1		
2	LAND USE COMMISSION	
3	STATE OF HAWAI'I	
4		PAGE
5	CONT'D HEARING AND ACTION	
6 7	A87-610 TOM GENTRY and) GENTRY PACIFIC, LTD. (O'ahu)	3
8	A92-683 HALEKUA DEVELOPMENT CORP.	19
9	(O and)	
10		
11		
12	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING	S
13		
14	The above-entitled matters came on for	a Public
15	Hearing at the Airport Conference Center, 400 Rodgers	
16	Blvd, Suite 700, Room #3, Honolulu, Hawai'i,	
17	commencing at 9:00 a.m. on November 13,	•
18	to Notice.	, -
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	REPORTED BY: HOLLY M. HACKETT, CSR #130 Certified Shorthand Report), RPR ter
25		

		Z	
1	APPEA	RANCES	
2	COMMISSIONERS:		
3 4 5	EDMUND ACZON BRANDON AHAKUELO KENT HIRANAGA AARON MAHI CHAD McDONALD, (Chair) JONATHAN SCHEUER		
6 7	SANDRA SONG ARNOLD WONG		
8 9 10	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: DAN ORODENKER CHIEF CLERK: RILEY HAKODA STAFF PLANNER: SCOTT DERRICKSON/BERT SARUWATARI DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL: RUSSELL SUZUKI AUDIO TECHNICIAN: WALTER MENCHING		
11	Docket No. A87-610		
12	For the Petitioner:	STEVEN LIM, ESQ. JENNIFER BENCK LIM, ESQ.	
13 14	For the City and County DPP	RICHARD D. LEWALLEN, ESQ. Deputy Corporation Counsel & MIKE WATKINS	
15 16 17	For the State:	BRYAN YEE, ESQ. Deputy Attorney General RODNEY FUNAKOSHI Director Office of Planning	
18	Docket A92-683	Halekua Dev. Corp	
19	For the Petitioner:	STEVEN LIM, ESQ.	
20	For Ho'Ohana Solar Inc.	ONAONA THOENE, Atty. at Law ANN BOUSLOG	
21222324	For HRT Realty, 300 Corporation & Honolulu, Ltd.	DEL WONG, ESQ.	
25			

1 CHAIR McDONALD: (gavel) Morning. Ι'd 2 like to call the Land Use Commission meeting to order. 3 Before we get started I'd like to introduce our newest 4 Commissioner, Sandy Song, who's on an interim 5 appointment from Hawai'i Island. 6 COMMISSIONER SONG: Right. 7 CHAIR McDONALD: Welcome. Welcome, Sandy. 8 This is a continued hearing and action meeting 9 to consider Motion for Order Amending Findings of 10 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated May 17, 1988. 11 12. 2. Issue an order modifying Commission's 13 Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated May 17, 1988 as amended by the 14 15 Commission's November 30, 1999 Order amending 16 Condition No. 6 of the D&O dated May 17, 1988 to 17 expressly authorize the use of a portion of the 18 Kamehameha Schools property for solar farm development 19 for an interim period not to exceed 35 years. 2.0 Will the parties please identify 2.1 themselves for the record. 22 MS. LIM: Good morning, Chair. This is 23 Jennifer Lim representing successor Petitioner Kamehameha Schools. And with me today from Kamehameha 2.4 25 Schools is Catherine Camp and Nicola Doss and one

other person.

12.

2.1

2.5

2 CHAIR McDONALD: 'Morning.

MR. LEWALLEN: Good morning, Chair,
Commissioners. Richard Lewallen, Deputy Corporation
Counsel, the City and County of Honolulu on behalf of
the Department of Planning and Permitting. With me is
Matt Higashiga.

CHAIR McDONALD: Good morning.

MR. YEE: Good morning. Depty Attorney
General Bryan Yee on behalf of the Office of Planning.
With me is Rodney Funakoshi from the Office of
Planning.

CHAIR McDONALD: Good morning. Let me update the record. On October 29, 2014 the Commission conducted the initial hearing on Petitioner's Motion for Order Amending Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated May 17, 1988 and concluded the evidentiary and oral argument portion of the proceedings and began its deliberations on this matter.

During deliberations the Commission unanimously voted 6/0 to recognize Kamehameha Schools as successor Petitioner with standing to seek and obtain the relief requested by the motion and set the filing date of November 15, 2014 for the parties to

submit their proposed Decision and Orders to assist the Commission in completing its decision making in this matter.

2.0

2.1

2.5

On November 3rd, 2014 the Commission mailed the agenda for the November 12 and 13, 2014 meeting to parties and statewide and O'ahu mailing lists.

On November 5th, 2014 the parties submitted their stipulated proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order to the Commission. Between November 5 and November 12, 2014 the parties timely filed their respective comments, exhibits, responses, joinders, stipulations, objections, and replies with the Commission.

Let me briefly describe our procedures for today on this docket. First, I'll call those individuals desiring to provide public testimony to identify themselves. All such individuals will be called in turn to our witness box where they will be sworn in prior to their testimony.

After public testimony the Commission will resume its deliberations and decision-making. The Parties will be given an opportunity to make concluding remarks on the motion in regards to their roles in the stipulated findings.

At the conclusion of the remarks on the motion and stipulated filing, and after questions from the Commissioners and answers thereto, the Commission will conclude its deliberations. Are there any questions on the procedures for today?

MR. LIM: No.

2.0

2.1

CHAIR McDONALD: For those that are providing public testimony the Commission would appreciate it if you could confine your testimony to issues consistent with this matter and avoid repetitive testimony. Are there any individuals in the public wishing to provide public testimony? Seeing none, Ms. Lim, do you have any remarks regarding the motion at hand?

MS. LIM: If I may I'll just take a couple minutes. We've already expressed our appreciation but I want to express it again 'cause I know it was a lot to get through, a lot to get through quickly, especially for a new Commission. And we and Kamehameha Schools obviously very much appreciate the time and the effort.

Two weeks ago we were before you and you ordered us to file a Stipulated Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order. That was pretty breathtaking. That's a lot to stipulate

to, a lot of details. It took a lot of work on
Holly's part just to get the transcript; and a lot of
real close work both with Kamehameha Schools in making
sure that we were reciting the facts correctly.

'Cause as you might remember you folks asked a lot of

2.0

2.1

'Cause as you might remember you folks asked a lot of detailed questions. We wanted to make sure we captured all that in these findings.

And then a tremendous amount of effort with the City, especially with the State Office of Planning and working together to come to the point where I can say to you this is the first time I ever filed a fully... stipulated.... D&O.

And, granted, the City isn't a party to the stipulation and Mr. Lewallen can discuss that. But to have that done in just a little over 2 weeks was a pretty big deal. So I hope that the Commissioners looking through this document believe that it accurately reflects not only the record but also provides the good cause which is the criteria for passing a Motion to Amend.

