			_
1		BEFORE THE LAND USE COMMISSION	
2		STATE OF HAWAII	
3			
4		Proceedings held on March 23, 2016	
5		Commencing at 1:30 p.m.	
6		West Hawai'i Civic Center	
7		Council Hale - Building G	
8		74-5044 Ane Keohokalole Highway	
9		Kailua-Kona, Hawai'i 96740	
10			
11		AGENDA	
12	I	Call to Order	
13	ΙΙ	Adoption of Minutes	
14	III	Tentative Meeting Schedule	
15	IV	Public Testimony - A89-646 Queen Lili'uokalani	
16		Trust (Hawai'i)	
17	V	Hearing & Action - A89-646 Queen Lili'uokalani	
18	Trust	(Hawai'i)	
19		Motion for Order Modifying Findings of Fact,	
20		Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order	
21	VII	Discussion and Action, if appropriate	
22		2016 Legislation Status Report	
23	VIII	Executive Session	
24			
25	BEFORI	E: Jean Marie McManus, CSR #156	

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 ---

		3
1	INDEX	
2	PUBLIC WITNESSES:	PAGE
3	Ken Melrose	11 16
4	Kirsten Kahaloa	16
5	PETITIONER'S WITNESS:	
6	LeeAnn Crabbe	
7	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/OP	33 67
8		6 /
9	EXHIBITS RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE	
10	Petitioner's Exhibits 13 and 14	20
11	Petitioner's Exhibits 1-12	22
12	OP's Exhibits 1, 2 and 3	21
13	County's Exhibits 1, 2 and 3	23
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	McManus Court reporters 808-239-6148-	

Τ	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Good afternoon.
2	This is the March 23rd Land Use Commission
3	Meeting.
4	The first order of business is the adoption
5	of the February 24th, 2016 minutes. Are there any
6	corrections or comments on them? If not, is there a
7	Motion to adopt the minutes?
8	COMMISSIONER ESTES: So moved
9	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Second.
10	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Motion moved by
11	Commissioner Estes and seconded by Commissioner
12	Scheuer to adopt the minutes.
13	All in favor say "aye", any opposed?
14	Motion carries, adopted unanimously.
15	The next agenda item is the tentative
16	meeting schedule. Mr. Orodenker?
17	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: We are here tomorrow
18	for continuation on this hearing.
19	On April 14th we will be on Oahu for an
20	update on the Waimanalo Gulch matter.
21	DR16-55 OP's Petition for Declaratory
22	Order.
23	On April 27 and 28 we are on Maui, and for
24	all in intents and purposes that takes care of the
25	calendar

1 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you, Mr. 2 Orodenker. Any questions on the agenda? 3 The next agenda item is a hearing and 4 action meeting on Docket A89-646 Queen Lili'uokalani 5 Trust, Motion for Order Modifying Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order filed 6 7 August 28, 1991. CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Vice Chair Scheuer. 8 9 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 10 Just in openness I want to disclose that 11 I've been working in this area as a consultant to the National Park Service on some water related issues 12 13 which do not arise in this proceeding, but I know 14 that the Movant has actually been in opposition to 15 what my client has been seeking in that matter. 16 Nonetheless, I believe that I can be fair 17 and impartial in these proceedings. 18 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any objections from the 19 parties? 20 MR. KUDO: No objection. 21 MR. YEE: No objection. 22 MS. SELF: No objection. 23 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you. 24 Will the parties please identify themselves 25 for the record?

MR. KUDO: On behalf of the Lili'uokalani 1 2 Trust, Petitioner and Movant in this matter, I am Ben 3 Kudo. And with me is my associate Clara Park. MS. SELF: Deputy Corporation Counsel, Amy 4 5 Self on behalf of the Planning Department for County 6 of Hawaii, and Daryn Arai who is a planner with the 7 county Planning Department. MR. YEE: Good afternoon, Deputy Attorney 8 9 General, Bryan Yee on behalf of the Office of 10 Planning. With me is Rodney Funakoshi from Office of 11 Planning. 12 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Let me update the 13 record. 14 On August 14th, 2015, the Commission received Queen Lili'uokalani Trust's Motion for Order 15 16 Modifying the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, 17 and Decision and Order dated August 28, 1991, Exhibits 1 to 4, and \$1000 application fee. 18 On August 24th, 2015, Commission received 19 20 State of Hawaii Office of Planning's request for 21 filing extension to September 14th, 2015 to file 22

responses to the Motion.

On August 25th, 2015, the LUC mailed a letter granting OP's request for filing of extension.

23

24

25

On September 28, 2015, the Commission

received OP's request for a filing extension to
October 22nd, 2015 to file responses to the Motion.

On September 30th, 2015 the LUC mailed a letter granting OP's request for filing extension.

On October 16, 2015, the Commission received Queen Lili'uokalani Trust's Supplemental Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Order Modifying the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated August 28, 1991, and Exhibit 5.

On October 22, 2015, the Commission received OP's request for a filing extension to November 6th, 2015 for all Parties to file responses to the Motion for Order Modifying the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated August 28, 1991. The Commission granted OP's request on the same day.

On November 6, 2015, the Commission received OP's response to the Motion for Order Modifying the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order dated August 28, 1991 and Exhibit 1. The Commission also received an email from Hawaii County Planning Department requesting a new filing deadline on same day.

On November 20th, 2015, the Commission

mailed a letter granting County's request for a new deadline and also a letter to Petitioner requesting additional information to support the Motion.

On January 11, 2016, the Commission received Queen Lili'uokalani Trust's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Support of its Motion.

On January 2rd, 2016, the Commission received County's Response to Petitioner's First and Second Supplemental Memorandum in Support of its Motion and Exhibits 1 and 3.

On March 4th, 2016, the Commission received OP's Supplemental response to Queen Lili'uokalani's Motion.

On March 11, 2016, the Commission received Queen Lili'uokalani Trust's Third Supplemental Memorandum in Support of its Motion.

On the same day, the Commission mailed a March 23rd and 24th, 2016 LUC agenda notice to the Parties and to the Statewide and Hawaii mailing lists.

On March 21st, 2016, the Commission received correspondence from Intervenor's Representative, Mark Van Pernis, advising that he no longer represented the Intervenor, Greater Kona Community Council, which was involved in the original

District Boundary Amendment proceeding; and would not be appearing. Public Records disclosed that the entity, Greater Kona Community Council was involuntarily dissolved in 1994.

2.1

On March 22nd, 2016, the Commission received correspondence from OP updating and revising OP's Exhibit 1 (State Department of Transportation letter) in OP Supplemental Response of March 4, 2016.

Our procedure for Docket No. A89-646 will be as follows:

First, I will give opportunity for the Petitioner to comment on the Commission's policy governing reimbursement of hearing expenses.

I will then call for those individuals desiring to provide public testimony for public hearing portion of the proceedings 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.

I note for all present, that in accordance with parliamentary procedure, any of the parties or members of the Commission may question in turn any of these public witnesses

After completion of the public testimony portion of the proceedings, I will give opportunity

for any of the parties to admit to the record their exhibits and/or witness lists.

We will then open our hearing in this matter. The Petitioner will present its case first. Once Petitioner is completed with its presentation, the order of presentation will be as follows: County of Hawaii Planning Department, the Office of Planning. I note for the record that the Intervenor in the original district boundary amendment proceeding, the Greater Kona Community Council, no longer exists as it was involuntarily dissolved in 1994, and is not present or represented at today's proceedings.

Once the Parties have completed their presentations, the Commission will deliberate on this matter.

The Chair would also note for the Parties and public that from time to time I will be calling for short breaks.

Any questions on our procedures for today?

MR. KUDO: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you.

Good afternoon, Mr. Kudo. Has the Petitioner been advised of the LUC's policy on reimbursement of LUC hearing expenses?

1	MR. KUDO: Yes, we have, and we have no
2	problem.
3	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you.
4	Are there any individuals desiring to
5	provide public testimony on this matter?
6	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Mr. Chair, we have two
7	people signed up to testify, the first being Ken
8	Melrose.
9	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: May I swear you in.
10	Do you affirm that the testimony you're
11	about to give is the truth?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	KEN MELROSE
14	Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the
15	truth, was examined and testified as follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Please state your name
18	and address for the record, and you can proceed.
19	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. Thank you,
20	Commissioner. My name is Ken Melrose, a resident of
21	Kealakekua, Hawaii.
22	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Please proceed.
23	THE WITNESS: I ask that you join me in
24	support of the request and give favorable
25	consideration to this Petition.

——McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 ——

In 2008, the County adopted the Kona

Community Development Plan. It was a community based

process that serves as guide a for regional

development in the Kona Districts going forward.

I served as Chair of the Steering Committee during the creation and adoption process, and the initial Chair of the Action Committee in nurturing its early implementation.

The vision statement of the Kona Community

Development Plan is a more sustainable Kona

characterized by a deep respect for the culture and

the environment, and residents that responsibly

accommodate change through an active and

collaborative community, a change that Kona presented

itself over time.

In order to achieve the vision, eight guiding principles became the foundation for the Kona CDP. While I feel all are appropriately addressed in the plans of the Petitioner, two are more important and form the basis for my support.

Guiding principle number five says: Direct future growth patterns toward compact villages, preserving Kona's rural, diverse and historical Character.

And guiding principle number six: Provide

infrastructure and essential facilities concurrent with growth.

The transportation and land use overall strategies of the Kona Community Development Plan direct future growth to designated growth opportunity areas, all which are located within the urban boundary of the County's General Plan, where a street network can be connected and infrastructure logically connected.

The Applicant's lands are located within two of those growth opportunity areas. The subject Petition is located within a targeted growth area being the Makaeo Village Regional Center, TOD, which is seamlessly attached to the Kailua Village core.

Their plan proposes to widen and extend existing thoroughfares and connect to existing utilities.

To me petition area is very much the right place for Kona to grow now.

The Petitioner appears committed to implementing the new community standards of a multi-modal, walkable, mixed use, high density community as a logical extension of the existing Kailua Village.

