryan Yee asked Mr. Jones, "Do you 3 remember submitting a development schedule setting 4 what's going to happen in the first five years?" 5 Mr. Jones answered, "Yes, I think it's part of my 6 slide presentation actually." Mr. Yee asked, "That's 7 as detailed as you have with respect to a development 8 schedule, correct?" 9 Mr. Jones answered, "Yes." Later Mr. Yee 10 asked, "Do you know where the first 650 homes will be 11 12 built?" Mr. Jones answered, "No, not at this time." 13 Mr. Yee said, "Bruce Plasch proposed that the land be 14 developed gradually." 15 MR. KUDO: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. 16 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes. 17 MR. KUDO: Can the Movant summarize where is 18 he going? He's reading from the transcript. What's 19 the argument? 20 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes, actually, Dr. Dudley 21 I was going to interject. We're aware of the record. 22 The record is the record, part of this proceeding. 23 Very good. What I'm trying to DR. DUDLEY: 24 say, then, is there is no good cause. There was no 25

good cause. The question is what is the cause all about? The cause is the reason for why we don't have a plan, a phased development plan, why that was never given. It was never given -- we don't have it because they refused to give it. Fourteen times they refused to give it.

Now we're supposed to say there's good cause here for them to be given the chance to go back and cure the Petition. There is no good cause. You know? This is, this is what happened. This is them saying: We won't give it.

And now we're supposed to recognize that as good cause. Good cause cannot lie with anything else. They're trying to transfer good cause to the fact that they have good cause to come back because they need to come back now.

We sent them off -- you sent them off to cure and they have good cause because they need to come back with a cure. That's not the good cause. Good cause needs to lie with the fact that they refused to give us the Petition and they don't have good cause.

Now, what I'm trying to say, then, is they needed either a stipulation from us or good cause for the Commission to allow them to go and do the cure.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: There's no question there's no stipulation. The only argument I hear Mr. Kudo making is for good cause. And I think you've addressed that.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. So what I'm trying to say then is we're going to run into this same problem now as we come back with the cure. The fact is that this whole thing should have been done before September 26, 2007 when they filed. And it certainly should have been done 45 days beforehand.

It's true that the Commission could waive the rules and allow them to come back with the cure. But you're going to have to waive the rules ahead of time or else you're --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I'm not understanding them to ask us to waive the rules. Is that right,

17 Mr. Kudo?

2.2

2.4

MR. KUDO: We're not asking the Commission to waive the rules.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Then we don't need to address that argument.

DR. DUDLEY: All right. Then what I'm basically saying is I think by your actions if you move ahead rather than just closing the case and walking away, I think you're opening the case to

appeal. 1 And I think that it really is -- you know, 2 it really is a waste of your time and the taxpayers' 3 money to continue on with the case at the present time 4 because of the problems that have been caused in the 5 past. Thank you. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners, any 7 8 questions for the parties? MR. KUDO: May I respond? 9 Mr. Kudo. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 10 MR. KUDO: Just a short response. 11 Mr. Dudley is really mixing up the good cause issue. 12 The Commission Rules provides that a party has the 13 ability to cure defects. This Commission in 2009 14 issued an order that states specifically that if --15 directing us to cure --16 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We get that. Wе 17 understand. 18 MR. KUDO: Yeah. 19 But we do want to give him CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 20 a chance to make the arguments as he sees fit. 21 Commissioners have any questions for the parties? 22 other response? City, OP? 23 Nothing further. 24 MR. YEE:

The Chair's going to move

CHAIRMAN DEVENS:

25

on this motion. Move to Grant the Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Petition to Cure the Deficiency of its First Amended Petition based on a finding of good cause which I believe is a fact that the LUC deemed the Petition to be proper and accepted it for filing in the first place. And after subsequent arguments the motions were filed.

1.4

1.6

2.2

There was a ruling, finding that it was deficient. The LUC did not shut the Petitioner off from coming back to try and cure the problem that the LUC found subsequently. I understand that the rule as it reads also requires the approval of the Chair. The Chair's approving this motion. And that is the motion that I make at this time. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER CHOCK: Second.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any discussion? There being none, call for the vote. And let me also note for the motion that based on the LUC's subsequent ruling finding that was a deficiency, it placed the Petitioner in a time constraint that was clearly beyond its control. That's part of the good cause for this motion.

MR. DAVIDSON: Motion to Approve Leave to File Second Amended Petition.

Ph/Fax (808) 538-6458

Commissioner Chock?

1	COMMISSIONER CHOCK: Yes.
2	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Matsumura?
3	COMMISSIONER MATSUMURA: Aye.
4	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Teves?
5	COMMISSIONER TEVES: Yes.
6	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Lezy?
7	COMMISSIONER LEZY: Yes.
8	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Contrades?
9	COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Yes.
10	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Makua?
11	COMMISSIONER MAKUA: Aye.
12	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Heller?
13	COMMISSIONER HELLER: Yes.
14	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Judge?
15	COMMISSIONER JUDGE: Yes.
16	MR. DAVIDSON: Chair Devens?
17	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes.
18	MR. DAVIDSON: Motion passes 9-0, Chair.
19	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Second motion, take
20	argument on, Mr. Kudo. Let me just explain for the
21	audience. The fact that the Motion for Leave was
22	granted does not necessarily mean that any deficiency
23	has been cured. That's the motion that we will now
24	have addressed by the Petitioner and the parties.
25	MR. KUDO: We have moved and requested the

Commission to find that the additional information
that we have submitted, which is Petitioner's Exhibit
No. 20 and 21, addresses and responds to the
Commission's request for further details on the

Project.

2.4

That information, which consists of the Ho'opili phased development plan marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 20, and the map for development phasing for Ho'opili, which is marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 21, were filed and attached to our Second Amended Petition.

As again the information that we have provided provides more detailed information as to the development timetable for the Ho'opili Project, in particular the construction and phasing of the Project both with regard to then residential component, commercial components and the infrastructure that is part of this particular Project.