I mean as Mr. Yee had said at the last hearing, it's a little bit of a fuzzy concept 'what is good cause'. But I think that in these 50 or some odd pages of findings and conclusions demonstrate that good cause. It's a solar Project on urban. It's not

1 a District Boundary Amendment. That decision was made 2 decades ago. This is a simple motion to let 3 Kamehameha Schools make good use of this property, a portion of this property for 35 years by having a 4 5 solar farm which doesn't create traffic, doesn't 6 create any sort of bad environmental impacts and gives 7 Kamehameha Schools an opportunity to figure out what 8 it is they want to do with the property going forward. 9 And Kamehameha Schools agreed to the 10 conditions requested by Office of Planning including that Kamehameha Schools submit a Master Plan within X 11 12. number of years of this Commission's Order. 13 So I think you've got the full package 14 here, a good Project, certainly good cause, and 15 something that's not only compliant with the Land Use 16 Commission rules but also with the State Plan. So 17 those are my concluding remarks. Thank you. 18 CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you, Ms. Lim. 19 questions for the parties? 2.0 MR. LEWALLEN: No. 2.1 MR. YEE: I have no questions. I just 22 wanted to say that I'm sorry we weren't able to get 23 the stipulation in on the schedule the Commission

asked for. I know that the LUC staff had to work

particularly hard in this matter. I just want to

24

25

assure you we really worked very hard to get you a stipulation. I know it came in sort of close to this hearing date. But it was not through lack of effort. Thank you.

2.0

2.1

MR. LEWALLEN: I've just spoken with the Department of Planning and Permitting about this. They ultimately tell me they have no objection to the proposed decision and conditions. Their only concern was the level of detail specific to the Project on this. I thought it may cause some difficulties down the line through permitting.

I discussed this with Ms. Lim. She and I agreed to disagree as a matter of philosophy. It's a matter about the ultimate Project that they want to do. So the City not being a part of the stipulation shouldn't be read as an objection to the Project. It was just, like I said, a matter I think a philosophical debate on the amount of language in there, she felt strongly should be included and the Department did not. But I just wanted to make that clear. So thank you.

CHAIR McDONALD: I'd like to personally express my appreciation for you folks all working together. Mr. Yee, I understand how much you have on your plate. I do appreciate your folks coming

together and providing the Commission with a complete document that we could review. There was some clarity that the document did provide to the Commission. I'd just like to express my sincere appreciation for your hard work on such a short deadline.

2.0

2.1

Commissioners, any questions or remarks to the Petitioner or parties at this point? Commissioner Scheuer.

COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Aloha. I want to thank you all also for working so expeditiously on this matter. I know it was in your interest and your clients' interest, but this body also gets the keys to drive next week. It's nice to see that we're all working together to move expeditiously.

I'm intending to vote in favor of the motion. I wanted to make sure that in the Findings of Fact, the stipulated Findings that I reviewed it talks about the Master Plan. But both Mr. Caldarone and Ms. Camp spoke very clearly not just about doing the Master Plan, but the process in which they would do a Master Plan with community consultation, comparing the Master Plan versus the strategic plan of Kamehameha Schools and the regional plan that they're developing there.

And to me that was, like, some of the most

significant that this new, whatever they propose finally to do with the property is really going to be much more in accordance with the needs of the client as well as with the community's needs and desires.

12.

2.0

2.1

I'm hoping to see those reflected in the Findings of Fact and detail just directly from the statements made by Ms. Camp and Mr. Caldarone about the planning process that they go through. So that when one reads the Decision and Order in context with the final Findings of Fact you can say: Okay. It's not just a plan. Here's a 5-page document, but here's the planning process that the school is intending to and has representing to go through. Thank you.

CHAIR McDONALD: Commissioners, any other questions for the parties? Seeing none --

COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Chair, a couple of comments. Since this matter was deferred to this meeting I had an opportunity to come up with a couple more questions. It's not of substance but just for the record. Was there any concern about hoary bats nesting habitats in that area? Just from reading the next application or Petitioners file they mentioned possible hoary bat habitation areas. I was just wondering if there was any concern for this area.

MS. LIM: The EIS that was done for this

property was done several, several years ago. But that didn't identify any Hoary bats or any other species of interest. That hasn't been revisited. But as far as I know there's no concerns regarding any kind of threatened or endangered species on the property.

2.0

2.1

COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: One other thing. There's concerns of the migratory water fowls and shore birds mistaking a solar field array as water, which I guess there's been occasions on the mainland when birds have flown into solar — solar fields. I was just wondering just for the record if you'd be looking at that down the road, if that's a concern.

MS. LIM: You know, I could turn to Ms. Doss, if that's okay. I will say, Commissioner, that's not something that's expressed in these findings. We — at the last hearing there were questions about could somehow these solar panels do something that would attract birds and cause 'em to fry.

You might recall Ms. Doss said: No, in fact the reflectivity, the point of the solar panels is to attract not to reflect the reflectivity from these panels is less than the windows on your house.

So that's something that we know we have

on the record. And in terms of it being an attractive for waterfowl really, I don't even know that there's waterfowl flying across this property.

COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Neither do I. I

COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Neither do I. I just wanted to state that concern for the record.

MS. LIM: Well, it's certainly something that can be looked at during the Conditional Use process too with the City. I'm sorry to turn my head. I was looking to get concurrence from Ms. Doss.

(Ms. Doss approaching the table.)

2.0

2.1

CHAIR McDONALD: Please state your name.

MS. DOSS: Nicola Doss.

CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you.

MS. DOSS: We actually are commissioning an updated biological assessment of the site to update on the EIS work that was done previously. And that will be submitted to DPP as part of our application. So I will look at an updated biological assessment.

COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Thank you. Just one general comment. I understand there's some urgency regarding this item because of some federal tax credits. But being relatively new to this Commission, receiving documents one or two days before the hearing date really makes me uncomfortable in decision—making 'cause it just puts a lot of pressure

on me to be reading these things the day before the item is to be heard.

For the record I hopefully will have more time to digest these documents. Some of these are quite lengthy and detailed. It's just difficult for me to comprehend this information that quickly.

CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you, Commissioner.

Actually I'll take responsibility for that. I actually imposed the deadlines on the parties.

10 Understanding that we have a full meeting agenda to

11 take us through the end of the year that was the

12 reason for the shortness of deadline. I do understand

13 you folks are under some pressure with regards to the

14 federal tax credit deadlines. Those deadlines were

imposed by me. So I'll take responsibility and,

16 Commissioner, I'll note that in the future.

Anything else, Commissioners? The Commission will now resume formal deliberations concerning whether to grant the Petition, whether in whole or in part, or to deny the Petition. If the Commission decides to grant the Petition in whole or in part, it needs to determine what conditions of

23 approval to impose.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

24

25

I'll note for the parties and the public that during the Commission's deliberations I will not

entertain additional input from the parties or the public unless those individuals or entities are specifically requested to do so by the Chair. If called upon, I would ask that any comments be limited to the questions at hand.