A strong relationship to the existing

1 Kailua Park is proposed to blend the makai edge of 2 the new Makalapua Project District Community in a 3 positive way. With your affirmative vote today, you'll 4 5 allow the Applicant to move ahead with a County 6 Project District Zoning Process wherein the details 7 of the uses and infrastructure connectivity can be formalized. 8 9 Thank you for this opportunity to testify. 10 I ask you to approve the subject petition. 11 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any questions, Mr. 12 Kudo? 13 MR. KUDO: No question. 14 MS. SELF: No questions. 15 MR. YEE: No questions. 16 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Commissioners? 17 COMMISSIONER CABRAL: First off, can you 18 turn your volume up a little bit? I could hear you 19 but the AC system is loud for up here. 20 Question, while -- particularly since I'm 21 from the Big Island, but Hilo, as you know, is a 22 whole other world over there. I understand that this land is --23 24 THE WITNESS: Can we have some of your

25

rain?

1	COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Occasionally we have
2	a vog day, and there is a big grass fire. I just
3	barely got past on my way here. I wish I could bring
4	rain for you there.
5	The question, when you were very involved
6	with the early stages of this planning, as that, were
7	you a member of the community or did you work in
8	someway or capacity for the developer or for somebody
9	involved or are you, the greatest part of that, just
10	part of that being a member of the community?
11	THE WITNESS: I was a member of the
12	community.
13	COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Thank you as a member
14	of that community for your involvement, because to me
15	that's, very, very important.
16	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Anybody else?
17	Commissioners?
18	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Kirsten Kahaloa.
19	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: May I swear you in?
20	Do you affirm that the testimony you're
21	about to give is the truth?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	
24	-000-
25	KIRSTEN KAHALOA

——McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 ——

1 Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the 2 truth, was examined and testified as follows: 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION CHAIRPERSON ACZON: State your name and 4 address for the record, and you can proceed. 5 6 THE WITNESS: My name is Kirsten Kahaloa. 7 And I'm representing the Kona Kohala Chamber of Commerce, 75-5737 Kuakini Highway, Kailua-Kona 96740 8 9 And I did bring a few copies, but not 10 enough. I didn't know how big the group was. 11 Aloha and good afternoon, members of the Land Use Commission. 12 Again, my name is Kirsten Kahaloa, and I 13 serve as Executive Director of the Kona-Kohala 14 15 Chamber of Commerce here in Kailua-Kona. 16 On behalf of the Chamber I'm here to 17 provide testimony in support of the Queen Lili'uokalani Trust's Motion to remove Urban Phase 18 III lands from the 1991 Decision and Order. 19 20 Just a little bit about the Chamber. 21 are West Hawaii Island's leading business 22 organization, representing over 540 businesses in our 23 community. 24 As the largest business organization on

Hawaii Island and the fourth largest Chamber in the

25

State, the Kona-Kohala Chamber of exists to provide leadership and advocacy for a successful business environment here in West Hawaii.

The LUC's approval to remove the Urban

Phase III lands, will allow the Trust to move forward

with both its Keahuolu Land Plan and Makalapua

Project District development project.

The positive outcomes of the LUC's approval, besides attracting more business and community development are the following:

Grow and diversify the local economy here in Kona. Ultimately we want our children to see that they don't have to leave Kona to find opportunities and a quality of life.

Secondly, provide the opportunity to bring more jobs and careers to Kona, as well as attract new industries, especially sustainable industries.

An example is the recent announcement of a new \$20 million Kona Brewing Co., facility on the Trust's lands in the Old Industrial Area. This new facility will produce 100,000 barrels of locally brewed annually and will provide more direct and indirect jobs and visibility for Kona, which is a great thing for our community.

And, thirdly, support over 2000 jobs that

Currently reside on Trust lands. The Old Industrial
Area, in many ways represents the working core of
Kona. It is full of fun places like Kona Brew,
hardworking auto shops, dry cleaners and more. It is
the place where Kona works.

We want to help these types of business and people continue to succeed and grow while encouraging new opportunities as the Trust proceeds with its two development projects.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of over 540 businesses in our community, and I encourage the LUC to consider these points in your deliberations in this matter.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any questions for Ms.

Kahaloa?

2.1

MR. KUDO: No questions.

MS. SELF: No questions.

MR. YEE: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you.

Commissioners?

I forgot to mention to Mr. Melrose, if you have a copy of your testimony to be submitted to our chief clerk so we can pass it out. By the way, we have a new staff, Briana. Please welcome Briana.

1 Are there any more public witnesses? 2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: We don't have any 3 signed up, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON ACZON: This concludes the 4 5 public testimony of our proceedings. The Commission 6 will now consider the exhibits by the parties. 7 Please describe exhibits you wish to have admitted to the record. 8 9 MR. KUDO: We have a series of slides 10 collectively referred to as Petitioner's Exhibit 13, 11 and these slides will be used during the testimony of our first witness, which is LeeAnn Crabbe, Vice 12 13 President Queen Lili'uokalani Trust. 14 The second exhibit we have is a series of slides labeled Petitioner's Exhibit 14, and these 15 16 will be used by the second witness that we have who 17 will be Tim Cornwell, who is replacing Richard 18 Gollis. I'll be explaining that situation shortly. At this time I would like to move those 19 20 exhibits into the record. 2.1 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Those are exhibits 22 numbered --23 MR. KUDO: 13 and 14. 24 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any objections from the 25 parties, Commissioners?

```
1
               MS. SELF: No objections.
2
               MR. YEE: No objection.
 3
               Maybe I missed something. Exhibits 1
 4
     through 13 are admitted.
5
               MR. KUDO: It's a series of slides, but
 6
     collectively they're referred to as Exhibit 13. They
7
     didn't label each one.
               MR. YEE: What I was asking, are you
8
9
     admitting Exhibits 1 through 13?
               MR. KUDO: Just Exhibit 13 and 14.
10
               MR. YEE: No objection.
11
12
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you.
13
     Commissioners? Having heard all the arguments
14
     regarding admission of exhibits, I will allow the
15
     exhibits to be introduced.
16
                (Petitioner's Exhibits 13 and 14 were
17
     received into evidence.)
18
                County, do you have exhibits which you wish
     to have admitted to the record?
19
20
               MS. SELF: We have no exhibits, thank you.
21
               CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Mr. Yee?
22
               MR. YEE: The Office of Planning submitted
     within its memoranda in this case one exhibit, and
23
24
     unfortunately we marked them Exhibit 1 because they
     are attached to different memos. Exhibit 1 I think
25
```

is a transcript from the McClean case.

We have another exhibit that was attached to our Supplemental Response, which is the Department of Transportation letter; and then we later submitted a revision to that letter which we would also ask to be admitted as exhibits into evidence.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: So Exhibit 1?

MR. YEE: Well, technically they should be labeled Exhibits 1, 2 and 3, unfortunately that's how we labeled them, but that would be the better way to refer to them in chronological order, 1, 2, 3.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any objection from the parties?

MR. KUDO: No objection.

MS. SELF: No objections.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Commissioners?

Hearing none, State Office of Planning Exhibit 1 is admitted into the record -- 1, 2 and 3.

(OP's Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 were received into the record.)

Mr. Kudo, please present your case.

MR. KUDO: Excuse me, I need to -- we had exhibits attached to our Supplemental Memos. We filed three of them. So we would like those in addition to be admitted into the record. They're

```
1
     Exhibits 1 through 12.
2
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Exhibits 1 through 12.
3
     Any questions from the parties?
 4
                MS. SELF: No questions about that, but we
5
     also had three exhibits attached to our response.
 6
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Let me take care of Mr.
7
     Kudo's exhibits first. So you don't have objection?
                MS. SELF: No objections.
8
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Mr. Yee?
9
10
               MR. YEE: No objection.
11
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Exhibits 1 through 12
12
     is admitted.
13
                (Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 12 were
     received into evidence.)
14
15
               Ms. Self?
16
                MS. SELF: We had Exhibits 1, 2, 3 attached
17
     to our Response to Petitioner's First and Second
      Supplemental Memorandum in Response Support of the
18
19
     Motion filed January 20th, 2016.
20
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any objection from the
21
     parties?
22
                MR. KUDO: No objection.
23
                MR. YEE: No objection.
24
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: So County's Exhibit 1,
25
      2, and 3 is admitted.
```

(County's Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 were received into evidence.)

Mr. Kudo.

MR. KUDO: Chairman Aczon and Members of the Commission, before I begin, I just wanted to explain circumstances that came up yesterday.

We planned to put on two witnesses today,
LeeAnn Crabbe from Queen Lili'uokalani Trust, and
Richard Gollis, who is a market feasibility expert
from California.

Unfortunately, Mr. Gollis, when he arrived in Kona received a message of a personal family emergency, and got on the next flight back to California. His partner, Mr. Tim Cornwell, will be en route to Hawaii to testify in his place, but unfortunately because of the flight schedule and his schedule, will not be arriving until 9:00 evening.

We plan on putting on Tim Cornwell therefore at 8:30 tomorrow morning, if that is convenient for the Commission. We apologize for bifurcating our case between today and tomorrow, but we thought that that would be the only way that we could put on our entire Motion hearing today.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Can you tell us the nature of the witness' testimony, the nature of his

testimony is going to be?

Just trying to see if there's going to be somebody who can answer that if there is any problems with any questions for the Commissioners.

MR. KUDO: Part of the basis for the Motion is to explain to the Commission why these Phase I and Phase II had difficulty being fully developed from 1990. And the market feasibility analyst is going to give the Commission the economics that occurred between 1992 to date. And in particular how it impacted the economy of the Big Island.

And that this in large part is the reason why it was -- the development of Phase I and Phase II has been somewhat retarded because of these economic situations.

So it is the basis of our Motion, and would be relevant to your consideration.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Okay. I'll take that into consideration, but I want -- I'm going to go ahead with proceedings, and take questions from the Commissioners. If you think that by the end of the day it's very important for him to testify, we'll take that at that time.

MR. KUDO: Okay.

The Motion before you today seeks to remove

a portion of the Queen Lili'uokalani Trust lands, who is the Petitioner and Movant in this case, referred to as Phase III. And this originates from the 1991 Decision and Order issued by this State Land Use Commission.

The purpose of this Motion is simple, uncontroversial and straight forward. The Motion has received the support of the State Office of Planning and the County of Hawaii Planning Department based on its filings -- their filings.

Before I begin my arguments on the Motion,
I would like to tell you a bit about who the
Petitioner is so that you will have a better
understanding of the context of this Motion and how
it fits within the Trust's business plan and mission.