We looked and examined, as I said before, the Koa Ridge filings which were very similar. And we tried to follow the details, the level of details that was included in their filings because we wanted to be responsive to the Commission. And we believe that we have.

In addition, we enclosed a map which

outlines the phasing of the construction as the Project proceeds forward. Based on that, we believe that our Second Amended Petition cures the defects that were found by this Commission in 2009 and we'd like to proceed forward to the hearings.

I'm sure that a lot of the people that are here today really go to the case in chief. And I think those issues will never be aired if we are never able to get to the hearing. So we are anxious to get forward and have an opportunity for people to give their point of view on the Project and the issues that concern them so that we can address them. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Kudo, curing the deficiency you look at this issue as curing a procedural deficiency, is that correct?

MR. KUDO: Yes.

2.4

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Would there be any effect on the timing if you were to refile the Second Amended Petition? How would that affect the timing of the proceedings?

MR. KUDO: Well, it would delay it for a few months because it depends on the scheduling because you'd have to have a separate hearing on that particular matter. That's what we were really trying to avoid was another hearing on the issue, but we can

do it, but it would...

2.4

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I'm not asking you -- I'm just try to satisfy myself that there's no procedural issues that I'm overlooking in terms of the Motion for Leave has now been granted.

The Second Amended Petition is filed. I'm not sure it makes a difference now with that. But I just want to know if you had any concerns about that.

MR. KUDO: I have no concerns about that.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Okay. City.

MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: The City takes no position on the motion.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Yee.

MR. YEE: The Office of Planning has no objection to the determination of the completeness of in the matter. As you know the Office of Planning previously objected on the basis that there was no incremental development plan. That incremental development plan has not been -- or is now part of their Second Amended Petition. Obviously we reserve the right to analyze, critique and respond to that incremental development plan. But we will do so in the context of the decision-making process in this case. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Kudo, with the filing

you're not asking the Commission to pass on the credibility or to accept it in any way, is that right?

MR. KUDO: Yes. We're not asking the Commission to look at it substantive. It's just a procedural issue.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Dr. Dudley, do you have any argument?

DR. DUDLEY: I don't think I'm really clear on what's going on here.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: The only thing going on is that they're trying to cure a procedural deficiency which I was trying to clarify and Mr. Kudo has clarified, that the way we're looking at it is correct in terms of they're not asking us to accept the substance of the plans. That will be subject to a lot more hearings and dissection depending on how this motion is ruled upon.

But they're merely meeting a procedural requirement that was not met previously. That's the issue that we're faced with at this point. We're not really arguing the substance of whether or not it's a good project, bad project or somewhere in between. We're not at that point yet.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. But we are arguing whether the material that was submitted, the phased

development plan and the phasing map, whether or not the substance of that is adequate, right?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Not necessarily. And I don't want to speak for Mr. Kudo. He can answer himself. But from what I understand they are merely trying to satisfy a procedural requirement that's mandated under the rules with the subsequent filing. Whether we agree with the merits of the substance of that is to be heard on another day, assuming they get by this motion today.

And, Mr. Kudo, is that a correct understanding?

MR. KUDO: Yes. What we're trying to do is submit a level of detail of information that we believe was requested by the Commission. What the Commission is doing today is saying: Okay. You've submitted the level of detail of information that we wanted but reserving the right to look at and examine the details of that information during the hearings.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. And I disagree entirely that that's the way we should be going about it.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And you can make your argument. Go ahead.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. I think that the cure has come back to us. We need to look and see does

this satisfy us or does it not, you know. So with your indulgence I would like to move on and really discuss this thing in detail.

1.7

2.0

2.1.

2.3

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: As long as you keep it within the parameters of the issues being raised in this motion because we did still have your motion as well.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I think you have an idea where I'm going with this and that I would like to really get into the substance of what he's saying. Would you prefer that I wait until my motion comes up and then I would lay that out?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Well, I don't want to tell you how to argue your case. You argue your case the way you see fit. But I also want to keep it confined to the issue being raised with this particular motion. You will have a chance to argue the other issues that you raise in your own motion right after this. That would also depend on how this motion turns out.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. So this motion -okay -- I would prefer to give my material now since
we have voted to handle these things together. I
would like to answer the question of whether or not we
see -- I'd like to point out the problems that I see
with the cure that they have provided. That means

going into the substance. So with your indulgence I'd like to do that now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Okay, we'll hear you.

I did pass out some Okay. DR. DUDLEY: Does everybody have those? And if you things here. could look at those with me, please. Okay. The first of those things is the original master plan. This is Okay. And Page2 is their development phasing Page1. map that they have given us. Page 3 is the revised Ho'opili plan unveiled, which is the material they So this is the map from the gave to the newspaper. And Page4 is the 'Ewa Development Plan and newspaper. the map that they have for the 'Ewa Development Plan.

The first problem with the material which they have given us is that their phased development plan does not really go along with their map. If we were to look at the first page there as just an example, the dark brown colors, you see in the center there some dark brown.

You see up to the left some dark brown, and then up to the right of that some more dark brown.

Those are the high-density buildings.

Now, if you look at the phasing map, which is the second one, you'll see that there's an overlay there. And underneath that is the original map. And

what you find is that you've got the same dark brown buildings are there although they're not dark brown, they haven't been moved at all.

1.1

So the second map, which is their development phasing map, takes into consideration the rail because the rail is there. You can see it with the UH West O'ahu station and the brown line going across and so forth. Okay -- the Ho'opili station over there. Their phased development plan talks about Transit-Oriented Developments. Where are the Transit-Oriented Developments here?

The Transit-Oriented Developments should be portrayed as circles, concentric circles with smaller circle inside and larger circle on the outside. And that's where the high development would go. Okay?

Instead, what they have done they don't have any Transit-Oriented Developments on this map. They have the buildings and the underneath part in the wrong place. Those brown buildings should be around the train station because that's what a Transit-Oriented Development is all about.