2.0

2.1

The Commission held a hearing on the merits of this Petition and oral arguments have just concluded. Commissioners Ahakuelo, Aczon, Scheuer, Hiranaga, Wong and myself have confirmed that they are prepared to deliberate on this docket. Commissioner Mahi, would you please signify with either an aye or nay that you're prepared to deliberate on this matter.

CHAIR McDONALD: Commissioner Song, would you please signify with either an aye or a nay that you're prepared to deliberate on this matter?

Aye.

Nav.

COMMISSIONER MAHI:

COMMISSIONER SONG:

CHAIR McDONALD: So noted. The goal today is to determine by way of motion, the Commission's decision on whether to grant in whole or in part Petitioner's request to modify the Commission's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated May 17, 1988 as amended by the

Commission's November 30, 1999 Order amending

25 | Condition No. 6 of the D&O dated May 17, 1988 to

1 expressly authorize the use of portion of the KS property for solar farm development for an interim 3 period not to exceed 35 years with regard to the 4 subject property, or to deny the motion. 5 decision is reached today, and based upon the 6 Commission's quidance, staff will be directed to draft 7 appropriate Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and 8 Decision and Order reflecting the Commission's 9 decision. 10 Commissioners, is there any further 11 discussion on this matter? I just have a final 12. statement. I'd just like to commend Kamehameha 13 Schools for their efforts in support of the State's 14 initiative with renewable energy. I 100 percent 15 support the Project. If this Commission so decides to 16 allow the motion to move forward, I wish you all the

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, I move to grant the motion in this case with applicable conditions based on the record and Petitioner's representations, condition should include Petitioner and OP's proposed conditions as may be amended by staff for clarity; the LUC's standard conditions where applicable, a condition limiting the interim use to

best of luck. Okay, Commissioners, what's your

pleasure on this matter?

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

1	utility scale solar development. The interim use			
2	shall not exceed 35 years. The use shall only be			
3	allowed on the areas described by the Petitioner and			
4	metes and bounds description will be required; that			
5	the facilities will be responsibly decommissioned at			
6	the end of 35 years. And any subsequent use of the			
7	property will be subject to environmental review and			
8	approval of this Commission through a properly filed			
9	Motion to Amend.			
10	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Mr. Chair, I second			
11	the motion.			
12	CHAIR McDONALD: We have a motion by			
13	Commission Wong that's been seconded by Commissioner			
14	Aczon. Any discussion? (pause) Mr. Orodenker, please			
15	poll the Commission.			
16	MR. ORODENKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The			
17	motion is to grant the Motion to Amend with applicable			
18	conditions as stated. Commissioner Wong?			
19	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.			
20	MR. ORODENKER: Commissioner Aczon?			
21	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Aye.			
22	MR. ORODENKER: Commissioner Mahi?			
23	COMMISSIONER MAHI: Aye.			
24	MR. ORODENKER: Commissioner Scheuer?			
25	COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Aye.			

1	MR. ORODENKER: Commissioner Hiranaga?		
2	COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Aye.		
3	MR. ORODENKER: Commissioner Ahakuelo?		
4	COMMISSIONER AHAKUELO: Aye.		
5	MR. ORODENKER: Commissioner Song has		
6	abstained?		
7	COMMISSIONER SONG: I've abstained.		
8	MR. ORODENKER: Chair McDonald?		
9	CHAIR McDONALD: Aye.		
10	MR. ORODENKER: Mr. Chair, the motion		
11	passes unanimously.		
12	CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Orodenker.		
13	And thank you to the parties for working so hard and		
14	diligently to get your findings in on time. We really		
15	appreciate you folks collaborating together. As		
16	mentioned, good luck with your Project. And thank you		
17	to the LUC staff for your hard work in getting the		
18	Commission all the necessary documentation for review.		
19	MS. LIM: Thank you, Commissioners.		
20	CHAIR McDONALD: We'll take a 5-minute		
21	recess to get our next agenda item situated. Thank		
22	you.		
23	(Adjourned at 9:30 a.m.)		
24			
25			

1 CHAIR McDONALD: Good morning. This is a 2 continued hearing on A92-683 Halekua Development 3 Corporation to consider Successor Petitioner's Motion 4 for Order to Bifurcate the Amended Findings of Fact, 5 Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order filed on 6 October 1st, 1996. Will the parties please identify 7 themselves for the record. 8 MR. LIM: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, 9 Members of the Commission. My name is Steven Lim. 10 I'm here with my associate Onaona Thoene and 11 representative of our client Ho'ohana Solar 1, LLC, 12. Ms. Ann Bouslog to my left. 13 MR. LEWALLEN: Good morning, again. 14 Richard Lewallen, deputy corporation counsel, City and 15 County of Honolulu on behalf of the Department of 16 Planning and Permitting. With me with that department 17 is Mike Watkins. 18 Good morning. CHAIR McDONALD: 19 MR. YEE: Good morning. Deputy Attorney 2.0 General Bryan Yee on behalf of the Office of Planning. 2.1 With me is Rodney Funakoshi from the Office of 22 Planning. 23 CHAIR McDONALD: Good morning. Mr. Lim, 24 seeing that this is a continuance, are you ready to 2.5 proceed with your presentation?

1 MR. LIM: Yes. We are. We'd like to 2 start this morning with a short presentation and 3 request --4 CHAIR McDONALD: I'm sorry, Mr. Lim, 5 Commissioner Scheuer has a disclosure. 6 COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: I believe one of 7 your witnesses is with Group 70 International. My 8 wife is an employee at Group 70 International, a 9 planner. 10 CHAIR McDONALD: Do you feel that your 11 participation will have any bearing on your 12. decision-making ability in this meeting? 13 COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: I do not feel that. 14 She has had no involvement in this Project. 15 CHAIR McDONALD: Parties, any objection to 16 Commissioner's participation? 17 MR. LIM: No objection. 18 MR. LEWALLEN: No objection from the City. 19 MR. YEE: No objection. 2.0 CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you, Commissioner 2.1 Scheuer. Mr. Lim, please proceed. 22 MR. LIM: Aloha. My name is Steven Lim 23 representing the successor Petitioner Ho'ohana Solar 1, LLC. First of all, to begin with, on behalf of my 24 25 client I want to, again, apologize to the Commission

for the fits and starts in this proceeding, a situation which we would have wanted to avoid but could not.

2.0

2.1

There's a very narrow window of opportunity for this Project, which window became unexpectedly narrower with the Commission's time out this summer. We were ready to file but we held off filing. Then the deadline at the back end of the process which is the HECO waiver Project deadlines for payment of monies, and the federal tax credit which you heard about in the prior proceeding.

Those are immovable deadlines which, if they are exceeded, will make the Project infeasible.