The Queen Lili'uokalani Trust is a private operating foundation founded by Queen Lili'uokalani, Hawaii's last reigning monarch. And was founded in 1909.

The instant petition lands on this Big
Island are within the ahupua'a Keahuolu, ancestral
lands that were given to the Queen by her mother.
The Trust property is dedicated for the benefit of
orphan and other destitute children in the Hawaiian
islands with preference given Hawaiian children of

pure or part aboriginal blood.

Over the last 100 years the Trust has continued to fulfill the Queen's mission by carrying for thousands of island children each year throughout the state.

The Trust does not charge any fees for the services it provides to the beneficiary children and their families. The Trust programs and services are supported by the revenue derived from its real estate holdings and investments.

In 2015 the Trust received about 26 million in real estate revenue from its real estate holdings and spent about 21 of that toward the charitable purpose. Keahuolu is the Trust's only landholding that can provide for meaningful revenue growth. The other parcels of lands that it owns are already developed in Waikiki.

The Trust has been involved in Keahuolu's development for decades. From the 1940's, when a portion of that land was condemned by the Territory of Hawaii to serve as the Old Kona Airport, and is now the site used by the County as named as Kailua Park.

Later developments at Keahuolu included

Queen Lili'uokalani Village, which was a workforce

housing project, the Makalapua Shopping Center, the Makalapua Business Center, the Kona Commons Shopping Complex, the Palani Road commercial properties and industrial areas, and the new Kona Judicial Complex which is underway.

In 1990, while the Trust was under the institution of management of First Hawaiian Bank, it prepared a land plan for the Keahuolu lands. The Trust petitioned this Commission to reclassify the Keahuolu lands from the State Agriculture and Conservation Districts to the State Urban District to prevent development.

I will now refer to Petitioner's

Exhibit 13. The Petition filed in 1990 identified three phases of development. Phase I, which is located here, II, and III (indicating).

Phases I and II, which are mauka of the Queen Kaahumanu Highway consisted of 545 acres of land. Phase III consisted of 212 acres makai of the highway.

The Master Plan focused on large scale commercial development with no plans for residential development. And this was out of a concern at that time that residential lots would be subject to the Lease Conversion Law under the Land Reform Act. Many

of these mandatory lease-to-fee conversions were being challenged and litigated during the 1980's the '90's.

In 1991 this Commission issued a Decision and Order that reclassified Phase I and Phase II from the Agricultural District to the Urban District. The Commission also ordered that Phase III, makai of the highway, would be incrementally districted or reclassified to the Urban District pending a showing that the Trust had substantially completed Phases 1 and Phases II.

After the Commission had issued its 1991

Decision and Order, the economy, however, took an unforeseen turn for the worst. Beginning with the burst of the Japanese bubble in 1990, and continuing through the global great recession of 2008.

To give more context to this Motion we will present two witnesses. Our first witness will be LeeAnn Crabbe, Vice President for the Trust, who will describe the Trust mission and its efforts to develop Phase I and II.

Our second will be Tim Cornwell, who will provide a retrospective look at economic and market conditions from 1990 to the present.

Ms. Crabbe will testify that since 1991 the

Trust has completed the backbone infrastructure improvements required under the 1991 Decision and Order. It has complied with all applicable conditions, and succeeded in attracting some large commercial tenants such as Macy's, Kmart and Regal Cinemas.

However, despite the Trust's best efforts it has not been able to fully develop Phase I and Phase II as originally proposed under 1991 Decision and Order.

 $$\operatorname{Mr.}$ Cornwell will testify as to the reason for this situation.

In 2002, after the Trust became independently managed, the Trust began to re-evaluate its land use plans for Keahuolu lands. Unlike the original Master Plan, which called for only large scale commercial development, the Trust has now revised its Master Plan, which will include significant component of residential development to serve the Kailua-Kona region.

The Trust recognizes the need for more housing on the Big Island. The Trust also recognizes a need to diversify so that in the event of other unanticipated recession or depressions, its real estate portfolio will not be dependent only on one

particular land use.

The Trust's long-term goal for Keahuolu is to not only create a long-term revenue stream to support its services for orphan and destitute children of Hawaii, but also to create a place that serves as model and creation of a sustainable community for the state.

The Trust proposes two separate development projects. First, the larger scale Keahuolu Land Plan. This will be the new Master Plan that we will be presenting to you in a different action, under which the Trust proposes to develop approximately 1350 acres; and secondly, the Makalapua Project District Development or MPD.

The MPD development, which is located in this vicinity here (indicating) is located in Phase III. Under the 1991 Decision and Order, Phase III remains subject to Incremental Districting, and requires the completion of Phase I and II before Phase III can reclassified.

We are seeking to remove the Incremental Districting from Phase III so that the Trust can proceed to develop the MPD project, which is here (indicating).

The Trust filed this Motion because Phase

III needs to be removed from the Incremental
Districting before the Trust can move forward, and
including Phase III lands in the MPD development.

The MPD development includes about

14.96 acres of lands in Phase III. The rest of the

MPD project is already entitled. The Phase III lands

are critical to the MPD development because these

lands are necessary to attract the types of tenants

needed to support a regional commercial center and to

generate revenue needed to support large scale future

Keahuolu land plan.

In other words, the Trust needs the revenue from that project to support this development of the larger Keahuolu land plan.

This Motion is the first step in a two-step process that the Trust is taking in order to proceed with its plans for the MPD development and the Keahuolu land plan.

If granted, Phase III will be released from Incremental Districting and will revert back to the Agricultural designation. From there the Trust will need to obtain the necessary land entitlements for Phase III as to the 14.96 acres by first applying to the County to include a less than 15-acre portion of Phase III, and then by amending the County zoning to

the proper category.

That will be followed with a new petition to this Commission for the remainder of Phase III and a revised Master Plan for Phase I and II.

The new petition to be filed with this

Commission sometime after the MPD entitlement

processes is underway, to implement the revised

Keahuolu land plan. This petition will affect Phase

I, II, and III of the Keahuolu lands.

During this proceeding we will describe our new Master Plan Community to take the place of the one that was presented to this Commission in 1990.

That new Master Plan is still being worked on, and should be ready no later than 2018. We originally thought that we could file a new petition by the end of this year, but as we continue to work on and refine our Master Plan, and conduct our ongoing consultations with various government agencies, it is taking longer than we anticipated.

Therefore, to be conservative, we hope that the new petition can be filed no later than 2018.

We therefore respectfully request that this Commission find good cause to modify the 1991

Decision and Order to replace Phase III from the docket and from the Incremental Districting order by

granting this particular Motion. 1 2 At this time I would like call our first 3 witness in support of the Motion, Ms. LeeAnn Crabbe, 4 to the stand. 5 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Can I swear you in? 6 Do you affirm that the testimony that 7 you're about to give is the truth? THE WITNESS: Yes. 8 9 LEEANN CRABBE 10 Was called to the stand by and on behalf of the Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined 11 12 and testified as follows: 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: State your name and 15 address for the record, and please proceed. 16 THE WITNESS: LeeAnn Crabbe, 1100 Alakea 17 Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 9681. BY MR. KUDO: 18 19 Would you provide your present title or 20 position with Queen Lili'uokalani Trust? 21 Α Vice President. 22 How long have you been employed at the Q 23 Trust? 24 This year will be 14 years. Α 25 Could you briefly describe your duties and Q

—McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 —

responsibilities at the Trust?

A I'm responsible for planning and development of Trust real estate, and I also have kuleana for management of all Trust real property throughout the State of Hawaii.

Q Would you briefly describe the Trust creation and its history?

A What we provided in the PowerPoint is a brief excerpt from the Queen's Deed of Trust. This is the last page of her Deed of Trust that was signed in 1909.

As Mr. Kudo mentioned earlier, we are a private operating foundation, meaning we are not grant making, we operate our own programs. So we cannot ratchet down our spending in any one given year, because we have beneficiaries and people that depend on our services on an annualized.

And the IRS also does not allow us to do that. We have spending requirements to maintain our nonprofit operating foundation status with the IRS, so we have some funding obligation for charitable purpose on an annualized basis.

The Queen signed her Deed of Trust in 1909 when she was still alive, so unlike the other ali'i trust in the state, we are not governed from the

grave, as I like to say, the others were created upon the death of the grantor.

As mentioned, as you can see on the screen, all of the property of the Trust Estate is to be used for the benefit of orphan and destitute children of Hawaiian ancestry.

These lands in our Trust supported the Queen until her death in 1917. The Queen actively managed these properties until her death.

Q Would you elaborate on what the Trust mission is today?

A We provide services throughout the State of Hawaii. Orphan and destitute children. We served approximately 12,000 orphan and destitute children in 2015 through direct services, direct social services. We applied social workers and community builders throughout the State.

We also served thousands more through our community building efforts and those are frequently done in collaboration with other community partners or organizations, non-profits like us.

Q Would you give us some examples of these community programs and services?

A Here's our motto of why exist. Our motto is: Healthy children, strong families, caring

communities. We provide grief counseling, individual life services, casework and financial assistance to assure that basic needs are met, group services, grief counseling for grandparents that are now raising grandchildren; and building capacity in neighborhoods that have the high concentration of Native Hawaiians in them, build social capacity in Native Hawaiian neighborhoods.

A big push for us is making sure that

Native Hawaiian children have at least one caring and
nurturing adult in their lives, which may or may not
be a birth or family member, but making sure there is
that one adult they can depend on.

Also provide strong support system throughout the community, again, building that social capacity within Hawaiian neighborhoods.

Here is a slide showing all of our are children centers of the State of Hawaii. We have centers on all of the major Hawaiian islands and satellite offices as well. Obviously for outreach reasons we're not on Kaho'olawe and Ni'ihau, although we do service Ni'ihau.

And, again, as I mentioned last year we serviced directly over 12,000 orphan and destitute children of Native Hawaiian ancestry and thousands

more through our community building efforts.

This chart that are we're showing here shows the number of beneficiaries that were served over the last ten years. As you can see, the number of beneficiaries we served over the last ten years has grown.

Spending on charitable purpose has grown correspondingly as well. And as you might know, in those areas when we had troubling economic times, such as 2008 and 2009, more beneficiaries served typically on the destitute side through our financial assistance programs, again, for basic needs.

One thing we would like to note is the needs of our Native Hawaiian children are growing unfortunately, and for us that's not okay. We are perpetual Trust. The IRS has asked us: What would you do with the assets if the Trust were shut down? It's a typical IRS question.