So what I'm saying is that there's no coordination between what they are telling us in the phased development plan and their phasing map and between their phasing map and their original plan for

the Project.

Now what we really need from them would be for them to straighten things out, you know. We don't need a map that shows buildings out of place and no Transit-Oriented Development here. What we need is two maps. We need a map that shows the original plan. And then we need a map that shows a plan with circles around the buildings and the building's mood so that it fits the plan.

so basically what we're trying to say, then, is, you know, they haven't taken the time to separate things out. They haven't given us a plan which is really clear. What they've given us is a plan that's just all a jumble where everything is just kind of put together and you figure it out for yourselves and maybe this and maybe that.

I'd like to say then the second point moving on to the third page here. They don't say -- what they told the public and what they have on Page 2 disagree. What they have told to the public is they're all of a sudden going to have farms on this property.

The farms are going to be 16 percent of the property. That's a substantial change. They have changed the focus and the intent of this thing to

where it's now going to have farms.

2.0

No mention of that whatsoever is made in any of the paperwork they have given us. They went to the public on exactly the same day that they turned the material in to you and told the public they were going to do one thing. And they instead turned in to you something that didn't reflect that whatsoever.

Let me point out talking about the -- if you go to the first map, take a look at it and take a look at the green areas on the first map. Now, if you go to the legend there it says "open space and buffers". All right? That's because these green areas right now are not farmed. And the reason they're not farmed is those are the gullies. Those are the gulches. Those are the hillsides. And they're not currently farmed. So they were planning on leaving those as open space.

If you go to the other map, the map that was given to the public, this is on Page 3, you see exactly the same open spaces. Some of them have been changed a little bit to show a lighter green and a darker green. But when we go and take a look at the legend the legend says, "These are now the commercial farms."

Where are the commercial farms going?

They're going to into the land in which commercial

farmers today don't farm because it's not worth it.

Okay? You know what they're doing, they're converting the junk land to the commercial farms.

2.4

2.5

That's what they -- and so they're telling the public one thing but what we get is just not there. There's none of that in anything that we have received. They say they're going to do a 5 megawatt station, a power station. There's nothing in what they have given us either in the phased development plan or in the map, that says how is that power going to come into the Project? They tell us about the pipes coming in for water. They tell us about the wastewater system.

Why don't they tell us about the electricity? That goes in pipes underground too, you know. It's something that is lacking from this map. There are definitely things that are lacking here.

The next thing that I'd like to point out is that this map is contrary to the 'Ewa Development Plan. Now, everybody knows the 'Ewa Development Plan, that's nothin'. But the 'Ewa Development Plan is the law. It was passed by ordinance and it is the law. And it's -- the 'Ewa Development Plan from 1997 is the one that's still in effect.

And if we go to that and you take a look

here at Page 4 what you find is the 'Ewa Development 1 Plan has a different idea entirely about what they're 2 going to do. You know? They've got phased 3 And if you take a look at Page 4 in development also. 4 the Ho'opili area you'll see that the dark yellow 5 sections are for the first years of phasing. 6 have numbered two sections over the second phasing years. The numbered three sections are for the third 8 phasing years. All right. So it doesn't correspond 9 with the 'Ewa Development Plan. 10

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Dr. Dudley, I apologize for interpreting.

DR. DUDLEY: Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: But we're running up on the lunch hour. We wanted to get to your motion as well, have them decided, this motion as well as your motion before we go to lunch. Can you summarize here?

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. Let me try to wrap up real quickly then. We have a problem with water desalinization. Their own testifier says they're going to be running out of water.

We don't have any pipes coming from anywhere showing us where are they going to get the water after they run out of water and we go to the desalination plant? It's lacking.

We find in the stuff they gave to the press, they're talking about Energy Star development. They're talking about making the places to save energy, water, natural resources, all kinds of things they're going to do. This group was really interested in the LEED program. There's nothing of that in the phased development plan.

2.

It comes to traffic. And traffic they do say something about traffic. What they say is we're going to agree with the Department of Transportation sometime after we're through with you guys. Okay? I don't like that. I think let's get traffic down now. Traffic is one of our major problems.

I think if we take a look at -- if we go back and just ask ourselves: Why is it that 14 times they refused to do this? Mike Jones testified that it was -- it was the fact that it would take so much time.

MR. KUDO: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to object because I think he's getting into the argument of the substance of the case in chief which is really meant for the hearing. I think we're trying to cure a procedural defect, not argue the case in chief at this point. I have arguments on every single point that he made. And we put it in our response. But, you know,

I think it's really meant for the case in chief. 1 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I understand. Why don't we give him another minute to wrap up his argument. 3 Thank you very much. I just --DR. DUDLEY: 4 I was on the point about the fact that they have 5 refused 14 times to produce this plan. Why? 6 it was going to take so much time. This 10 pages is not something you refuse 14 times to produce. Okay? 8 So what I'm saying it's lacking, it's inconsistent, it 9 didn't provide all the material and you should not 10 approve this as curing the problem. It just simply 11 doesn't do it. Thank you very much for your time. 12 Commissioners, any CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 13 There being none, any questions for the parties? 14 rebuttal, Mr. Kudo? You don't need to address the 15 arguments that he made that went outside the issue. 16 But I wanted to give Dr. Dudley the respect and the 17 time to make his argument with had the understanding 18 that he's a layman and trying to understand the 19 substance of the case and the procedural. 20 MR. KUDO: We have no further argument. 21 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: City? 22 MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: NO. 23 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Yee, anything you want 2.4

to add?

25

MR. YEE: Just very briefly. When the 1 Office of Planning is basically saying that the 2 Petition and the incremental development plan are 3 sufficient for purposes of completeness in 15-15-50C 4 Hawaii Administrative Rules, whether or not the 5 Petition and the incremental development plan is 6 sufficient to justify reclassification is not before 7 you today. And the Office of Planning is reserving 8 Thank you. comments on that. 9 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Understood. At this time 10 the Chair's going to move to grant the motion, 11 Petitioner's Motion for Determination, that its second 12 amended position cures the deficiency of its first 13 amended Petition and is ready for processing. 14 It appears that the subsequent filings 15 satisfy the deficiency that was noted previously by 16 this Commission under HAR 15-15-50-C19. Is there a 17 18 second? 19

COMMISSIONER CHOCK: Second.