I'll have much more testimony on that from our witness from Ho'ohana Solar Mr. Larry Green. But at this time I have a request.

You've had a series of filings by the State Office of Planning regarding the enforcement of the Commission's Condition 19 relating to the offsite infrastructure that's to be provided by the landowners in the area, at least pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding that's mentioned in Condition 19.

I hope to answer your questions about all of those issues as we go through these proceedings, but I want to explain to you a little bit about how

- 1 Ho'ohana Solar -- we call them Ho'ohana Solar, and the
- 2 Robinson Kunia Land, LLC which is the landowner --
- 3 I'll refer to them sometimes as Robinsons -- how they
- 4 | fit in with the rest of the Project.
- 5 As you could see from our graphic that's
- 6 in the middle board and that's Petitioner's exhibit
- 7 | relating to the overall Project Area. Up at the top
- 8 portion of the board is Royal Kunia Phase 2 Increment
- 9 3. That is the Robinson lands. Among those other
- 10 lands in the area are the increments Phase 2,
- 11 Increments 1 and 2 which are closer to Kunia Road
- 12 | which is on the left side of that diagram.
- 13 CHAIR McDONALD: Excuse me. Mr. Lim, are
- 14 you going to proceed with your evidentiary portion of
- 15 | the proceeding?
- 16 MR. LIM: No, not now. I'm going to go
- 17 | ahead and just overall make the argument hopefully the
- 18 | Commission will grant our interim relief to
- 19 consolidate the proceedings for our presentation.
- 20 Then I'll go into the Group 70 witness.
- 21 CHAIR McDONALD: Okay. If we're going to
- 22 be referencing exhibits, I think we should admit your
- 23 exhibits into the record.
- 24 MR. LIM: I'll go ahead and wait on that
- 25 | for the formal proceedings. And I'll refrain from

referring to that.

2 COMMISSIONER SONG: Excuse me, Chairman.

3 I would appreciate it if Mr. Lim can clarify what he's

4 making an argument for right now. I'm not really

5 | clear.

2.0

2.1

MR. LIM: Sure. Part of the issue for us and the reason why I wanted to do a preliminary explanation, is that this proceeding is different in kind and nature from the proceeding you just got through deliberating on.

In that proceeding there's one landowner and a solar developer. In this proceeding we have six separate landowners and one solar developer who's developing only a portion of the land which is the Robinson lands.

So we have different problems and different ability to do things within the context of the Project as requested. So we hope that the Ho'Ohana Solar can be a catalyst for solving the problems with the State Ag Park. And as a result we've been in discussions with the Department of Agriculture and the parties here.

We have an agreement that I would make at this time on our oral motion to consolidate the hearings, records and files on Ho'Ohana's Motion to

Bifurcate with the Motion to Amend pursuant to Commission Rule 15-15-54. It's warranted as the motion involves the same parties and issues. And consolidation will be conducive to the proper dispatch of business and justice as stated in Rule 15-15-54.

12.

2.0

2.1

2.5

I will represent to you that we have a stipulation between the successor Petitioner, the Office of Planning and DPP to consolidate the hearings on those motions to allow us to, then, proceed with the presentation of evidence.

The stipulation includes the reservation that all parties reserve all rights to call witnesses and cross-examine witnesses and present argument after the presentation of the Petitioner's case in chief.

There are tactical and legal and procedural reasons for the request to consolidate. The primary reason is that it will allow us, the Successor Petitioner, to proceed with providing the evidence to the Commission today as much as we can on the record, while we also are able to work out the negotiations with the State and the County and the City and County on the issues that they have including the Department of Agriculture offsite infrastructure.

That way we can proceed with presentation of evidence. We can use this valuable day and then

come back, we hope, on November 21st to conclude our presentation and any cross-examination if need be.

12.

2.0

2.1

At that time it's our hope that we can come back with an agreement between the parties on the issues on proceeding forward.

So, therefore, I make that oral motion to consolidate the hearings and request that we be able to do that. If we are able to do that then we'll proceed with our first witness.

CHAIR McDONALD: So the request is to consolidate the motion to bifurcate.

MR. LIM: For hearing purposes, yes.

CHAIR McDONALD: Parties, any objection with the request?

MR. LEWALLEN: We have no objection. That was our agreement. Mr. Lim said that he would, should we need to cross-examine any -- Mr. Lim said should we need to cross-examine the witnesses at a later time that he would secure the presence of them.

CHAIR McDONALD: Office of Planning?

MR. YEE: The Office of Planning has no objection to the consolidation. Just so that we're clear. I think I understood what Mr. Lim was saying. Mr. Lim will basically be presenting his case, his witnesses, his direct. The Office of Planning at this

time will not be cross-examining -- I think neither will DPP, cross-examining the witnesses until the 21st.

12.

2.0

2.1

And Mr. Lim will bring back any and all witnesses that the parties or perhaps the Commission would want to cross-exam. Quite frankly, because it seems odd and I'm not sure everyone's followed the rationale why we're doing it this way. We had — we inconvenienced the Commission yesterday. I acknowledge that. I understand that. And I apologize for it. Certainly I regret it.

It was because we met for settlement. I won't get into the discussions. But we had some movement. So the thought was perhaps we might be able to reach — or at least narrow the issues and hopefully reach an agreement by the 21st.

But just the time schedule was such that we weren't sure we were going to get everything done in one day, so we couldn't put off this hearing completely. So in order to allow us to move forward with some of the time requirements for this hearing, Mr. Lim will be presenting his case for both motions, take everything and bring all the witnesses that he needs. And we can get that finished.

And then on the 21st we either will have

an agreement, in which case it makes things much simpler, or we don't, in which case the parties will then proceed with its cross-examination and obviously oral argument at the end. So with that understanding that we'll be able to withhold our cross-examination at this time until the 21st, that is the stipulation.

2.1

CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you. Commissioners, do you folks have any question with regards to Mr. Lim's request?

MR. WONG: Chair McDonald, Vice Chair Wong, members of the Commission. My name is Del Wong and I represent HRT Realty, 300 Corporation, and Honolulu Ltd. which are other landowners in the Petition Area. I'm here today because, frankly, we've been blind-sided by what is supposed to occur today.

We were told back in October that there were discussions taking place between Ho'ohana and the Office of Planning in order to resolve any concerns that the Office of Planning had with respect to the Motion to Amend, which is the underlying Motion in Chief. We were told: Hold off from filing an opposition; we're going to be discussing this with the Office of Planning.

And as late as Sunday, November 9th, I received, and I believe that Mr. Orodenker received,

an e-mail from Petitioner's counsel stating that today we would have a hearing on the Motion to Bifurcate.

And if the Motion to Bifurcate is granted, we would then begin presentation of evidence on the Motion to Amend.