We would love to be put out of business and have reason to answer that question, what would these Trust assets do if there were no longer any more orphan or destitute children anywhere on this planet.

Unfortunately, that's not reality for us in the foreseeable future, which is why we need to exist, to provide services because sometimes the

State cannot or will not provide service.

Native Hawaiians lag in all of the typical areas: Education, health, housing and employment.

Some statistics: Over 17 percent of school age Native Hawaiian children live in poverty level.

And of those missing a parent about 27 percent in single-parent households live in poverty.

So for us it's important to increase the level of services that we are able to provide to Native Hawaiian opio and their families.

We sometimes describes ourselves as a nongovernmental organization, NGO. Again, providing services or supplementing services that governmental agencies may or may not provide.

One example we would give: There was a situation where we had orphaned one children in California, languishing in that state system, where our state CPS would not step in. And our agency stepped in to bring those kids home. They actually live up in Kohala with their grandmother to be reunified with family, grandparent that would keep all five children together.

So the grandma, the oldest was Kohala High School, youngest was four years old in preschool.

It's quite a strain on a 64-year-old woman, but it

was something our agency felt was real important to do for the Native Hawaiian children and help the family.

We support these programs through our land base. Hard to see in this light, but we are a small Trust. We have just 6300 acres statewide on only two islands, Oahu and Hawaii Island, and I would compare that to my former employer, the Kamehameha Schools owns over 360,000 acres statewide. So.

6300 acres is all we have, and it has to pay all of our bills. On Oahu we have 48 acres, 16 acres in Waikiki generate over 70 percent of real estate revenue.

So it's a scary place to be. Again, because we are a private operating foundation to be so heavily dependent on one geographic area, Waikiki, and one sector of the economy being tourism.

Keahuolu, the 3400 acres we have here in Kona, really presents the only meaningful opportunity we have for growth of our income base over the next several generations.

Q Ms. Crabbe, are you familiar with the Trust lands in the ahupua'a of Keahuolu?

A I am. As I mentioned, as you can see, we have 3400 acres here in Keahuolu.

Q How far did the Trust come to own the Keahuolu lands?

2.1

A The Queen inherited these lands from her mother Analea Keohokalole.

Q How does the development of these lands tie into the Trust mission?

A Increased revenues to support our charitable purpose, an expanding reach of those programs and services. Our fiduciary responsibility really is to diversify our asset base. It's just a prudent investor thing not to have your eggs so heavily rated in one basket.

And as many of our ali'i trust, we were land rich, cash poor. We had to diversify our portfolio. So we are invested in marketable securities and some private investments that provide that hedge, a defensive hedge against different staggers in the economy.

Q Could you briefly describe to us the development history of the Keahuolu lands?

A We have got a graphic here, a similar map that Mr. Kudo had up earlier. He mentioned in the 1940's the state -- well, the territory at that time, condemned part of our land for development of the Old Kona Airport, which is now in use as the county's

Kailua Park. Then in the 1960's we developed the Old Industrial Area, which is B, and as we mentioned, that's basically the small business incubator for Kailua-Kona.

Then in the 1970's, we started a camping program along our shoreline just north of the Old Airport Park, and that's noted as C on the map. We operate three camp sites along the shoreline.

Also in the 1970's we developed some commercial properties along Palani Road, a couple of shopping centers. We have a office building there, Palani Court.

And E, our Kona Unit, which is in the subject Phase III, our Kona Unit was built in 1981 where we provide services to all of West Hawaii from Kohala to Ka'u.

And the Business Center, F, Business Center which was done in 2000, thereabouts. And that was envisioned as an expansion area for the Old Industrial Area. It's now morphing into a very mixed use type of district.

And then in the 2008 we actually opened the first Petco in the State of Hawaii at Kona Commons, with Kona Commons and the Target store. We were second Target store in the state.

1 Moving mauka of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway.

2 And it's not shown on this particular aerial photo,

3 | but farther up Palani Road is the Queen Lili'uokalani

4 | Village residential development. And our

5 understanding that was on the condition of the Old

6 Industrial Area, sort of a workforce housing where

7 | people working in the industrial area live, Queen

8 | Lili'uokalani Village.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then in the 1990's in Urban Phase I, the Makalapua Shopping Center was constructed with Kmart, then Liberty House and Hollywood Theatres.

They're all still there no known as -- still Kmart, still alive and kicking for a little bit more.

Hollywood Cinema is now Regal Theatres, Liberty House is now Macy's store.

In 2013 we opened the Kepo'okalani
Interpretive Center. That was part of our mitigation
efforts for the Ane Keohokalole Highway.

And I'll address some future development that will take place here. Of note, some of the historic or post contact took uses that took place on our properties, up along Ane Keohokalole Highway there was a quarry that was in operation back in the 1970's and that village reopened for construction of Ane Keohokalole Highway. And we believe that was

done for base course material for Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway in the 1970's.

At turn of the century about the 1890's to 1924 there was the sisal factory in operation along Palani Road, and a lot of sisal plants up there along Palani Road are still there near the Queen Lili'uokalani Village.

Q Are familiar with the land plan that was presented to this Commission in 1990?

A Yes.

Q Would you describe the project and the three phases of development that were originally planned?

A So in the late '80's early '90's the Trust was still so under the institutional management of First Hawaiian Bank. So the land plan that they devised contemplated 100 percent large scale commercial uses. So it was designated in phases as an urban activity area.

A centralized business plaza was contemplated, as well as a regional shopping center or regional hospital. Governmental facilities and some civic facilities such as an auditorium. There was no residential uses, as Mr. Kudo mentioned, contemplated in that original plan.

Phase I, the 315 acres, included a regional shopping center. We started a little bit of that with the Makalapua Shopping Center. Portions of the mid-level road which have been constructed and is now known as Ane Keohokalole Highway.

Also a mauka-makai road past that regional shopping center and a part of that has been constructed. It's known as Makalapua Park. And a regional hospital and civic plaza was planned as part of that Phase I development.

Phase II was an in urban expansion area that was to have been developed to be, I guess, simpatico with the State's Kealakehe development, what the State had contemplated in the adjacent ahupua'a of Kealakehe.

And then our Phase III area makai of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway was further urban expansion of the larger plan. It was anticipated that Phases I and II would be done in a ten-year period, and that some of the for Phase III would begin in that ten-year period. All three phases were expected to be completed in 20 years. And total off-site costs were projected at that time at \$130 million in 1990 constant dollars. And again it was a 20-year plan.

The D and O included requirements on

certain backbone infrastructure improvements. 1 2 Have these been completed? 3 Α Yes. Are you familiar with the Petition that the 4 5 Trust filed for the project in the Land Use 6 Commission in 1989, and the LUC 1991 Decision and 7 Order of the Petition? 8 Α Yes. 9 Q

Under the 1991 Decision and Order, how are the lands in Phase I, II and III reclassified?

Α So, again, Urban I and II mauka of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway were redistricted from Agricultural and Conservation Districts Into Urban, and Phase III was incrementally reclassified from Agriculture to Urban when we had showed the Petitioner, meaning us, the Trust had shown significant progress on Phases I and II.

So my understanding, as a lay person, of Incremental Redistricting is showing that kind of substantial completion before we could come in for reclassification to Urban.

Did the 1991 Decision and Order also hold certain conditions?

Α Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Can you describe some of these conditions?

A Some of the example were, again, we had planned a large business-serving hotel, one of the conditions was the creation of one non-tourism related job for every hotel room that we were allowed to build.

2.1

We are adjacent to the Kealakehe Landfill, the Old Kona Town landfill here, kind of that big mound. And believe it or not they have cows grazing on this landfill, which is a little disturbing, because there are fires burning underground.

So there's some gasses and fumes that are coming out that landfill. You can't see it, but I think there about ten or so fires burning underground. Because we've got lava-tube systems that are feeding oxygen to these fires.

But one of the conditions of approval from the 1991 D and O was that we have a no-build area, you can't see it, but it's 1300 feet around that landfill. It's a pretty significant chunk of land. So no-build within 1300 feet of that landfill.

And then the last -- there were several conditions, but the other was that infrastructure, because this was a phased project that infrastructure would be brought on appropriate with the phasing, water, wastewater and transportation.

Q Can you describe to the Commission members what the current status of Phase I and II are?

A So in Phase I we have constructed the Makalapua Shopping Center, about 25 acres. Again, that's Kmart, Regal Cinemas and Macy's. We are just about close to completing our deal with the State of Hawaii for the Kona Judiciary Complex, which will be on ten acres just north of Kmart along Makala Boulevard.

That project has been already gone out to bid. Bids were opened in January, and we do hope construction will begin on that Kona Judiciary Complex later this year. It will be great for Kona, it's 140,000 square feet of what we consider major office use. Closer in. Brings our family court system into a much safer area.

Let's see. 2013, as we mentioned, we brought in Kepo'okalani Interpretive Center. And as mentioned in our annual reports to the LUC in terms of infrastructure, in order to get Makalapua Shopping Center off of the ground, we did have to provide water source for that. So in 1996 we dedicated the Keahuolu Well No. 1, a reservoir and transmission system to County of Hawaii, Department of Water Supply. In 2010 we entered into a water use

development agreement with the County Water Supply as well.

Another condition of our approval as we noted is a connection of all of the facilities in urban Phase I and II to the County Wastewater System, that has been completed.

And in 2003, in conjunction with widening of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway, Department of Transportation, State Department of Transportation sent us a letter noting that we had met Condition 8 of the 1991 D and O in regard to state transportation requirements.

Q Please explain to us why Phases I and II were not substantially completed although the backbone infrastructure has been completed.

A The real estate market slowed. No one, I think, could have imagined the Japanese bubble bursting, and then the great recess of 2008. And we've got significant flow mauka of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway. That's really where Hualalai starts rising. So we have got some topographic challenges there.

So changing market demands, I think, from large scale commercial users. As an example, Costco is just to the north of Koloko -- Costco would not do a leasehold deal. They wanted fee simple. At that

point we wouldn't do a fee simple deal with a large user like COSTCO.

So changing demands, and just, again, one single use large scale commercial, it just didn't work with the market conditions in Kona. The Concord Group market analysis, which we have submitted in one of our -- I think in supplemental number two, shows that we did overestimate the demand for commercial and the tourism product.