20

21

22

2.5

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Second by Commissioner Any discussion? There being none, call for Chock. the vote.

MR. DAVIDSON: Motion as stated by Chair 23 24 Devens.

Commissioner Matsumura?

	TANKE GET ONE DE MA EGUMUDA.
1	COMMISSIONER MATSUMURA: Aye.
2	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Chock?
3	COMMISSIONER CHOCK: Yes.
4	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Teves?
5	COMMISSIONER TEVES: Yes.
6	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Lezy?
7	COMMISSIONER LEZY: Yes.
8	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Contrades?
9	COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Yes.
10	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Makua?
11	COMMISSIONER MAKUA: Aye.
12	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Heller?
13	COMMISSIONER HELLER: Yes.
14	MR. DAVIDSON: Commissioner Judge?
15	COMMISSIONER JUDGE: Yes.
16	MR. DAVIDSON: Chair Devens?
17	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes.
18	MR. DAVIDSON: Motion passes 9/0, Chair.
19	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Why don't we get to the
20	last motion. After we rule on that we'll take a
21	break. And I apologize to the public for not getting
22	back to you sooner. But we needed to at least have
23	the motions ruled upon.
24	But we certainly want to give you all the

will -- well, why don't we take the motion and see where we are at that point in time.

Dr. Dudley, your motion.

DR. DUDLEY: Which last motion was that? CHAIRMAN DEVENS: It was your motion.

MR. KUDO: Mr. Chairman, may I make a point?
CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes, sir.

MR. KUDO: In looking at FOM's motion it really -- all of the arguments, all of the arguments go to the case in chief. And I believe it's more proper to take up his arguments during the hearing I mean rather than at this point.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your point is well taken, but we had consolidated the motions earlier. And that was something that the Commission passed on. So I think at this point we would have to go forward and give Dr. Dudley the opportunity to argue his motion. Dr. Dudley, you know which motion we're on now? It's the motion that you filed on June 1st of this year.

DR. DUDLEY: It's the 3-part motion?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes. And some of it may be moot now so you don't have to repeat the issues that have already been decided upon. But the arguments have been made for the record.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. I think the first and

second motions are moot as far as I can see. And
there's not much sense in presenting more material on
those.

I would like to talk about the third part of the motion, though, which is to remove this land from further consideration.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Doctor, can I ask you this before you jump into your argument?

DR. DUDLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do you have any legal authority that you can cite the Commission to for such a proposition where we would remove this property 'til 2061?

DR. DUDLEY: No. I wish I did. It was simply a layman reading your rules and trying to find ways that that could happen. So, you know, the things I came up with are really kind of oblique --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Are you really pushing this argument at this point in time?

DR. DUDLEY: Yes. The way I think it could happen also -- no, not this time. I think the other two motions really make this motion moot. But I would like to speak to it for just a minute.

I think we need to begin to look to how the Commission can do that. I will have lawyers looking

into it trying to find something. People told me,
"You're really just beating a bush, knocking your head
against a wall."

But even waiving rules is a possibility it seems to me for doing this, you know. It looks like, looks like --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do you want to consult with your attorneys and come back with this argument some other time?

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. Good.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You want to proceed that way?

DR. DUDLEY: Yes, that would be fine.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Okay. Parties have any objection to that? Do you want to withdraw this motion at this point or how do you want to proceed?

DR. DUDLEY: I'm afraid I don't know enough legalese to tell you what I want to do. But I'd like to defer for another time. Maybe withdraw is the best way.

MR. KUDO: I think it would be cleaner for him to withdraw, otherwise you have this res judicata issue taking up the same issue in the case in chief if he repeats it again.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You want to withdraw the

motion at this time? 1 2 DR. DUDLEY: Okay. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: So the Chair will 3 4 note that --DR. DUDLEY: Mr. Chair. 5 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes. 6 DR. DUDLEY: Counsel here just tells me --7 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Which counsel? 8 9 (Laughter) My newest hired counsel DR. DUDLEY: 10 suggests that I not withdraw but ask for a continuance 11 on the motion... that part of the motion. 12 MR. KUDO: We would object to a continuance. 13 We would like him to argue now if that's the case. 14 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: City, do you have any 15 No position? 16 position on this? MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: Well, I think we agree 17 with Petitioner that we'd rather him argue it today. 18 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Yee, any position on 19 this issue? 20 We have no position on this issue. 21 MR. YEE: Dr. Dudley, I think to CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 22 keep it clean it would probably make more sense to 23 take the argument today. I seriously doubt that 24 you're going to come up with legal authority that's 25

going to allow us to grant what you're asking for.

It would probably get us into a lot of trouble. But that's my own personal thought. I haven't done the research on it. But I'm sure it would be very difficult for us to grant what you're asking if the Commissioners were inclined to even go in that direction.

DR. DUDLEY: Could I take --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Why don't we do this. Why don't we take your argument, let the Commission rule on this motion, and take our lunch break and come back.

DR. DUDLEY: All right. Mr. Chair, to tell you the real honest truth I haven't read over my material on this. And I'm really not prepared right now to do it. Could we take lunch and then I could take a couple minutes when we return?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You want to take a couple minutes now? Because I don't want to keep the public waiting, you know. I got a real problem with that. People take off from work and there's so many people here today that obviously took time to be here. The time now is about 12:21. We started earlier this morning. It's been several hours. I want to extend some courtesy to the people that are here.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I feel for you if you had not had an opportunity to review your materials. You did make a filing. The filing is under your name, apparently signed by you. So I have to assume that you have some familiarity with the arguments that you filed and presented to us in good faith.

so why don't we take your arguments and let the Commission rule on your motion and then we'll take a break for lunch.