2.0

2.1

But if the Motion to Bifurcate is denied, Ho'ohana will request that the hearing on the Motion to Amend is deferred until November 21st. So let's just put this into context. My clients are told: Don't oppose. Do not file in opposition in these proceedings until we can have an opportunity to discuss this with Office of Planning.

We received an e-mail November 9th:
Here's what's gonna happen. We're going to have -we're gonna have the hearing on the Motion to
Bifurcate. If that's granted then we'll put on
evidence. If it's denied we're going to continue the
matter until the 21st to give you, HRT, Honolulu Ltd.
and 300 Corporation, more time to present any
opposition that you may have to the substance of the
matter in writing.

So we have not filed in opposition in this case...based upon that reliance. Relying on their representation that this Motion to Amend will not be heard today.

At 4:00 yesterday the senior attorney in my office calls me as I'm headed out of the office to my daughter's basketball game. "Oh, by the way, just so you know there's going to be a change in plans tomorrow. We're going to be consolidating the motion. We're going to be hearing both of 'em."

12.

2.0

2.1

This is the worst example of trial by ambush that I've ever seen. Frankly, it taints the entire proceeding. I can't believe that this happening. My clients were not in the room when there was this supposed stipulation between Ho'Ohana and Office of Planning. We were not party to that. We were only informed of that at 4:00 in the afternoon yesterday. At the 11th hour the day before the hearing today we're told, "By the way, everything that we told you before, cancel that. We're not doing it that way."

I respectfully submit that no evidence should be put on on the Motion to Amend based upon the representation from counsel that this was not going to occur. You can't just switch things and change the process at the eleventh hour without the agreement of interested parties.

CHAIR McDONALD: I understand there's some changes that have been requested. At this time I'm

going to entertain a motion to enter into executive session to discuss this matter with our attorney general.

12.

2.0

2.1

2.5

COMMISSIONER WONG: I move.

COMMISSIONER AHAKUELO: Second.

CHAIR McDONALD: All those in favor?

"Aye". Any opposed? The Commission will now enter into executive session. If you folks could all remove yourselves from the room. And our chief clerk will come and get you once our executive session is concluded. (9:54 to 10:30)

CHAIR McDONALD: We're back on the record. There's some questions that the Commission will get to. But before we get to that, Mr. Wong, can you please reclarify your position as to the participation of this hearing in this matter before us.

MR. WONG: Certainly. As I stated previously we were only given notice that the Motion to Amend was gonna be heard today at 4:00 yesterday afternoon, after being told specifically that it was not going to be heard today. So I had voiced my concerns with that on behalf of my clients, that we had not had the proper opportunity to file in opposition or to brief the Commission as to our position in writing.

opposition. However, I understand from speaking with Mr. Lim and Mr. Yee that there are some scheduling issues that the Commission in its wisdom may choose to override whatever objections we have because of scheduling matters.

2.0

2.1

2.4

2.5

CHAIR McDONALD: And who is your client?

MR. WONG: My clients are HRT Realty, LLC;

300 Corporation and Honolulu Limited.

CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you. Mr. Lim, there were representations made yesterday by your associate that all the parties, landowners that have interest in this parcel had been reached out to with their filings. However, in this particular case the response was you have not received any type of response or objection from Mr. Wong or his client. Can you please clarify that for us.

MR. LIM: We started the initial outreach on this matter in April of this year. We made telephone contact and particular e-mail contact. At one point in time we did receive an e-mail from Mr. Wong's office saying that they understood what we were proposing and had no objections. We submitted our draft Motion to Amend to all the landowners in July and received no response.

We sent another follow-up e-mail to them approximately 2 weeks afterwards and received no reply and so we filed. We believe we've tried to do the due diligence before filing of the motion. You've seen me here before. I don't want to bring problems to the Commission if I don't have to. If we had time to work all these issues out before coming we would, of course, would have done that. We just got this financial cliff that we're dealing with that doesn't allow us any additional time.

12.

2.0

2.1

So, again, we apologize for that. I hope the Commission can see fit to allowing us to present our direct testimony subject to the reservation to the rights of the parties to cross examine. We request that the Commission allow us to consolidate the Motions for Hearing so that no one is prejudiced in terms of what they want to object to.

And hopefully we can come back at the November 21st hearing with a much smoother sail for you.

CHAIR McDONALD: I guess procedurally, Mr. Wong, seeing that you do have interest in the property, you'll be admitted as a party to the proceedings. And I guess I'm curious, as Mr. Lim had stated, the filing for a Motion to Amend has been on

the table for a while. He has not, nor the Commission, have received any type of objection or response to the filing.

2.0

2.1

MR. WONG: That is correct. We do not necessarily — or at the time we did not object to the Motion to Amend in substance. We had no problem with the idea of Robinson's land being used for a solar development.

Our objections arose subsequent when OP filed its response which would in effect impose new conditions or what we view as new obligations on the Petition Area. That's when our objections accrued. So Mr. Lim is correct that we had seen the Motion to Amend and substantively we do not have a problem with it. Our objections, our concerns arise because of OP's response.

CHAIR McDONALD: Mr. Yee, can you please respond. Go ahead.

MR. YEE: If I could just respond. Thank you. 1. OP's objections are on the record. HRT did have an opportunity to file their comments or responses to OP's pleadings. They have not yet done so. We have no objection. I guess our thought was all that's gonna happen today is a presentation of evidence. There's no intention to give argument by

any of the parties. Any of the parties, including HRT I believe, may ask to cross-examine on the 21st. If HRT would like to file a further pleading soon, very soon, we wouldn't -- we wouldn't object. Although I will note, that if the Motion to Bifurcate had been denied today, then HRT's comments and objections to the OP's objections would have been, you know, frankly, rather late.

12.

2.0

2.1

But with the understanding that they have an interest in this case, we certainly don't want to prejudice their ability to bring forward any information to you and present their arguments to you in some reasonable fashion.

So in sum I think I believe HRT's rights are not being prejudiced by moving forward today. As I said they can still oppose. They can still cross—examine. They can do whatever they could have done before. Admittedly they're not going to know whether or not the bifurcation is going to be granted or not, but that is a decision I think that really is a procedural question up to the Commission.

It's not up to the parties to represent.

It's not up to the parties to make a determination of.

That's a decision solely held by the Commission. So,

I believe it's appropriate to move forward today.

CHAIR McDONALD: Commissioners, any questions for the parties at this point? Commissioner Scheuer.

2.0

2.1

COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: I have a question for Mr. Wong. When the Chairperson asked you to restate your concerns you said that you had no idea that the Motion to Amend would be considered today. If I heard you correctly, the agenda that was timely filed for this hearing, clearly states that there is 2 possible motions, one for the Order to Bifurcate and one for the amendment. So, you know, based on the sort of public notice this was clearly on the table.

So can you clarify again, please, what you're saying when you had no idea that the amendment might be considered today.