And Tim Cornwell from the Concord Group can explain that in better detail than I can.

We have had several Large scale commercial users that have looked at our property, but the on and off-site cost, again, because the slow and topographic conditions really precluded any kind of meaningful deal from happening.

Macy's, just to give an example, we are in active discussions with them to move them makai to the Makalapua project district development where they will have better visibility from Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway, and the topography better suits that kind of large scale user.

Example, the Target had 160,000 square feet under roof. That was a lot of concrete to pour, and a lot of boulder ripping to make that plat of pad

happen. It was very difficult to do with the slope we've got mauka of Queen Ka'ahumanu. Which is where Phases I and II are.

And ultimately being closer to Kailua

Village makes a huge difference for these commercial

users. The tourist trade coming off Kailua Pier from

the cruise ships, and the hotels that are down along

Ali'i Drive as well make a large difference in the

capture of the tourist market, especially for retail

users.

Q Can you tell us what efforts the Trust made to develop Phase I and II?

A As I mentioned, we had several discussions with large scale commercial users, and it wouldn't be appropriate to name names, but those all fell through. And we didn't run through the on and off-site development costs for those deals.

Q Turning our attention to Phase III of the project, which is located makai of the highway, could you describe to us what the current status of that is?

A Phase III, again, is subject to the incremental redistricting. Our new master plan will include those lands, because we are contemplating really essentially different uses than the 1990 plan

did by including residential. And we're also looking at a different phasing plans.

So the linear phasing of going from Phases

1, II and then III, from a market absorption

standpoint would be arguably very difficult to

accomplish, because you're selling basically just one
kind of product at a time.

So we're looking at different phasing where we could possibly be selling product in our mauka lands and our makai lands at the same time. It gives us a lot quicker absorption, because we're selling to different markets. So uses in phasing will change in the new plan.

The only activity that happened in that urban Phase III area was development of our children center in 1981.

Q Now, did the Trust decide to revise the old plans?

A Yes. When we first in 2002 when First
Hawaiian Bank stepped down as institutional active
manager and institutional trustee of our Trust, we
became at that point an independently managed Native
Hawaiian Trust. All three of our trustees today are
Native Hawaiian.

We reevaluated everything we had, and truth

be told, our investment portfolio had taken a very large hit in 2000 and 2001 with the dot com bubble burst, all of these bubbles bursting, in a period of very important growth for the Trust.

So we did reevaluate the plans at that time and realized that again, because of topography, the mauka lands, that Urban Phases I and II were better suited for smaller footprint uses, maybe such as residential development, but certainly not singularly -- as a single purpose large scope commercial uses.

Q Why did the Trust decide to revise the project plans?

A When we looked at the topo, we looked at the market challenges, we did look over the files from First Hawaiian Bank, and the kinds of discussion we had with potential tenants, we realized it really wasn't market -- it wasn't a feasible deal any more, just 100 percent commercial on urban Phases I and II.

Q Would you provide us with a brief overview of the Trust revised plans?

A The revised plan contemplates two separate projects. And you'll hear maybe some of these acronyms rather than give you the full names. We have two Makalapua Project District development, the

MPD development, and the Keahuolu land plan, the larger land plan for 1350 acres.

So this is a diagram showing the Makalapua Project District development, about 70 acres. 55 of those acres do have current entitlements. This is the area essentially mauka of the Old Airport Park and makai of Kona Commons. So a lot of -- the locals refer to it as the Kona Commons expansion area.

About just under 15 of those acres is crosshatched in that diagram are in the Phase III area right now. We are looking at a dense compact mix use development that is called for in the Kona Community Development Plan that was adopted in 2008.

We are basically just north of Kailua
Village, and Kailua Village has nowhere to grow other
than north toward our land, so it's a great
opportunity. A community already exists here. What
we are able to provide this community is a way to
planfully grow.

We are in a corridor, that the Kona CDP designates as a growth opportunity area or regional commercial center. There are four of these large regional commercial centers identified in the Kona CDP. Ours is one. Kailua Village just adjacent to us and there two others in North and South Kona.

-- this is an opportunity to organize and intensify new development both in form and function, kind of that new urbanism. And it's really a way to an avoid the urban sprawl that we've been seeing along our coast, kind of leapfrog-development that has been taking place along Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway.

Infrastructure already exists here. It's good, smart development for Kona. This is envisioned as a mixed use, walkable, multi-modal village, that will provide needed housing, and economic growth for West Hawaii which is one of our fastest growing communities in the State of Hawaii.

We're planning a diverse range of uses in close proximity to each other. So right we're looking at residential, hotel, retail expansion, some office use, there's not a lot -- very deep market for office in Kona, but there is some office demand. And some other civic and community uses.

So, again, it's an interconnected pedestrian multi-modal street network where we're intermingling homes, buses, entertainment all in one district.

This project is going to require a Chapter 343 environmental document. We're going to be requesting a less than 15-acre district boundary

amendment at the county level.

Although, again, we do have existing entitlements on the 55 acres, we will be seeking a zone change at the county level to the project district.

Our current zoning does not allow hotel or residential uses. We'll need Special Management Area Permit at the county level again, everything makai of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway is Special Management Area.

We are looking at obtaining those county entitlements, if all goes well, by the end of 2017.

We think at the very earliest, and this project would be developed in phases over a 15-year timeline.

Q Can you explain the significance of how this MPD development relates to the Motion before us?

A We need the release of the Phase III lands from the incremental redistricting so we can take that less than 15-acre portion to include in this Makalapua Project District Development.

We basically need that additional acreage, we need the 70 acres in total to provide the right kinds of co-tenancies and to get that interconnected multi-modal street network to make this a financially viable project.

As I mentioned earlier, Macy's, we are in

very active discussions with then. I've been in Cincinnati a couple of times to bring them makai into this district. It would double the size of their storm from 50,000 to 103,000 square feet.

But to get the right kinds of co-tenancies to make this the right kind of vital retail district that the Kona CDP contemplates, we need the acreage, number one, to park it, although we are trying to get people out of automobiles, but, again, to get the trails and that kind of street network going, and to get the right developer interest to bring the residential component in as well.

So I guess -- shall I move on?

O Yes.

A So, again, we're working on two projects, the Makalapua Project District Development, which we discussed. This is our larger Keahuolu Land Plan.

Basically Urban Phase III, the subject of our Motion today, gets divvied up between these two projects. So less than 15 acres would go to MPD development, and remainder of that Phase III area would go into this Keahuolu Land Plan.

This Land Plan takes the lands under Phases
I and II mauka of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway, the
remainder of Urban Phase III, and another district

here, about 600 acres that are currently in State Conservation District would be included in this new Keahuolu Land Plan. So about 1350 acres.

Our vision for this is to create a community that nurtures healthy families; is economically resilient, culturally vibrant; connected to aina, because we are a Native Hawaiian Trust.

For us we cannot always live in the past, but we've got to be grounded by history and prepared for our future. That's what this plan is about for our Trust.

It's a mixed-use community. Again, no sole purpose, that singular purpose zoning. We're looking at about 6500 residential units, including multi-family and single-family, but it's skewed more towards the multi-family side.

An additional 1.3 million square feet of commercial uses. We have about 1.3 million square feet on our campus today, with the existing development that I described earlier. And other civic and community uses, such as schools and recreation centers and the like.

We're showing 30 percent as dedicated open space, not all of it conditioned. We love lava.

It's a great big black sponge. It takes care of a

lot of our stormwater events. But it will include trails, walking paths, and some of it will be conditioned for parks and play spaces.

And we've got that worked into all of our -- we've got a series of interconnected neighborhoods. It's hard to see, but those dashed lines are basically all of our little neighborhoods, or little ped sheds, or pedestrian sheds where we have services within each of those neighborhoods, so you would never really have to get into a car to leave to get services or play gates or just to throw a ball around with your child.

But within the open space areas, we are showing an thousand foot setback along our shoreline. It's a very rugged treacherous shoreline. You've got Class A waters. A lot of very significant archaeological and cultural sites. We have done all of our archaeological inventory surveys.

Our staff has worked this property. We felt one staff member, Mike Ikeda, who's been on the property over 40 years and has been probably in every lava tube we have.

So we know where our special sites are. We are going to keep all of those in open space. Those are preserved for generations to come. And the

shoreline, the 1000 foot setback is a no-build area except for program use. So it's for our kids, where our kids can be Hawaiian.

And we would like to embrace our residents as well. The more we educate, the more others can help us protect what we have, to protect and celebrate what we have.

When this plan is final, we will file a new district -- well, we'll actually come back to ask that our 1991 Decision and Order for Urban Phases I and II be reopened, because, again, we still want commercial uses up there, but we would like to add residential uses as well. And we'll file a new petition for the remainder of the Urban Phase III land, and this other Conservation District parcel.

This is also going to require a Chapter 343 environmental document, a State Land Use District Boundary Amendment with your body.

We'll need county entitlements such as zoning, although we do have zoning on Phase I now, it's zoned commercial. And we'll need a Special Management Area Use Permit for any of our lands makai of Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway.

So following approval of this particular Motion, the new petition for this Keahuolu Land Plan

would be submitted no later than 2018, or I will probably be hung by one of my bosses.

Q Turning to the MPD development, when does the Trust expect to finalize the plans for the MPD development?

The MPD will be, if the Motion is approved this week, we would start that process immediately with the county. We've just finally refined those plans for the MPD. And at one point we had thought we could process both of the projects concurrently at state and county levels, but unfortunately -- or discussions with different governmental agencies are taking longer than we had anticipated for this larger Keahuolu Land Plan, which is why that will come in a little bit later than the Makalapua Project District.

Q Why is it important that the Trust to develop and place the MPD project on the market ahead of the KLP project?

A The MPD development is an opportunity.

We've got significant retail and hotel interest in getting something going down there. It's, again, a mixed-use project that comports with the county's plans for this area in terms of it's consistent with the Kona Community Development Plan.

And we have seen a lot of growth in this

area, especially with opening of the Kona Common Project in 2008. The Target store and some other things that are happening down in the Village.

The MPD development has the support of the county. We have been working closely with the County Department of Parks and Recreation, the Kailua Park Master Plan in making that happen, the first phase of that happened. The tarmac is still down there from the Old Airport. We've been working on roadway connections and better entries and exits, especially for our tsunami events from the Old Airport Park. So it will enable development of infrastructure, such as roads and water and sewer to Old Airport Park.