DR. DUDLEY: Okay. Give me a minute.

(Pause) All right. Mr. Chair, I think it best right now to just go ahead and withdraw it. However, I will, I will enter it again. I think it's something that we really need to have the Commission think about.

This is the last piece of property within the Urban Growth Boundary. We need to take some time to think about what we're going to do with this piece. And because of that we've got to find a way to give us the time to do that.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: No, if your decision's to withdraw we respect that decision and note the motion has been withdrawn.

Ph/Fax (808) 538-6458

DR. DUDLEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: With that we'll take our lunch break. But for those that want to provide public testimony, basically there is not a whole lot of substance left to be decided on today. We decided on the motions. It appears that the matter will continue to proceed forward. There will be many other opportunities to provide public testimony in this matter.

But we will reconvene after lunch if you want to provide public testimony. We reassure that you will be given that opportunity. Also, to let you know that there will be other times when we start hearing more of the evidence where you can give public testimony and it may make more sense then knowing what the Petitioner is proposing and knowing a little bit more about the substance.

But just wanted to give you a heads up and forewarning on that. Anyway, we'll take our lunch break, reconvene at 1:30.

(Lunch recess)

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We're back on the record.

I apologize for running a little bit late on this. In any event we're going to come back, take remaining public testimony. Do the parties want to add anything to the record at this pont in time, Mr. Kudo?

1	MR. KUDO: We have nothing further to add.
. 2	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: City?
. 3	MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: Nothing further.
4	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Yee?
5	MR. YEE: Nothing further.
6	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Doctor?
7	DR. DUDLEY: No.
8	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do we have any signed up,
9	Dan?
10	MR. DAVIDSON: No.
11	CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Is there anyone out there
12	in the audience that wants to provide public testimony
13	in this matter? You can come forward, please.
14	ROSIE GOO,
1 -	being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined
15	2021.5
16	and testified as follows:
16	and testified as follows:
16 17	and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do. Rosie Goo, again. I
16 17 18	and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do. Rosie Goo, again. I just wanted to say
16 17 18	and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do. Rosie Goo, again. I just wanted to say MR. DAVIDSON: Go ahead, have a seat.
16 17 18 19	and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do. Rosie Goo, again. I just wanted to say MR. DAVIDSON: Go ahead, have a seat. THE WITNESS: that rezoning the most
16 17 18 19 20 21	and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do. Rosie Goo, again. I just wanted to say MR. DAVIDSON: Go ahead, have a seat. THE WITNESS: that rezoning the most productive agricultural lands on O'ahu doesn't make a
16 17 18 19 20 21	and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do. Rosie Goo, again. I just wanted to say MR. DAVIDSON: Go ahead, have a seat. THE WITNESS: that rezoning the most productive agricultural lands on O'ahu doesn't make a lot of sense. And there are many in the community who

children that need to eat good food.

so I think that those people in the community are really relying on you as a Commission to preserve, to conserve and to protect the agriculture land in the way that the state constitution requires the state to do.

So I just ask you to think about the future long term not just the fact that we have a bad economy and times are difficult and people do need jobs. But being shortsighted in regard to the most productive agricultural land I think we would really be selling present and future generations short. And that's what we rely on you for to make the right decisions. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions from the parties for this witness?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MR. YEE: No questions.

DR. DUDLEY: No questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? There being none, thank you very much. Next witness. Once again my name is Victoria Cannon from Makakilo.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Can I swear you in again.

VICTORIA CANNON,

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined

and testified as follows:

1.1

Makakilo. I just want to reiterate these are prime... ag...lands. They are the only prime...ag...lands left. You are compelled by your own statutes to give these lands the greatest possible protections. You are compelled by your own rules to do that. Do you all understand that? I have the chapter and the paragraph if you need it.

I also want to reiterate we're looking here at an issue that is going to mean more jobs for mainland folks than it is for our own union boys. And I am incensed that these union members are not being told this by their own leaders.

You folks need to see to it that the truth comes out on that particular issue. That is the point that D.R. Horton-Schuller Limited Liability Corporation continued to stress. It is not necessarily the truth.

Finally, regarding your own subchapter 8

Land Use Commission Administrative Rules 15-15-77

under the decision-making criteria for boundary

amendments, paragraph B-5 of that subchapter.

As of Tuesday morning, I told you this in my earlier testimony, 5:30 Tuesday morning I received a

call from a man who works for Standard and Poors in New York City. I had been waiting for his call for almost three weeks. He was away on school kids' vacations, but regardless, he made it very clear to me Horton has gone from a 4 to a 2. A 2 is flags raised.

It has gone from triple B. to BB- which is creating some rumblings in the bond market and the stock market in New York City.

You folks have no assurances that they are going to simply seek this land reclassification change, get the zoning changed from ag to urban and simply turn around and sell it so they can pay some of their \$2.2 billion senior unsecured debt they are going to be required to pay on shortly. You need to investigate these issues, please, before you make any other decisions. I expected the decision today. I wasn't surprised. But coming up I'll bring it up again. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness? There being none next witness.

DENISE SNYDER

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Can I have your name and

address, please.

THE WITNESS: Denise Snyder, 4592 Mana

Place, Honolulu, 96816. I represent a lot of people
in the community and I'm here to try to protect our
agricultural land. I'm extremely concerned that it's
even gotten this far.

It's my understanding that a lot of the ag land that's still zoned ag land is not that productive. The farmed ag land that is currently being farmed, the vast majority of that is being used to grow non-edible crops such as GMO seeds and flowers.

And I'm also concerned that you guys look into having ag land that's really used for edible crops and not cash crops. This ag land up for rezoning is being used to grow a large percentage of our locally grown and consumed vegetables and fruit.

I'm extremely concerned that such a large tract of land that is such a high grade of land is even up. I can't understand how it got this far. I urge you to think about the big picture and help us obtain food security. That's a fundamental right, the right to eat.

This seems like such a no-brainer to me.

