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

		3
1	INDEX	
2		
3	PUBLIC WITNESS: PAGE	
4	JOSHUA BEAM 10	
5	BRUCE U'U 12	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148	

1 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Good morning. 2 This is the April 20th, 2016 Land Use 3 Commission Meeting. The first order of business is adoption of 4 the March 23-24, 2016 minutes. Are there any 5 6 corrections or comments on that? If not, is there a 7 motion to adopt the minutes? VICE CHAIR WONG: So moved. 8 9 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Seconded 10 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Motion has been made by Commissioner Wong and seconded by VICE CHAIR SCHEUER 11 to adopt the minutes. 12 13 All in favor say "aye". Any opposed? 14 The minutes are adopted unanimously 15 The next agenda item is the tentative 16 meeting schedule. Mr. Orodenker. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Due to a number of 17 18 withdrawals, the only thing on the agenda right now is May 18th or 19th, which will be the Waimanalo 19 Gulch on Oahu. 20 2.1 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Mr. Chair, has there 22 been any further confirmation on the presence of some 23 of the intervenors on that matter in our next 24 meeting? 25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: We notified everybody.

We don't have confirmation yet of whether or not --1 2 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Anybody else? Thank 4 you. 5 The Chair would like to note that the May 6 meeting regarding the status report for SP09-403 will 7 be in a remote facility at the Honolulu Airport and would like to ensure that meals will be provided to 8 9 the Commission and required staff as an integral part 10 of the meeting. 11 Mr. Orodenker, can you make certain this is 12 attended to? 13 MR. ORDENKER: Yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: The next agenda is an action meeting on Docket No. A89-646, Queen 15 16 Lili'uokalani Trust (Hawai'i)'s Motion for Order 17 Modifying Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, 18 Decision and Order filed August 28, 1991 to adopt the 19 form of the order. 20 Will the parties please identify themselves 21 for the record? 22 MS. APUNA: Good morning. Deputy Attorney 23

MS. APUNA: Good morning. Deputy Attorney Genera, Dawn Takeushi Apuna, here for the Office of Planning. Here with me today is Lorene Maki and Bryan Yee.

24

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Let me update the record.

On March 23-24, 2016, the Petitioner presented testimony and argument in support of its Motion at the West Hawaii Civic Center in Kailua -- Kona, Hawaii. After testimony and argument by the Parties, the Commission voted to grant Petitioner's Motion.

On April 13, 2016, the Commission mailed the April 20th agenda notice to the Parties and to the Statewide, Oahu, Maui and Hawai'i mailing list.

On April 18th, 2016, the Commission received notice from the County of Hawaii Planning Department that it had no objection to the adoption of order regarding QLT which will be heard at the April 20th meeting and would not be present at said meeting.

Are there any individuals desiring to provide public testimony on this docket?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: We don't have anyone signed up, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Mr. Kudo, do you have any comments at this time?

MR. MATSUBARA: No comments. I'm just here to answer any questions, if there are.

1	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Commissioners, before
2	you is the form of the Order granting the Motion for
3	Order Modifying Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law,
4	Decision and Order filed August 28th, 1991 in Docket
5	A89-646. The Chair will entertain a Motion to
6	approve the form of the Order in this matter.
7	Commissioners, what is your pleasure?
8	COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Would I like to make
9	a Motion in favor of this action.
10	COMMISSIONER WONG: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: The Motion has been
12	made by Commissioner Cabral and seconded by
13	Commissioner Wong. Any discussion?
14	If there is no further discussion, Mr.
15	Orodenker, please poll the Commission.
16	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17	The Motion is to adopt the order.
18	Commissioner Cabral?
19	COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Yea.
20	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Wong?
21	VICE CHAIR WONG: Aye.
22	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Hiranaga?
23	COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Aye.
24	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Mahi?
25	COMMISSIONER MAHI: Aye.

——McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 —

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Scheuer? 1 2 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aye. 3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Chair Aczon? 4 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Aye. 5 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Mr. Chair, the Motion 6 carries unanimously. 7 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: We will take a 8 five-minute recess to set up for the next agenda 9 item. (Recess taken.) 10 11 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: We're back on record. Agenda item V, VI and VIII pertain to 12 13 DR15-54 Pu'unoa Homeowners Association and DeVonne 14 Lane Petition for Declaratory Order that the proposed 15 construction of a homeless encampment and commercial 16 campground on 7.9 acres of a 22.7 acre parcel located 17 at Hokiokio Place and Lahaina Bypass Road at Maui Tax 18 Map Key No. (2) 4-7-003, portion of lot 31, Lahaina, 19 Maui, Hawai'i, in the State Land Use Agricultural 20 District requires a district boundary amendment. 2.1 Let me remind the audience that this is not 22 a contested hearing. 23 Will the Petitioner please identify itself 24 for the record? 25 MS. WRIGHT: Good morning. My name is

Deborah Wright. I'm here representing the Pu'unoa 1 2 Homeowner's Association. With me is the other 3 Petitioner, DeVonne Lane. MR. HOPPER: Good morning, Mr. Chair, 4 5 members of the Commission, Michael Hopper, Deputy 6 Corporation Counsel representing the Maui County 7 Department of Planning. With me is Planning Director, William Spence and staff planner, Kurt 8 9 Wollenhaupt. 10 MS. APUNA: Good morning, Deputy Attorney General Dawn Takeuchi Apuna on behalf of Office of 11 Planning. Here with me is Lorene Maki, planner, and 12 13 Deputy Attorney General, Bryan Yee. CHAIRPERSON ACZON: I will call for all 14 15 those members of the general public desiring to 16 provide public testimony on DR15-54 agenda items V, 17 VI and VIII to identify themselves. All such individuals will be called in turn to our witness box 18 where they will be sworn in prior to their testimony. 19 20 Are there any individuals desiring to 21 provide public testimony? 22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: We don't have 23 anybody --

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Please have a seat.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony

24

that you're about to give is the truth? 1 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 3 JOSHUA BEAM 4 Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Please state your name and address for the record and please proceed. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Joshua Beam, and I live at 10 1725 Hanohano Street in Lahaina. 11 So I am -- my understanding of what is 12 going on today is that we're trying to decide whether 13 or not the LUC should be hearing the merits of the 14 case and decide on the permit for the campground. 15 I don't think it should -- I support the 16 project. I'm a member on the board of the homeowner 17 campground. And the fact is that this is a Maui 18 issue. There's precedent that it should be allowed 19 in the special use permit process and should be 20 decided by Maui people. 2.1 I was born and raised in Lahaina. And I 22 support the project. I think it's a great thing and 23 a positive way to help people when in need.

-McManus Court reporters 808-239-6148 ---

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any questions, Ms.

That's all I got to say.

24

1 Wright? 2 MS. WRIGHT: No. 3 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: OP? Commissioners? VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you for coming 4 5 to testify. 6 Do you understand that when we take action 7 on these projects, we don't take actions about whether -- the merit of whether it's good to help 8 9 homeless individuals or anything else? That we're 10 required to look at the law and rules and cases involved? 11 12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, but I have to plug that 13 in. The first part of my testimony was that I don't 14 think you guys should be hearing the merits of --15 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: And I heard that. I 16 just want to make sure that, you know, our actions 17 are never for or against homeless people no matter 18 how we decide today. THE WITNESS: My fear is that the 19 20 Petitioners, their motivations are different. 2.1 They'll make the process more complicated and so it's 22 the end justifies the means kind of thing. 23 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you for your 24 testimony.

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

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Anybody else?

Please

1 have a seat.

2 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: May I swear you in?

3 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony

4 | that you're about to give is the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BRUCE U'U

Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Please state your name and address for the record and proceed.

THE WITNESS: Bruce Wu. My address is 249 Kupua Street, Paia, Maui.

Good morning everyone. I wasn't going to testify, I was just to hang out there and listen.