MR. WONG: Right. Because based upon the November 9th e-mail that I received on Sunday from Mr. Lim's office, we were given the representation that the Motion to Amend would be continued to a later time if the Motion to Bifurcate was denied.

COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: So just for the record you're not -- you're suggesting that there might have been some representation from another party but not from this Commission.

MR. WONG: That is correct.

1 COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Thank you.

CHAIR McDONALD: Anybody else?

Commissioner Song.

12.

2.0

2.1

2.5

COMMISSIONER SONG: Mr. Lim, you previously talked about your efforts prior to filing this motion with the landowners. But that's not the issue Mr. Wong raised. Have there been discussions with the landowners since you filed this Petition? Or what is your comment to Mr. Wong's statement that he's been blind-sided?

MR. LIM: The statements by him as to our representations are correct. And we're dealing, like I said, a multi-party arrangement here. So we learned only yesterday that one of the parties wouldn't stipulate to bifurcate the proceedings. And it was a critical party to our interest.

So we had to back down. That's why we sent the e-mail as soon as we knew that. We had hoped through the parties discussion with OP and DPP that the mechanism by which we've chosen, which is the Motion to Consolidate, the motions for hearing, and proceed with the evidence would give everybody the opportunity to still make their objections before the next hearing. And I'll represent to the attorney for HRT that successor Petitioner does not have any

- objections to their filing of any motions or pleadings in opposition to what we're requesting. But we
- 3 | believe that -- we strongly believe that we have the
- 4 | workings of a settlement in place. And it's just a
- 5 | matter of trying to get the parties all to agree.
- 6 | That's why we're requesting the Commission's
- 7 | indulgence. I know this is not common. We had that
- 8 | financial cliff that we're trying to avoid. And we
- 9 request your consideration and allow us to proceed.
- 10 COMMISSIONER SONG: Mr. Chairman, I have
- 11 just a couple more questions. Mr. Wong, are you ready
- 12 to proceed today?
- 13 MR. WONG: I'm not.
- 14 MR. LIM: We are specifically reserving
- 15 | the parties' rights to present evidence and
- 16 cross-examine witnesses at the November 21st hearing.
- 17 This would only be a presentation of Petitioner's
- 18 direct presentation in chief.
- 19 COMMISSIONER SONG: Mr. Lim, what you're
- 20 proposing -- my background is in litigation -- what
- 21 | you're proposing is very unusual. I understand that
- 22 Office of State Planning has agreed and the City and
- 23 | County has agreed, but there's another landowner here
- 24 | who says they're not ready to proceed. And I'm
- 25 concerned about prejudice, the prejudice by continuing

this proceeding, allowing this proceeding to continue.

2.0

2.1

If, in fact, you're so close to a settlement, wouldn't it make sense to defer this hearing and come back to this Commission with a settlement rather than doing this in such a piecemeal fashion.

MR. LIM: We would love to do that. I worry that we don't have enough time to do that before the cliff comes. So that's why we're taking this very unusual request to the Commission. We were talking to Mr. Wong on the break. And I understand that he was not able to reach his client. And that's why he can't say that he's okay to go forward. But he's willing to let the Commission make the decision on that.

He said that he's not ready to proceed, but I don't think that he means that he can't sit and listen to the testimony as long as he reserves his right to cross-examine. We are willing to bring back all the witnesses on the 21st of November if any party requires, or the Commission, of course.

COMMISSIONER SONG: Mr. Chairman, just one thing further. I'm just really concerned with the procedural error. This is subject to reversal if we proceed with starting this hearing today. That's my feeling on the subject.

CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you, Commissioner Song. Commissioner Wong.

12.

2.0

2.1

COMMISSIONER WONG: Mr. Wong, sorry, I'm still confused. I'm real slow. Sorry about that.

Okay. You have no problems with the Motion to Amend, is that correct?

MR. WONG: I would say that during the timeframe that Mr. Lim was referring to when he stated that we did not file in opposition, at that time I did not have any opposition to the Motion to Amend. With the procedural issues that have arisen today, and based upon, depending upon what the Commission rules, my client may have an opposition in substance to the Motion to Amend. I don't know.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Okay. But you could have talked to your client in August, approximately, or when it was served, right, the Motion to Amend?

MR. WONG: What's changed since the filing of the Motion to Amend is the fact that OP has placed conditions or seeks to place conditions on the approval of the motion. And it is with respect to those conditions that my client may have reservations. We don't know at the end of the day what the final form of those conditions will be. That is subject to the Commission's decision as well as the parties may

1 have the opportunity to resolve them prior to coming 2 back on the 21st. But as we sit here today I don't 3 think anybody can, with a hundred percent certainty, 4 represent to the Commission what those conditions 5 would be. 6 COMMISSIONER WONG: Let me get this 7 straight then. The Commission in its wisdom can put 8 any conditions on and approve it, correct? 9 MR. WONG: Yes, sir. 10 COMMISSIONER WONG: The landowner or 11 whoever that comes, the Petitioner that comes in front 12. of us, must follow that conditions, is that correct? 13 MR. WONG: Yes. 14 COMMISSIONER WONG: Even, let's say, we 15 put some conditions on, the landowners or the 16 Petitioner must follow those directives, orders and 17 conditions -- statements, right? 18 MR. WONG: The procedural issue that we're 19 raising today is that we don't know -- HRT 300 2.0 Corporation and Honolulu Limited don't even know and haven't had the opportunity to present its position on 2.1 22 those conditions 'cause we don't know what they are. 23 COMMISSIONER WONG: But let's say at the 24 end of all the motions, witnesses and all that, you 25 wouldn't even know what conditions -- I could have

said, you know, "shoot for the moon". Isn't that correct? And that'd be a condition? That's at the last point, isn't that correct? As you representing your clients they wouldn't know until that point when I say, you know, you have to run and put out a fire or something. Isn't that — wasn't that true?

2.1

MR. WONG: I'm only responding to what OP has put on the table. What we know today is that they are requesting certain conditions. I'm not going to engage in a hypothetical about shooting to the moon or putting out fires.

What I am responding to are the conditions that OP has indicated they want in order to allow the Motion to Amend to be subject to their — to their approval. So that's what I'm reacting to.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So how long would it take for you to talk to your client and get their feedback on these conditions?

MR. WONG: I think what we would need to have is some sort of a discussion in its reasonably a final form as possible between OP, Canyon, HRT, and Ho'Ohana and presumably Robinson as well, essentially all of the landowners and interested parties in the Petition Area.