The next time the ships don't come in or the boats

don't come in who doesn't get to eat? Which one of us is going to be left starving? Please protect O'ahu's ag lands. It needs to be getting stricter.

4 | Concentrate on edible foods. Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness? There being none, thank you very much.

HARMONY BENTOSINA

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do. My name is Harmony
Bentosina. My address is 92-1242 Makakilo Drive. We
need to save our farmland. Ho'opili would pave over
the best farmland on O'ahu. And this is not only for
us but for our future and for our children's future.
Hawai'i is perhaps the most geographically isolated
place in the world and we cannot know for certain that
mainland food will always get here.

I heard them say that the latest plan from Ho'opili calls for garden plots. But garden plots in no way compensate for sacrificing the best farmland on this island. I mean the best agricultural lands should not be growing houses.

People claim Ho'opili will bring jobs. But food is even more basic than jobs. And farmland provides agricultural jobs. And it's even a boon for

tourism. Tourists don't want to come here to see a paved over island. I mean they want open space and so do the people who live here. We want food and we want open space.

1.5

I think that Joni Mitchell said it the best in her song (singing) "Don't you know -- you don't know what you got till it's gone. They paved paradise and put up a parking lot." My response is I firmly hope not. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you. Any questions for this witness? There being none, thank you.

RICK STANLEY

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Can we have your name and address, please.

THE WITNESS: (Off mic) Rick Stanley, 4038C Keanu Street, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96816. I've been lookin' at both sides of the argument. It seems like the other side, not my side, (back on mic) gee, I'm a sound man. I should know this.

I am a union member, but I recognize the need for jobs but not to sacrifice the heritage of my children for jobs. Now, the only argument I've heard

is, number one, a big corporation wants to make more money. And number two we need the jobs.

I repeat. Not sacrificing what our children will have. They will have nothing but ashes and oil balls if we keep this up. Just because a law is made does not mean it's good law. You have the power to change something here. Just by changing it that's not gonna make it good. And you will be wrong if you let us lose this agriculture land. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much. Any questions for this witness? There being none thank you very much, sir.

ROGER WICKENDEN

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I so swear.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Can you state your name and address for the record?

THE WITNESS: Roger Wickenden, 974 Apokula Place, Kailua.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Go ahead, sir.

THE WITNESS: We live in changing times.

When I became a resident of Hawai'i in 1968 the

25 | pillars of our economy were sugar, pineapple and the

military. We have observed radical changes since then. What future changes should we guard against?

1.9

- 1. World food supply is starting to decline while the word population continues to increase.

 Futurists predict starvation of large populations in another generation.
- 2. The preeminence of the United States naval power to maintain freedom of the seas in the Pacific is likely to be challenged by emerging economies and navies of Asian nations.

Any decision made this year to achieve the right balance between urban and agricultural use of land is likely to be seen as inappropriate only 10 years from now.

A primary reason for reclassifying any of the proposed lands to urban is the proximity to a rail station. But the impact on agriculture may require limiting reclassification to a much smaller perimeter about the proposed Ho'opili station and also the proposed UH West O'ahu station, than the area covered by the existing Petition.

The three considerations I have brought up: future world, food shortage, future contestations of freedom of the seas and HART has not yet been implemented, reclassification of the proposed land is

inappropriate at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness? Hearing none, thank you very much, sir.

ALI'I TASI PONDER

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your name and address,

9 | please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10 THE WITNESS: Ali'i Tasi Ponder. Kahuku.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do you have a mailing

12 | address?

THE WITNESS: Yes. P. O. Box 360 in Kahuku,

14 96731.

15 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: I'm the fifth generation to live in my community. My grandfather worked at the sugar mill down the street from me when he was a kid.

The wonderful thing about these kinds of situations is that it is allowing a number of us, including myself who never thought of themselves as a good public speaker, to become so awakened by what we see that we're forced out of our comfort zones. And I realize that I can't just sit back and complain in my living room and expect anything to change.

And even though I come here and I see the authority and the power that can feel to me as a citizen outweighs the little people in the country, I also recognize in each of you that you're a person just like I am.

2.2

So I hope that when I come up and speak, as everyone does, that we have an ability to move you to really hear us because I can see how it would be very easy to stop listening and hearing people, hearing the same things over and over.

The one thing that I want to kind of -- I felt important to say is that even though I live on the other side of the island, and we're talking about Ho'opili, we're starting to understand regardless of where we live on the island that we all collectively contribute to the benefit or the undermining of this entire island.

So I'm on the board of a number of different organizations. One of the organizations that I'm involved in involves 28 different organizations that are all for the preservation of our ag lands, but are also very empathetic and sympathetic to the need to develop in a good way.

So I guess what I want us to all keep thinking about is how to use our creative

intelligence, develop in a way that meets our current and future needs, not what we decided was applicable years ago, and not, and not paint ourselves into a corner where we have nothing to eat which makes no sense at all.

I want to kind of encourage everyone to realize that more of us are becoming advocates for the right to eat, the right to eat healthy food and to live a clean and healthy lifestyle.

And we're going to involve more and more people. Because if you can get me out of my part of the island and cancel a day's worth of work to come here and speak like this when I wasn't able to do this at all a year ago, then I'm encouraged to think that there's going to be more and more people. And I definitely want to be on that side. So I hope that you'll continue to keep your eyes, ears and heart open to us. Mahalo.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Questions for this witness? There being none, thank you very much.

CHARLES CAROLE

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes. My name is Charles

Carole. I'm the vice president of the Honolulu League

of Women Voters, 49 South Hotel Street Room 314, 96813. The League is for sustainable agriculture on O'ahu. Therefore we are in opposition to the rezoning of the last 'Ewa agricultural land.

2.1

The city has zoning and gave permits for over 30,000 housing units to be built. We don't need additional -- the additional 12,000 housing units.

These lands are prime agricultural land close to the markets. Local food is far more nutritious than the imported food.

In addition, if jobs are needed we have a dying need for renewable energy projects on O'ahu. And these will provide additional opportunity, job opportunities. So therefore we hope that you would consider denying this application for rezoning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness? There being none thank you very much, sir.