And it's a major step toward establishing that regional commercial center contemplated in the Kona CDP.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: How long will this be?

MR. KUDO: About 10, 15 minutes.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: I would be like to take a short break, but go ahead.

Q (By Mr. Kudo): How will the Trust address any potential concerns about the release of the conditions that are presently on the Phase III property as a result of the 1991 decision? How will you address that?

A We are willing to carryover any applicable conditions from the 1991 D and O to any new actions.

Q What are the Trust plans for the remaining Phase III lands?

A They will be included in the Keahuolu Land Plan.

Q What would happen if the LUC were to deny this Petition?

A Well, we wouldn't be able to move forward with either the MPD development or the Keahuolu Land Plan. We would have to evaluate how we would best move forward to facilitate the MPD development.

Because, again, we have immediate opportunities there to realize some of the hopes and answer dreams of the Kona CDP and our Trust as well.

The Phase III, release of the Phase III lands should be included, a portion to be included in the Makalapua Project District Development. Again, it's needed in order to attract the kinds of tenants, the co-tenancies and the development partners we need to make this project financially viable.

We know from experience at Makalapua

Shopping Center, our standalone Macy's, basically our standalone Macy's without parking all around, just doesn't work. You need co-tenancies to get a vibrant

retail district going. And I think many of us that travel understand that, the places we like to shop.

So without the additional 14 acres from Urban Phase III, we don't know that we could really attract the kind of development interest we need to make the MPD development financially viable.

Q Has the Trust been conferring with the County of Hawaii regarding the revised plans, particularly for the MPD development?

A Yes, we have.

Q What other government agencies has the Trust conferred with about these revised plans?

A We continue to meet -- we're kind of past -- we're with many different governmental agencies. So at the state level, Department of Transportation, Department of Education, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Office of Planning.

At the county level, Planning Department, monthly or more frequently; Department of Public Works as frequently as that; Environmental Management, Parks and Recreation, mass transit, police and fire.

Q Has the Trust begun work for the drafting of an EIS Prep Notice for the Keahuolu Land Plan?

A Yes, we have begun an internal Draft of an

EIS Preparation Notice.

Q Now, in conclusion, how does the Keahuolu Land plan and the MPD development tie into the Trust mission?

A These are ancestral lands. They were inherited -- the Trust inherited these lands from our Queen, and she inherited the lands from her mother, Analea Keohokalole.

Unlike most developers, we can take a very long term view, and we realize how fortunate we are. So we are putting a lot of investments into public realms and place to make this a special place. We're doing shoreline development. So this is kind of what we're contemplating, this development 2.0, different from what we are seeing north on the coast.

So we're really taking an intergenerational view, long-term value for generations to come. We don't need double digit IRR in our initial years.

We're making a big investment for big return for future generations, for kids yet to be born. So future asset managers are sitting on an asset that's generating a lot of revenue for charitable purpose.

The needs of Hawaiian children are not going down, they're actually increasing, which is a sad statistic for us, and something we don't take

lightly.

We've looked at the billions of dollars that have been spent on Hawaiian programs. We are not better as a people, so you'll be seeing some changes.

We've already reorganized on the charitable side. We're making some big plays on how we start addressing poverty for Native Hawaiian family.

But that takes funds and resources. We don't charge any fees to any of our beneficiary children or their family for the services we provide. So we have got to generate more money for our families and our programs.

And we've also got to fund -- as many of us know, entitlements don't come cheap. So we have got to fund future entitlement efforts to make these lands profitable or leasable for our are charitable purpose, because our Queen didn't ask that these be left as open space. These lands need to feed our families for generations to come.

That may sound somewhat trite, but again, this is all we've got. We don't have a lot of land in the state. So this is our leadership example of how Hawaiians do responsible land development in this state. So we're looking at an evolutionary flexible

framework. We've got to be flexible with the market 1 2 demand, not inflexible. Again, looking back at some 3 of the mistakes we made with one singular purpose, or one singular use in our commercial development. 4 5 So we are going to need some flexibility on 6 phasing when we come back to you with this land plan. 7 Long-term view, we are not -- we don't have 8 a large carrier on this land other than real property 9 tax and opportunity cost. 10 So what I would like to leave you with is 11 one of the gems that came out of our Community 12 Advisory Group. We like to say we are not investor driven, but beneficiary driven. That's the way we 13 14 operate, that's the way we plan, and that's the way 15 this development takes place. 16 MR. KUDO: This concludes the direct 17 testimony of Ms. LeeAnn Crabbe. 18 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Before Ms. Crabbe takes 19 some questions from the parties and Commissioners, I 20 want to take a five minute recess. 21 (Recess taken.) 22 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: We're back on the 23 record.

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 ---

MS. SELF:

Are there any questions for Ms. Crabbe?

The county has no questions.

24

25

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Mr. Yee?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. YEE:

2.1

Q Let me focus for the moment on the MPD?

You testified you consulted with Department

of Transportation, Department of Education and

Department of Land and Natural Resources; is that

correct?

A That is correct for the overall Keahuolu plan.

Q Who have you consulted with -- will you consult with the Department of Transportation; the Department of Education? I will add the Department of Defense; Department of Land and Natural Resources; and Department of Health prior to reclassification of the 14.96 acres in the MPD?

A Yes, we are happy to do that. We met with Department of Transportation just a couple of weeks ago, and we did present the MPD development to them at that last meeting. So fairly recent. But we are willing to consult with all of those state agencies.

Q And I was wondering, in any of the documents that were submitted, is there a map detailing the intersections that are discussed in the Department of Transportation's letter?

1	A Well, this map that we have up right now
2	does show the intersections, in terms of the the
3	intersections of Queen Ka'ahumanu or these are the
4	major backbone roads (indicating). There's obviously
5	a much wider roadway schedule.
6	Q Could you point to where is the
7	Manawalea Boulevard connected to Queen Ka'ahumanu
8	Highway?
9	A Right there and up there (indicating).
10	Q Where would the intersection by Hale Maka'i
11	Street and Makala Boulevard?
12	A This is the current signalized intersection
13	at Hale Maka'i, so this signalized intersection gets
14	you mauka to the police station and mauka to the
15	wastewater treatment plant.
16	So we are proposing that this signal be
17	relocated to Manawalea intersection. And over here
18	is Makala Boulevard, which is our major mauka-makai
19	street, connects Kuakini up to Ane Keohokalole.
20	And then our last signalized intersection
21	along Queen Ka'ahumanu is at Palani Road.
22	Q There's a reference to a Road A. Do you
23	know where that is?

A It's right here (indicating).

24

25

Q How does that work into this question of

where the intersection should go, the signalization should go?

2.1

A Well, we had proposed, again, for the overall Keahuolu Land Plan, that Road A, B, potentially we could study it in our TIAR as an signalized intersection; and Department of Transportation has asked that we just consider that right-in/right-out.

Should the discussions take us to a place where the signal is not relocated from Hale Maka'i to Manawalea we would request that DOT -- and that is part of our ongoing discussion -- really look at that Road A signalization. So it's part of the continuing discussion with DOT.

- Q And do I understand then that you will be preparing a Traffic Impact Analysis Report as part of your MPD application?
 - A Yes, it's underway.
- Q Would you agree to provide a copy -- actually ask for a hard copy and one electronic copy of the application after filing with the county?
 - A Absolutely.
- Q For the record, the Office of Planning has agreed that if they do so, it would constitute service upon the DBED as required by statute.

Do you have any plans to submit any further 1 2 county district boundary amendments? In other words, 3 county boundary amendments for areas 15 acres or less for any of these lands after the MPD 14.96 acres is 4 5 approved? 6 Not a this time. 7 Do you have any thoughts or plans that you might sequentially redistrict any parts of the 8 9 Keahuolu lands in a series of 15-acre county district 10 boundary amendments? 11 No, we don't. It's a large plan that, you 12 know, there are co-dependencies within the larger Keahuolu Land Plan that would preclude that. 13 14 And would you -- is it then also your 0 representation that before you then develop Phase III 15 16 outside of the 14.96 acres as part of the MPD, that 17 before you develop that remainder of Phase III lands, 18 you will be first coming to the Land Use Commission 19 for a petition for district boundary amendment? 20 Α Yes. 21 So you will not be developing, say, 22 gentlemen farms on these acreages? 23 No. Α 24 I think that's -- just to finish up. Q

Did you have an opportunity to review the

25

Office of Planning's supplemental response?

- A I have.
- 3 Q Did you see our recommendation in there?
- 4 A I did.

- Q Do you have any concerns or problems with the compliance with those recommendation?
- A No.
 - Q Thank you. Nothing further.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Commissioners, any questions for Ms. Crabbe? Commissioner Cabral.

COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Since I know some of these roads, I've certainly been down to the Kona Park and Old Airport many, many times.

You're on one of these -- and I don't truly understand, and maybe you don't yet know.

Are you looking at developing in multiple locations simultaneously? You've got a lot of data here.

Are you going to be looking, as you go through the approval process, of what's permitted in that? Your mix of what looks like, in terms of one area, you've got 180 units, residential units mixed in with 470,000 square feet of commercial, and 15,000 square feet of community, and hotel about 180 rooms.

Of your residential, what is your vision of what that residential is going to be? Is it single-family dwelling, townhouses, apartments, subsidized low income or a mix?

I would like to just understand the community vision there.

2.1

THE WITNESS: In the Makalapua Project

District Development, the 180 units, those will all

be multi-family, because, again, it's a dense compact

village that we're contemplating.

Right now we are looking at almost

100 percent rental product, but we are refining the
market study to determine more of the "for sale"

product will be in the Keahuolu Land Plan area.

There seems to be great demand for rental product right now. And we are planning to meet county requirements for 20 percent of those units being affordable.

COMMISSIONER CABRAL: I would like to comment on that, because I do a lot of housing on the Hilo side, and high project on this side also.

I would like to encourage that there is such a desire to have HUD and low-income housing, and we need so much of it, but I think in these areas what we really need is housing that your working

folks that are going to be employed in those areas can, 1, afford to live in; and also can qualify to live in, so you need to have a lot of, in a sense sort of free market, but not above market type of rental rates. So I would encourage you to look at that perfect mix, whatever that might be. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Vice Chair Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aloha. So I have a bunch of questions and I'll ask a couple and see if anyone else wants to ask questions before I go on.