Once that -- once a position has been

1 reached, then we would have the opportunity to either 2 oppose or support. We're not at that point yet. 3 COMMISSIONER WONG: And how long, again, 4 would it take do you think? 5 I don't know because I'm not MR. WONG: 6 the one -- I'm not the Movant. I'm not the Petitioner 7 in this matter. The Petitioner is Ho'Ohana. They're 8 the ones dealing directly with Office of Planning. 9 And Office of Planning is proposing certain 10 conditions. So I would not be able to unilaterally 11 tell you that. 12. COMMISSIONER WONG: So let's say we take 13 another three meetings, or let's say another month or 14 so for you to work on something. We give you a set 15 deadline. Do you think it would be finished by then? 16 MR. WONG: I think that the parties would 17 work with all due speed and good faith in order to try to reach an amicable resolution. But I cannot give 18 19 you an answer with a hundred percent certainty that 2.0 would be the case. 2.1 CHAIR McDONALD: Commissioner Mahi. 22 COMMISSIONER MAHI: It seems to me,

> HOLLY M. HACKETT RPR, CSR Ph/Fax (808) 538-6458

Chairman, that we are being placed into a position

where we're standing outside an oven trying to decide

whether the lasagna was baked or not. And we get the

23

24

feeling that it's not gonna be baked. It's going to be partially baked. The mozzarella is not going to be melting. And then the sausage is not going to be all nice and warm. You know, I hate to eat things or make decisions on things when they're half baked.

12.

2.0

2.1

So I would suggest that you all get together so that be cognizant of what the Commissioner has shared with us about the fact that if we're going to hear about what the lasagna is gonna look like, but you haven't decided what you're going to put in the lasagna yet, I best not hear it at all because we'll be, again, asked to make certain decisions and feelings. And we don't know what we have yet.

So I know we've taken a long time. I talked about yesterday. Hey, did you camp outside his door, knock on the door waiting for some kind of answer? Just short of that, right? So I had a funny feeling about that. I think now this is my feeling: Let's get the whole pie baked and we can make a good decision. Let's not go on half baked stuff.

COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR McDONALD: Commissioner Scheuer.

COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Sorry. I want to go back again to something the Chair made. Really I understood our discussion yesterday's motion when the

Petitioner asked for the continuance. I was under the clear impression when we talked about how many companies there were, how many had been in agreement, and your attempts to contact the others, that there was going to be an agreement today for most 6. Is it now my understanding that the meeting that was held with the Department of Agriculture yesterday, nobody from HRT was there or part of that discussion?

2.0

2.1

MR. LIM: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: So why were we given the impression that they were?

MR. LIM: I don't know exactly what was said yesterday. But if that was the impression given then I apologize. We have been in discussions with all the parties through the proceedings. The big issue for this proceeding and the reason why we are having such difficulty — and I'll step back a little bit — is Ho'Ohana Solar is not one of the landowners we are proposed lessee of the Robinson lands.

So it's like we came into a — it's like we came into the party late and are now dealing with problems that were already existing. We're trying to, through Ho'Ohana's efforts, we're trying to propose a fix to the problem. I think the Department of Agriculture wisely chose to use the solar farm

Petition as a reason to bring all the parties to the table. That has happened. So that's a good sign.

12.

2.1

We think we're at the point where we've discussed it with them. And that I think or we thought we had everybody on board in terms of the proposal for settlement. I myself believe that the issues that we're dealing with today are going to be worked out before next Friday. I'm hopeful that the other parties, including the HRT group, is able to join us on that.

MR. YEE: Could I just give hopefully a brief clarification?

CHAIR McDONALD: Mr. Yee.

MR. YEE: Thank you. We'll certainly defer to whatever the Land Use Commission decides to do procedurally on the hearing schedule. I just want to be clear about something. I think what's happening is the landowners had no opposition to the Motion to Amend as filed by Ho'Ohana because all they said is, "I want to put solar. No new conditions." So the landowners didn't care. They're okay with that.

On October 8th the Office of Planning filed its response. We said, "No, you should have conditions." We layed that out. The landowners might not be all that happy with imposing new conditions,

- 1 but nobody filed any opposition. Now, that may have
- 2 been partly because they thought a bifurcation would
- 3 be decided first. If it's bifurcated they were
- 4 | thinking "it won't apply to me. So if it doesn't
- 5 apply to me I don't care."
- The Office of Planning opposed the
- 7 | bifurcation as we also filed. And we said, "No don't
- 8 | bifurcate."
- 9 Now, at that point the landowners had a
- 10 | choice of what to do. And apparently based upon in
- 11 | the e-mail, I'm not sure what the basis was, there was
- 12 | a statement made about the order of the motions to be
- 13 heard. But I just want to be clear where the
- 14 opposition comes from and where the agreement came
- 15 from. So there's agreement on their Motion to Amend
- 16 but not agreement on the Office of Planning's
- 17 comments. So I just want to be clear about that.
- 18 Thank you.
- 19 CHAIR McDONALD: Appreciate that, Mr. Yee.
- 20 | Commissioner Wong.
- 21 COMMISSIONER WONG: I have a question for
- 22 Mr. Lim. Mr. Lim, do you think you can get agreement
- 23 by December 10th with everyone, all parties?
- 24 MR. LIM: Yes, I'm confident we can get
- 25 agreement. We believe that the negotiations,

especially yesterday's meeting — that's why I wasn't here — went very well, as well as we could have expected. We appreciate the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Planning and the Department of Planning and Permitting in getting to that point.

2.0

2.1

- Of course some of the landowners may not be on board yet, but I think that once we are able to work with them further that we can get them on board. The problem that we have, like I said, is one of the cliff. If we do not get a final action by the Commission by a vote at the December 10th/11th meeting I believe it is, then the Project will be withdrawn.
- COMMISSIONER WONG: Mr. Wong, do you believe also that you could get some sort of agreement by December 10th?
- MR. WONG: Well, I don't have -- I don't have settlement Authority from my client. So I cannot speak with any certainty. But I would represent to the Commission that my clients would come to the table in good faith and work with everybody to see that, to try to reach an amicable resolution.
- COMMISSIONER WONG: Okay. This is what
 I'm thinking. I'm going to tell you the truth.
 Because Commissioner Mahi talked about lunch, (general

We

laughter) I'm getting hungry. But anyway, what I'm 1 thinking is why don't you guys talk about it, because 3 I want to continue this process. Because we do have, 4 you know, the Petitioner said we do have a deadline. Talk about it. See if we can continue this process 5 6 after lunch. And if not then we go to talk it out 7 from there. That's my feeling right now, Chair. 8 CHAIR McDONALD: So noted, Commissioner. 9 It seems to me we have a procedural issue. It's been 10 brought up by a few of our Commissioners. And I think it's been brought up -- well, it's been brought up in 11 12 our discussions with our attorney general with regards 13 to the procedural matter at hand. 14 Mr. Lim, I'm not sure why the request for 15 consolidation has been requested at such a late date. 16 Would you consider withdrawing that motion for the 17 purpose of moving forward with our agenda before us so 18 that we can proceed with your presentation and 19 entering your exhibits and hearing your witnesses? 2.0 That would assume that the MR. LIM: 2.1 Motion to Bifurcate is deferred? Or... 22 CHAIR McDONALD: It's actually to hear 23 your motion to bifurcate first. 24 MR. LIM: The Motion to Bifurcate, I would

like to talk to my client, take 5 minutes on that.

could consider that. I'd like to talk to the other parties because we have an informal agreement on procedure today. The parties may not agree to handling this as a separate matter. So if we could have 5 minutes or so.