URSULA MEGAFORT

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes, I always tell the truth.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Name and address.

THE WITNESS: My name is Ursula Megafort and $$\operatorname{\mathtt{my}}$$ address is 42 North Kainalu Drive in Kailua. And I

oppose the reclassification of some of our most productive farmland to urban. I believe that there are very good reasons and sound judgment underlying the Hawai'i State Constitution that asks the state shall conserve and protect agricultural lands, promote diversified agriculture, increase agricultural self-sufficiency, and assure the availability of our agricultural suitable lands. I know you have heard this several times today. But we cannot repeat it often enough.

What land on this island could be more vital to agriculture self-sufficiency than the fertile land of Ho'opili proposed development? I cannot think of any. We are a small island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, the farthest removed from any land mass of any place on our planet.

This makes us vulnerable on many, many fronts, not the least on our ability to feed ourselves for any lengths of time. Too much agricultural land has already been lost.

Sadly, and regrettably we already import over 80 percent of the food that we eat. And I understand that there's only an estimated 7 days supply of food on the island should a major catastrophe could cut us off from imports.

This is not only an uncomfortable predicament to be in, it is a dangerous one. I do not think it is wise to make even -- to make it even worse further reduce by further reducing our already limited agriculture self-sufficiency.

2.5

Given the resources and geographic isolation of our island there is a limit to development whether we like it or not. Livability and survival will enter the equation at some point. And the longer we continue to ignore the cumulative impacts of individual developments, the sooner the day of reckoning will come. We cannot afford to lose more than 1500 acres of our most productive agricultural lands.

Are short-term jobs really a sufficient and moral justification for selling out for long-term interests? Would that not be a shortsighted and irresponsible way of governing? What after jobs?

Yes. What after jobs? Let's not focus on temporary gains for some.

Let's focus on the long-term sustainability and food security for all. Please honor the mandate of our state constitution by denying the request for the land use classification before you. Thank you for letting me speak.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you, Ma'am. Any questions for this witness? There being none, thank you very much. Any other witnesses?

THAD SPREG

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

1.1

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Name and address, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Thad. I live at 92-1152 Kueonani Street in Makakilo 96707. I wrote what I was going to say this morning when the room was full. I'd like you to note that the Ho'opili supporters have left but many who oppose Ho'opili development are still here.

In other words, those who are supporting Ho'opili with their wallets are gone. Those who oppose Ho'opili with their hearts are still here. Today you were to determine whether or not to accept the Petitioner's motion. You saw before you many, many members of the community. A lot of those here were in support of Ho'opili but many were not.

But what needs to be factored in is that most, if not all, of those in favor of the development were here because it directly affects them mostly in the form of them getting jobs.

Those of us who are here in opposition to the development are not here because of any direct benefit. So although you saw more supporters than those in opposition the reality is the opposite. The general public does not support the change of the best agricultural land in the state of Hawai'i from ag to urban.

Now, we don't have a budget for fancy signs. We don't have union guys we can dangle the promise of time limited jobs in front of. If we did you would see much, much, much support in opposition of Ho'opili than you would for it.

Commissioners, you represent the people.

Talk to the people. Listen to the people. Listen to all the people, not just the ones with the big bucks and the fancy signs. You will find that the will of the people is to preserve what we have, not to pave over it. Please find a way to ultimately deny this Petition. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thad, did you have a last name that you can give us for our record?

THE WITNESS: Spreg.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Can you spell that.

THE WITNESS: S-p-r-e-g.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you. Any questions

for this witness? There being none thank you very much. Any other witnesses?

THE WITNESS: Aloha, Commissioner. My name is Phyllis Katcher.

5 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Can I swear you in first, 6 please.

PHYLLIS KATCHER

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your address, please.

THE WITNESS: 3652 Hilo Place, Honolulu 96816. My name is Phyllis Katcher and I'm not a big bucks union guy. And I don't hold fancy signs. I'm really one of the people. I was president of Waikele Community Association for 7 years.

And the D.R. Horton-Schuler people Schuler Homes Division, they were the primary developer representing -- they built probably over 2,000 homes in Waikele.

And I was the president during that whole time from the very start to the very finish. And they didn't ask me to testify but I wanted to because I wanted to tell you firsthand you can trust D.R.

25 | Horton. I volunteered to testify today just to share

my personal experience.

2.0

During my term as Waikele they always put people first and they always fulfilled every promise that they agreed to do even during the toughest times. I guess I'm here to say Hawai'i is such a tough place to do business.

And we've seen so many developers come and go. Even recently in the news we've seen developers unable to fulfill promises and things go back and forth.

But D.R. Horton is here for the long haul.

And for, I think, almost 40 years they have built thousands and thousands of affordable homes. I think the homes at Waikele they started at about \$80,000 for a 2-bedroom townhouse, which is almost unheard of. I know they probably didn't make very much money on those homes. But they fulfilled them and always took care of the people.

So I wanted you to know that. That I feel that we're lucky that they're willing to invest millions of dollars to help Hawai'i families have a better life. Both of my parents and grandparents were farmers, two generations of farmers. And I have a lot of aloha for the farming community. But I mean there's people here that can't even -- they don't know

where their kids are going to sleep at night. There's children that go to bed hungry.

some of the union people I was talking to out there they have been on the bench for two years. They don't have a job. They can't even buy their kids even basic things like school supplies. So I mean weighing those two things I think a roof over your head and basic things like food, shelter and a job are much more important.

So even though I do sympathize with some of the comments that were made previously, I just think we've got to look at the priorities. And a basic job is far more important.

One other thing too I wanted to point out is a lot of the piecemeal developments that we've seen lately, a lot of those small developments do not bring community benefits like this Project does. This Project has a lot of considerations for the community.

These small piecemeal developments, they don't provide traffic relief like Ho'opili does. And I really ask that you have the courage and vision to approve this project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much. Any questions? There being none. May I swear you in?