First of all, you mentioned in Makalapua project development area, 50 acres is already entitled.

Can you walk us through how that 50 acres was entitled?

THE WITNESS: This was done, I believe, back in the 1990's, 2000, and again, it was part of 100-acre project called Makalapua Business Center actually, and it's zoned MCX at county level.

It was originally, I assume that that would be an expansion of the Old Industry Industrial area. So it had that MCX zoning, which allows some light industrial and commercial uses but not residential.

It had since morphed -- we started with

Increment 1, which included HPM in the Kona

International Market Place, Increment 2 had some

light industrial, United Laundry, the BMW dealership,

and then we brought in Kona Commons.

2.1

- Again, it's close to Kailua Village, and it's flat for the most part. So it's right connection down into the village, and it's much more conducive to that kind of large scale use.
- VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: When did it enter into the State Land Use?
- 11 THE WITNESS: Off the top of my head, I
 12 couldn't say.
 - MR. KUDO: I wasn't involved at that time, but I was involved in 1990, but I believe they had those lands were urbanized prior to 1980.
 - VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I would be interested in knowing if the -- and I apologize if I missed it. I reviewed all the material and perhaps mixed it.
 - Were there any conditions placed by the

 Land Use Commission for those 50 acres of this Common

 65-acre MPD?
 - THE WITNESS: To be honest, I believe all of those conditions have been met, because we're not submitting -- the only reports we are submitting on that area is to county in regards to zoning

conditions.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Then I have a second question, and if you want to say, commissioner, please direct that to be the county, that's fine.

But I'm interested that having actually read the Common Kona CDP, there is moves to revise it now, and also change the County General Plan and the relationship of the CDP to the County General Plan.

So some of the testimony, as well as your testimony, referenced its compatibility with the existing Kona CDP.

How does this change in the county's planning process potentially affect what you're trying to do both with the MPD, as well as the larger plan?

THE WITNESS: As a lay person -- I'm not a planner -- what I could say is that we are meeting the spirit of the Kona CDP, and we're taking this project district zoning, because, again, we want to add residential and hotel uses.

The uses you're talking about right now,

Macy's does work with current zoning. So it's -
Kona CDP and zoning, we're okay. And I would say the

same on the larger land plan, when we have to come

back in for those entitlements.

1 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you.

Just one more question for now.

2.1

If I understood the various submittals that you've made, you're open to the idea that any of the conditions, as appropriate, that apply to Phase III from the 1990 or '91 actions by the Land Use Commission would be applied to the 15 acres. One of those condition was the condition about having a one for one connection of a non-tourism related job for hotel units, and you're talking about having 180, I believe, hotel units in this.

Can you say very briefly how you're planning to keep to that potential condition, since that condition seems to be one that would be applicable to the 15-acre change?

THE WITNESS: I think we have been as transparent as possible.

And so in discussions with the county, the county could impose that condition on us, and which is why we would serve notice on Office of Planning concurrent with filing anything with the county.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR SCHEUER:} \mbox{So if I can rephrase}$ $\mbox{my question.}$

Assuming the parties and the Commission and the county all agree that that's one of the

applicable conditions, do you feel that design of the 1 2 Makalapua Project District is going to be able to 3 satisfy that condition? THE WITNESS: Absolutely. 4 5 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Because of the other 6 commercial development that's being proposed? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. 8 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I'll stop for now. 9 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Commissioner Hiranaga. 10 COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Good afternoon, Ms. 11 Crabbe. 12 So listening to your testimony, and I did 13 read the material, it was unclear to me. You said 14 you were unable to come to terms with COSTCO because 15 they wanted a fee simple parcel. 16 And so for clarity, does the QLT offer fee 17 simple improved urbanized lands, or is it all fee sold? 18 19 THE WITNESS: We have done one fee simple 20 transaction, and that was the Target transaction. 21 And we did it basically to solidify our market 22 position with Kona Commons. Target was going to go 23 to another project on this coast, and we needed Kona

So we didn't -- we kind of grudgingly, we

Commons to be regional retail for West Hawaii.

24

did do one fee simple transaction, and that was with Target, with some significant clawback clauses in that purchase and sale agreement.

So we have right-of-first refusal if they ever go dark to take that parcel back. But for the most part, in terms of all of our representations, even in our private letter of rulings of the IRS, our core competency is long-term ground commercial leasing.

commercial leasehold is a big minority as far as how people or commercial entities want to gain ownership and build-out properties because there is definitely a time when the lease reverts back to the owner, be it 50 years, or 100 years, the time still comes along.

And so is that something that's written in the Trust, or is that just a management philosophy?

THE WITNESS: It's -- we have different layers of oversight. So we have the Attorney General. We have the Internal Revenue Service that review our Trust on an annualized basis.

The IRS doesn't like us selling too much land. So what do have to go in for private letter

ruling before we do any of those kinds of transactions.

Without any residential development, the commercial development, without roof tops, it's hard to build more retail because you need people to shop at the store.

We believe the right development partners that we have under the developers that we have, understand that you can be very profitable doing commercial leasehold, because you don't have to invest a lot of cash up-front in purchasing the land.

And so it's just a difference of do you show land on your balance sheet, or do you show just a ground lease payment on your profit and loss statement on an annual basis. So it's kind of how you look at it from a financing standpoint.

So we have found some developers who actually prefer commercial leasehold, those who understand it.

COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: One last question.

You mentioned that you were formerly employed at Kamehameha Schools, and they, I believe, have gone to more aggressive fee simple program versus leasehold.

Were they regulated by the same

2.1

2.4

1 requirements by the IRS? 2 THE WITNESS: They have different 3 carve-outs in the IRS code than we do, because we are a private operating foundation. We're not a school 4 5 or a university or a hospital. So we are 501 c3, but 6 the Kamehameha Schools and even Queen's Hospital, 7 Queen's health systems have different carve-outs in 8 the IRS code than we do. 9 So as an example, they are allowed to have 10 for profit subsidiaries and they are allowed to go 11 vertical, where we are not. 12 So there some nuances in the IRS code 13 between our two organizations. 14 COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Just a quick question related to Vice Chair Scheuer about the conditions. 16 17 I understand there is 25 conditions on the Decision and Order 1991. Are they still in place? 18 MR. KUDO: Yes. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: So are there any of those conditions going to be affected on this Motion? 21 22 MR. KUDO: No.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: They're still going to be in place?

23

24

25

MR. KUDO: Those conditions will still be

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 ---

applicable to Phase I and II. And then Phase III reverts back to agriculture, so don't need the conditions any more.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you. Vice Chair Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Just a couple more questions.

Just in your -- I realize that this is a conceptual plan and we're not approving your MPD, but the community use section of the MPD, can you tell us a little more about what that -- the crossover into Phase III. Can you expand?

THE WITNESS: We are pretty excited about it. Again, from some of our community engagement, we have been encouraged not to, as a living monument to the Queen, instead of a statute, to create a music hall, since the Queen was such a prolific composer. And we really don't have a performing arts center here in Kona. So that's what we are planning there, and some other community meeting space and things of that sort.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you. One last question.

I understand and fully appreciate the relationship between the MPD and the larger land plan

in terms of providing the financial resources.

Are there any other connections, planning concepts or other things that connect these two projects?

THE WITNESS: Roads and trail systems, because, again, no cul-de-sacs, no loops and lolly pops. It's an interconnected grid, for sure.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: So the MPD is being developed in relationship to the fact, knowing that you're going into this larger land plan?

THE WITNESS: Correct. You know, existing Kailua Village, which is why, on the larger land plan, although hesitate in planning other people's land, but we are showing connections into state property in Kealakehe as well.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you. That's it for me.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you, Ms. Crabbe.

MR. KUDO: We have one more witness who is arriving at 9:00 this evening, so will be testifying at 8:30 tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Ms. Self, how long do you think is your presentation?

MS. SELF: Well, we're really going to just rely on our response already filed. We have no other

1 position. 2 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: So you're not going to 3 have any presentation? 4 MS. SELF: No. CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Mr. Yee, how long do 5 you think is your presentation? 6 7 MR. YEE: The Office of Planning similarly is relying -- will not be presenting any witnesses in 8 9 this case unless you for some reason had questions 10 and wanted to ask of Mr. Funakoshi. But otherwise, 11 we will be just simply reserving for final argument. 12 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Parties, Commissioners, 13 do you have anything for this witness tomorrow, 14 burning questions that you guys want to ask him? I'm trying to see if we need the witness in 15 16 place or we can conclude hearing today. 17 Commissioner Estes. 18 COMMISSIONER ESTES: Pardon me, but what you're saying is that we don't need to hear the 19 20 witness tomorrow, is that what I'm hearing? 21 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Yeah, that's correct. 22 COMMISSIONER ESTES: Okay, then I have a 23 couple of questions I want to ask somebody. 24 I have the slides or the testimony for 25 Richard Gollis. You got that? You really don't

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 ---

need -- I just want to know what is NLW?

MR. KUDO: That was the name of the company that did the market study Natelson Lavendar Whitney. The market study feasibility study in the 1989 Docket that resulted in the 1991 approval by this Commission. It was a market study submitted and part of the record.

COMMISSIONER ESTES: Then I assume what we're going to get from the new Concord Group is the prediction that it looks good, we can do all this, so --

MR. KUDO: The Concord Group was asked to, number one, give this Commission an idea of what has happened in the economy from 1990 to date, which included two major recessionary trends, and to show that the Big Island in particular followed the downturn in the economy both in Japan and California, as distinguished from the mainland United States, for two decades.

And then the 2008 global recession occurred and everything went down.

They have been tasked to do a market study on the MPD, but they were not going to testify on that because it's still on-going. They were just simply here to give you a reason as to why the

economy went down, and why the NLW report was 1 2 originally submitted to this Commission didn't 3 anticipate those downturns in the economic situation, 4 and therefore, the market, for various real estate product that we were predicting in land uses didn't 5 6 come to fruition. And as a result --7 COMMISSIONER ESTES: I understand that. 8 That's very clear from this. I only say that we are 9 all optimistic about where things are going, but it's 10 a crap shoot, and with the world the way it is today, 11 anything can change. 12 MR. KUDO: That's correct. I would agree 13 with you. 14 COMMISSIONER ESTES: That's all. Thank 15 you. 16 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Commissioners, you have 17 the slides of Mr. Gollis in front of you. You guys can use that. Commission -- Vice Chair Wong. 18 19 VICE CHAIR WONG: Because he's flying in 20 tomorrow. 21 MR. KUDO: Tonight. 22 VICE CHAIR WONG: I think it would be

VICE CHAIR WONG: I think it would be appropriate -- I would like to hear what he says, I'm going to tell you the truth, because I want to hear

from what he says, and if possible, if no other

23

24

parties have anything else to say, if we can move to the other portions of the agenda. Recess this Motion and move to the discussion actions if possible.