2.0

2.1

CHAIR McDONALD: Mr. Yee, do you have a comment?

MR. YEE: Yeah. We talked about being prepared to move forward. The Office of Planning understood that we would not have to present our case or to cross examine witnesses today. We would move forward with the bifurcation, but we just, you know — we had not prepared our witness for testimony today. So we can move forward with their witnesses, perhaps, is our offer. I'm not sure we can even get to our witnesses.

But in our minds the bifurcation, the Motion to Amend, one, involves the exact same issues. So it's not so much the consolidation is what I'm thinking of as much as hearing the evidence. So we would still ask that their witnesses be heard and that subject to their stipulation that we not be required to do cross-examination today.

CHAIR McDONALD: I bring this up because Mr. Wong is coming before us in objection to what's

- 1 being requested by Mr. Lim. Prior to this I think we
- 2 can all agree that no response has been provided.
- 3 Right. So trying to move forward with what's
- 4 | currently on the agenda. And that is the motion to
- 5 hear the order for bifurcation. I'm asking Mr. Lim if
- 6 he's prepared to proceed in that fashion.
- 7 So if you want to have a discussion with
- 8 your client, Mr. Lim, we'll take a 5-minute recess.
- 9 MR. LIM: Thank you very much.
- 10 (Recess 11:00-11:30)
- 11 CHAIR McDONALD: Okay. We're back on the
- 12 record. Mr. Lim, have you had a chance to talk to
- 13 | your client?
- MR. LIM: Yes, we did, Mr. Chair, members
- 15 of the Commission. Thank you, again, for your
- 16 patience with us. I talked with my client. We also
- 17 talked to the State Office of Planning and the
- 18 Department of Planning and Permitting. We have
- 19 | collectively agreed to request that the Commission
- 20 defer the hearing today until Friday, November 21st in
- 21 Honolulu, as I understand you're next meeting is held.
- We anticipate, I being the internal
- 23 optimist, I anticipate coming back to you with a much
- 24 cleaner presentation. We will be continuing both the
- 25 | Motion to Bifurcate and Motion to Amend so nobody

loses any rights. We request that the Commission grant that continuance. We expect to prepare and submit before then by no later than Tuesday of next week what we call written direct testimony.

2.0

2.1

It's in writing question/answer question/answer. You'll see that in various petitions that you see primarily on the larger projects. That will give you an idea of the testimony that's to be coming. We're hopefully getting that draft testimony to the parties over the weekend to have them look at it with their clients and get it finally submitted to the Commission no later than Tuesday.

The reason for that is that in that way hopefully we can — at least the successor Petitioner can shorten our presentation and our questioning of the witnesses. I can ask them to present summaries of their testimony on the stand and then the parties can open up for cross—examination.

CHAIR McDONALD: Parties, is that the agreement between the Petitioner and City as well as the State OP?

MR. YEE: Yes.

MR. LEWALLEN: Yes.

MR. WONG: My clients agree as well, HRT, 300 Corporation and Honolulu Limited.

1	CHAIR McDONALD: To further elaborate, any
2	filing whether it be the briefs, any objections from
3	the different parties, need to be filed with the LUC
4	staff by next Tuesday. This is an order for the
5	Commission to prepare itself for next Friday's
6	hearing. Commissioners, anything else to add?
7	Commissioner Scheuer.
8	COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Just to make sure.
9	So we now have four of the six landowners?
10	MR. LIM: Five of the six.
11	COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Five of the six.
12	MR. LIM: Mr. Wong represents three of the
13	landowners.
14	COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: I think you know
15	where I'm going, Mr. Lim. Are we going to go down
16	this road again when the other party shows up and
17	says, "Oh, wait. I just heard about this."
18	MR. LIM: We have been in contact with
19	them the most, actually. So we're going to see if we
20	can get them on board the next session.
21	CHAIR McDONALD: Who is that sixth?
22	MR. LIM: Kam Partners 4 Realty Company.
23	They were the ones that last appeared before the
24	Commission in 2013 to amend the traffic condition for
25	the Kunia Interchange from a regional from a local

1 to a regional traffic improvement. So they're known 2 to the Commission. And we have been in constant contact with them also. So I will reach out to them 3 4 again. I was going to inform them of the proceedings 5 in any event. And hopefully we can get the parties 6 closer aligned. We're in a different position. 7 We're not one of the landowners, but we're trying to 8 bring everybody with us if we can. 9 COMMISSIONER SCHEUER: Mr. Chair, if I can 10 continue. My concern is, first of all, the staff has 11 worked extremely hard. We had staff members working 12 on a holiday to try and get us the summary. There's 13 also a consequence now with 2 days of hearings. 14 There's other parties with their own deadlines, their 15 own concerns in front of the Land Use Commission were 16 not scheduled for these last 2 days. 17 So I really hope that there's some 18 assurance before we actually get to the 21st that 19 there will actually be a substantive non-sloppy issue 2.0 before us. That's my concern, Chair. 2.1 CHAIR McDONALD: So noted, Commissioner 22

Any further comments, Mr. Lim? Scheuer.

23

24

25

MR. LIM: No. Just that we really, really appreciate the Commission's patience. Like I said the final date that we have for the Commission's vote on

1	the motions is the December 10th and 11th hearings.
2	Because right after that the HECO waiver process
3	requires our client and the other solar providers that
4	are in the waiver process, to come up with a, what
5	we're trying to negotiate down from a 7 figure number.
6	So that's why we say if we don't get the final action
7	by that date we have to withdraw because we cannot
8	risk putting that money down. So I appreciate it very
9	much.
10	CHAIR McDONALD: Thank you.
11	Commissioners, any further discussion? Hearing all
12	that's transpired this morning I think it's in the
13	best interest of this Commission to approve the
14	continuance and take the matter up on November 21st.
15	I trust, Mr. Lim, that you and your party
16	will be prepared and have whatever stipulated
17	agreements with the Office of Planning. So that we're
18	adjourned.
19	
20	(The proceedings were adjourned at 11:30 a.m.)
21	000000
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

I, HOLLY HACKETT, CSR, RPR, in and for the State of Hawai'i, do hereby certify;

That I was acting as court reporter in the foregoing LUC matters on the 13th day of November 2014;

That the proceedings were taken down in computerized machine shorthand by me and were thereafter reduced to print by me;

That the foregoing represents, to the best of my ability, a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matters.

16

10

11

12.

13

14

15

This____ day of_ 17 2014 DATED:

18 19

20

2.1

HOLLY M. HACKETT, HI CSR #130, RPR #5910 22 23 Certified Shorthand Reporter

24