KENT FONOIMOANA

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

2.2

2.4

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Please state your name and address.

THE WITNESS: My name is Kent Fonoimoana.

My address P. O. Box 122 La'ie, Hawai'i, 96762. Thank

you, Commissioner Devens and the rest of the

Commissioners for a long day had by all. I'm not here

to speak against or for the Ho'opili project. As a

former blue collar worker and carpenter, member of the

Carpenters Union 745 I understand the need of my

brothers to have work.

However, I think that during these times that we're entering, this new, still fresh millennium, that there other issues that we as an island people need to address first. I'm wearing my favorite hat, always wear this hat. It's a hat that was given to me by First Wind, First Wind that installed our wind turbines out in Kahuku.

I'm also a member of the Kahuku Community
Association and the Ko'olauloa Neighborhood Board.
Our community supported that Project because we can recognize that as island people we need to learn how to be sustainable. And there will be a point sometime

in our future that we will be needing to generate our own electricity without having to depend on shipping in foreign oil or even domestic oil. And to take it a next step further besides power, I think there are some things that come before electricity. Number one of those things is food.

I think that for myself, like I said, I'm not against the Project. I'm actually for certain aspects of their development including -- anybody here, nobody looking -- I'm actually for rail. Good. There's nobody else from my Defend O'ahu Coalition Here. (Laughter) So being for some things because I can understand them.

However, if the developers and you folks and everybody else can find a way to move forward while still preserving our critical ag lands, you'd have a lot of people on board if the two of them can be done simultaneously. And I think that it can be done. I think that it's gonna take a little realignment of their plans.

But I try to be an optimist about things like that. And I just hope that you folks can take all this information, wave a magic wand over it and everybody will be happy and pono. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you. Any questions

1 for this witness? There being none, thank you very 2 much, sir. Aloha.

THE WITNESS: Aloha.

BEN SCHAFER

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Name and address, please.

THE WITNESS: Ben Schafer, 52-210 Kamehameha Highway, Hau'ula, Hawai'i 96717. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank you the way you're conducting the meeting. You know, I've been to a lot of different meetings and some of them aren't so nice, the chairmans aren't, but I'm glad that you're doing a wonderful job as far as conducting it and the group here.

Before I start I'd like to read something that I found up on the Internet just now.

In 1961 the Hawai'i State Legislature determined that a lack of adequate controls had caused the development of Hawai'i's limited and valuable lands for a short-term gain for a few while resulting in long-term loss to the income potential of our State's economy.

Development of scattered subdivisions

creating problems of expensive yet reduced public services and the conversion of prime agriculture land to residential use were key reasons for establishing the statewide zoning system. To administer the statewide zoning law the Legislature established the Land Use Commission.

2.5

The Commission is responsible for preserving and protecting Hawai'i's land and encouraging those uses to which lands are best suited."

I bring that up because, e kala mai, because I'm from the Windward side, Ko'olauloa. That is not my district but I'm speaking up because we're talking about the island, islandwide. And on the General Plan basically it says the Windward side was going to be kept country. Right? But we keep encroaching development, more development. La'ie has a whole bunch of stuff going on. Turtle Bay still has plans for the hotels going up, all not part of the General Plan.

So the give was that they were going to build the Second City out at Kapolei. However, when you look at the way how things are developing so fast without anybody thinking, whatever land that we have that is the best for agriculture we want to save it. Right? You know, shortsighted, yeah, we want to make

some money right now and bang 'em right out, whether it goes to another group or whether they put up the housing it's a good idea.

But what is the best use of that land? And if that hand can be used for agriculture because we can get more out of it then that's what the land should go far. Number one. That should be the first priority.

There are other areas which you can build on like from the airport all the way to over here. Ugly area. Ugly area. Instead of building all in Ewa to fight the traffic why don't they start building this way so people don't have to be in the traffic?

There is a whole bunch of options that are still open and only picking on areas which they have prime land. There are much more we can do with the city and the state to find out, hey, what else can we do to bring jobs over here? Because I'm a union member too.

My whole family were teamsters, were carpenters, laborers' union, masons' union, just about every union you can think of. But we need to have jobs that are sustainable for our communities that's gonna last.

There's a whole bunch that we can do over

here. But building on prime agriculture land would be hewa, would be wrong. We need those lands, the only lands we have left. It's not only feeding our people it's what our people can afford to eat more than anything else. Yeah?

Because as the land -- as the land prices go up higher, food prices go up higher, more people will be out of food as well. What can they afford to eat? We need to save those. That the mandate. That's the mandate of the Land Use Commission. I urge you to weigh it and try to set the tone so that we're looking at the overall picture.

What are we saving? Not so much what are we building. What are we saving for 50 to a hundred, 150 years from now? What are we saving for our future generations?

That's what I tell our groups that come out to Kahana. Our job is to malama the land to take care of the land for the next generation and the next one and the next one.

What are you folks doing here to ensure that we are saving it for that the next one and the next one and the next one and the next one and the next one? Or do we want it to all be developed and we all gotta move somewhere else because we couldn't afford to stay over here. Yeah? You

folks set that tone. Thank you. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much, sir. Any questions for the witness? There being none, thank you very much. Any other witnesses? There being none we stand adjourned. Thank you. (The proceedings were adjourned at 2:25 p.m.) --000000--

CERTIFICATE 1 2 I, HOLLY HACKETT, CSR, RPR, in and for the State 3 of Hawai'i, do hereby certify; That I was acting as court reporter in the 5 foregoing LUC matter on the 30th day of June 2011; 6 That the proceedings were taken down in 7 computerized machine shorthand by me and were 8 thereafter reduced to print by me; 9 That the foregoing represents, to the best 10 of my ability, a true and correct transcript of the 11 proceedings had in the foregoing matter. 12 13 This 10th day of July 14 15 16 17 Hally Fu. Hackett 18 HOLLY M. HACKETT, HI CSR #130, RPR 19 Certified Shorthand Reporter 20 21 22 23 24 25