2.1

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: If there is a burning desire by the Commissioners to hear the witness, I'm to bring him in tomorrow. Therefore, I'm going to recess right now and take everything --

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I'm not sure I have a burning desire, Chair, but I would like to, in the interest of respecting the Movant and Petitioner's efforts to have a witness here, and dealing with unforeseen circumstances, and since we're going to be here anyway, I would like to have that chance to have them -- and I also would be interested in whether it's the staff or the Movant looks into it, I would just like that assurance on responses to my question about whether there were any conditions that still remain on the 50 acres from this body, the 50 acres of the 65 acres. I think that would give us a chance to have an answer to that.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: So since -- let me call a five-minute recess.

(Recess was taken.)

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Back on record.

The Commissioners are willing to continue

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 ---

the hearing on item V and VI for tomorrow, and go to item VII and VIII on the agenda.

Any objection to that? Can I have a Motion?

commissioner Hiranaga: Mr. Chair,
question -- from an overall question. I've not been
involved in a full-blown district boundary amendment,
but I understand that financial economic projections
is part of the justification for redesignating ag
land to urban, but from other applicants ten-year
absorption, 15, 20 year absorption, no one really
knows what is going to happen three months from now,
because if they did, they'd be doing something else.

But is that something that is an integral part of a decision to revert back to ag? Why is it so important to have these financial projections as part of presentation, is my question. That use of evidence in the future, if an applicant fails to fulfill what has been represented to the LUC in order to get a boundary amendment, is that used as evidence for a possible reversion?

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: I guess we wouldn't know. Mr. Orodenker, do you want to -- I'm just offering having options to get this thing so we can use our time properly. Mr. Kudo.

MR. KUDO: I believe that the reason for that financial information, and again, this is not a boundary amendment petition, but a Motion that arises out of a previous Land Use Commission decision.

The reason that we put on the evidence for the record is so that this Commission has evidentiary basis upon which to support its decision that are put into what are called Findings of Fact. Because you all are finders of fact.

So when we put on evidence, you take evidence from -- facts from the evidence that we present that are relevant to your decision, the decision before you, and those are incorporated into your Decision and Order as a finding of fact.

So if we put on an economists, and it's relevant to your decision to grant this Motion, you would find certain Findings of Fact from the evidence that we have submitted to you that support your decision to either approve the Motion or deny it.

And in this case, the reason that we have the financial person testifying is because we wanted to provide this Commission with the evidence to support an approval of this Motion in your Decision and Order.

Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Yes, it does, helpful.

So looking at the PowerPoint slide, it appears that this is primarily all historical in nature, and not projecting justification for the change for the MPD.

Is that going to be presented, future projections or the justification for the 15 acres to be taken out of Phase III and added to the --

MR. KUDO: The reason that -- the 15 acres is being -- we're asking you to take the Incremental District Order off of the 15 acres is because incremental districting is like a pre-approval of this Commission of urbanization. And the pre-approval says if you come back and show that you finished Phase I and II, or satisfied whatever the conditions that the Commission has imposed, we will consider urbanizing Phase III.

Well, the reason that we're putting on the economist is to tell you why we did not substantially complete Phase I and Phase II, but nevertheless we are requesting, in light of the bad economic times, which we are submitting to you as the reason for that, asking you to lift the Incremental Districting Order on the Phase III lands, in essence to proceed

forward through the county on the 15 acre portion of it.

And then we will later come back with a major new petition for the mauka and makai events, Phase I, II, and III, with a new master plan that addresses the market that we see right now.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Go ahead, Mr. Yee.

MR. YEE: Just to hopefully briefly comment.

Generally the Office of Planning doesn't like to go back to old decisions and change them. Everyone had their chance to make their arguments, you win, you lose, you get whatever it is, Decision and Order is issued. Everyone has to comply with that Decision and Order.

Sometimes that's not always true.

Sometimes conditions have changed. Sometimes

something that you required or didn't require. The

market conditions change, et cetera. So they're

coming back to you, and said you issued a decision in

1991, change that decision.

And while we normally don't like to, in this case, I think, from our respective, they're demonstrating why that condition should change, why the incremental districting of Phase III should be

taken out instead of kept in agriculture.

And the reason for that, I believe, there case not ours, but I think the argument is because we thought Phase I and II were going to be developed quickly, because we thought market conditions were going to be great.

As it turns out, conditions were not great. So we haven't been able to develop Phase I and II.

And furthermore we're going to get a new plan. It's taken so long for us to get here, that the plan we had in 1989 just doesn't make any sense today.

So I think -- and so I think what this witness does is provides the evidentiary basis by which you can look back at the 1991 decision and say, yeah, that was the decision, but, yes, in light of these -- of what has happened, which was not their fault, it was the result of market conditions and prediction, or the erroneous predictions, and therefore, we should just withdraw this increment of Phase III of the project.

Now, the bottom line of this, of think from our perspective is, each one of the parties have no objection to the Motion. If we all knew you were going to grant the Motion, probably we wouldn't have such a concern.

But since we don't know what anyone is going to decide, you know, the Petitioner wants to put on a witness. They had a perfectly good reason why the witness wasn't available today.

2.1

And so in light of the uncertainty from our perspective what the result is, I frankly think it would be fair to let -- and the man is on the plane -- so given the fact that they're flying him out here, I think it would be fair to allow them the opportunity to present their witness?

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Fair enough.

COMMISSIONER ESTES: Yes, I have no problem with listening to the witness tomorrow, but I believed you when you told me all this. You didn't have to bring in an economist to do it.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: That's what I thought.

Maybe the PowerPoint presentation was good enough.

But to kind of use the time properly, the Chair is proposing to rearrange the agenda today to continue the discussion on agenda V and VI, and go to agenda VII and VIII.

COMMISSIONER ESTES: So moved.

VICE CHAIR WONG: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Moved by Commissioner Estes and seconded by Vice Chair Wong to arrange the

1	agenda to go to agenda VII and agenda VIII and
2	continue discussion on V and VI tomorrow at 8:30.
3	Discussion? Hearing none, those in favor
4	say "aye", opposed. Motion carried.
5	Commissioners, we're on agenda
6	five-minute recess.
7	(Recess taken.)
8	(Necess caren.)
9	-000-
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 AGENDA VII - 2016 LEGISLATION STATUS REPORT

2 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Back on record.

Commissioners, we're on agenda VII, legislative status report. Mr. Orodenker.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Most of the legislation that we were tracking has died. There are only two bills remaining that are of concern to us. One of them is -- I can't remember the number right now. House Bill -- I'll remember.

Anyway, it's the one -- it's a bill that would allow -- it's not just directed at us, it's for any contested case hearing to go directly to the Supreme Court on appeal rather than having to go to the circuit court, and intermediate court of appeals.

We were just watching that one. I don't think we have an issue with it.

The bill that's of most concern, House bill 2617, which it was passed by the house originally, having two provisions in it. One was a provision that would have the county submit their general plans to us for district boundary amendment changes, to change the district boundaries in conjunction with the general plans.

And the second provision which would have

returned the five-year boundary reviews to the Land Use Commission from OP.

2.1

after crossover, and essentially what happened was they removed the provision with regard to changing the five-year boundary review to Land Use Commission. They left in the provision that would change -- require the county to submit their general plans to us, and then they reinserted -- or inserted, for intents and purposes, the administration bill expanding our powers.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: That was house bill -- EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: 2617.

All the other bills that were related to our powers died. They died on the house side, and then one Senate Bill 2355 that came over from the senate to the house was not -- had a triple referral and was not heard by the deadline, so that bill is dead as well.

COMMISSIONER ESTES: Who is sponsoring House Bill 2617?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: The original bill was sponsored by Ryan Yamane, Yamashita and Sylvia Luke.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Vice chair Wong.

VICE CHAIR WONG: Mr. Chair, I wanted to

McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 —

move into executive session to consult with the 1 2 Commission's attorney on questions and issues 3 pertaining to the Commission's powers, duties, 4 privileges, immunities and liabilities with respect 5 to appeals of Commission's decisions, including but 6 not limited to any other matter. 7 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Is there a second to go into executive session? 8 9 COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I will second. 10 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Moved by Vice Chair 11 Wong and seconded by Commissioner Hiranaga. 12 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I was trying to follow 13 that last phrase that you added on "any other 14 matter". I prefer to be much more specific about why 15 we are going into executive session. 16 17 VICE CHAIR WONG: It's regarding, you know, 18 Bridge 'Aina Le'a, Castle & Cooke, and legislative 19 issues also. VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: So to be a difficult 20 21 Commissioner, we're actually so far only on agenda 22 item VII? 23 VICE CHAIR WONG: And also the legislative 24 issues. It's part of VII and it's going to be

25

rolling into VIII.

1	COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Well, just move
2	onto VIII>
3	VICE CHAIR WONG: There is some issues on
4	legislative sessions.
5	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Some legislative
6	issues.
7	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Are we finished with
8	the public portion of the legislative report then?
9	Okay, thank you and forgive me,
10	Commissioners.
11	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Discussion? Hearing
12	none, all those in favor say "aye", opposed?
13	Motion carried.
14	COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: I didn't do the
15	second, Chad was second.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE STATE OF HAWAII)
2) SS. COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
3	,
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on March 23, 2016, at 1:30 p.m., the
6	proceedings contained herein was taken down by me in
7	machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
8	typewriting under my supervision; that the foregoing
9	represents, to the best of my ability, a true and
10	correct copy of the proceedings had in the foregoing
11	matter.
12	I further certify that I am not of counsel for
13	any of the parties hereto, nor in any way interested
14	in the outcome of the cause named in this caption.
15	Dated this 23rd day of March, 2016, in
16	Honolulu, Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148