And I haven't been following the process. I know I testified at council awhile back, I can't put a date on it.

And I see there before the body, as the same as Joshua, in thinking that the process is different, this process, where it comes before this body.

I also do believe that the Planning

Commission is more than capable, in fact set up to

handle this type of cases, the Special Use Permit.

And I would know that, because -- well, I was part of the Planning Commission for five years.

I was vice chair for Planning Commission for five years. So we had a bunch of Special Use Permits that came to our way, and we handled it like any other case.

I've never seen, I've never heard of the process being done this way, because of some type of petition signed to have it go to an avenue different than anyone else prior to filing for a Special Use Permit.

So I've never heard it, and I was lost coming in here, trying to understand or wrap my brain around how can a petition reroute the process that's beyond going for -- I guess you going to have to ask the Planning Director, four years, regardless like Vice Chair said, Jonathan -- can't pronoun your last name, sorry, kala mai.

It just sets precedent for the next person coming in here and getting petitions. If that's the case, we can go get them too, but there is a respected process in place. It's been respected for years, and I like you guys to respect the process also.

That's all I have to say. By the way,

thank you guys for coming and thank you for giving me 1 2 the opportunity to give my two cents. 3 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any questions for the testifier? Ms. Wright? 4 5 MS. WRIGHT: Yes, I have one question. 6 Are you under the impression that the 7 reason we are here before the Land Use Commission is 8 because of a petition that was signed by a group of 9 people, by many people? THE WITNESS: The only reason I'm here --10 11 haven't been following that. If this never been done 12 before. Like I've been on the Planning Commission 13 for five years, and we dealt with a lot of Special 14 Use Permit cases that never went to Land Use. And I 15 just -- this is something new, that's why I'm here. 16 I don't know about the petition. That's what I heard someone said earlier. Just the process 17 18 is different from what's been happening for the last 19 20 years to my knowledge, that's all. MS. WRIGHT: Thank you. No other 20 21 questions. 22 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: County? OP? 23 Commissioners? Thank you Mr. U'u. 24 Anybody else? No one else. 25 General public portion of the proceedings

1 on number DR15-54 is now completed.

Ms. Wright, I understand you have submitted a Position Statement and a Supplement to Position Statement which, among other things, indicate that the Commission lacks jurisdiction over this matter.

MS. WRIGHT: I apologize. Some people were talking. I'm having trouble hearing.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: I understand you have submitted a Position Statement and a Supplement to Position Statement which, among other things, indicate that the Commission lacks jurisdiction over this matter.

Do you want to make oral argument on this issue?

MS. WRIGHT: Yes, I would like to make oral argument on all the positions that we stayed.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Please proceed.

MS. WRIGHT: First of all, with regard to the jurisdictional aspect, there are a couple different portions to our argument on the jurisdictional matter.

This order, this Declaratory Order that was entered by the Land Use Commission on March 3rd.

There are a couple different bases. First of all, the Declaratory Order entered on March 3rd,

20016 by the Land Use Commission was appealed on March 29 to the circuit court. When that appeal was filed, the jurisdiction over that Order goes to the appellate court, in this case the circuit court.

That is the court that has the right to make decisions, and with regard to the Order. And in fact, there is a process by which, under Rule 91-14, where if the court says it needs more information, or if the court wants to have some evidence taken on the issue, it can refer it back to the agency, if someone request it under the proper procedures.

So there is a way for the court to send it back to the agency to ask for additional information, and that hasn't happened.

So right now I don't believe, just based on the appellate process, that the Land Use Commission has jurisdiction to make a determination with regard to the Declaratory Order, either to act on it in any way, reconsider it, resend it, do anything to it just because of that.

Additionally, under your Hawaii

Administrative Rules there a couple of different rules, one of which is if you're going to reconsider an Order under 15-15-84, that the reconsideration has to be set and occur within seven days of the order.

Now, I know that you haven't used the word "reconsider" on the agenda per se, but saying that you want to make a determination on whether or not to rescind an Order is reconsidering the Order.

Whether or not then after that you're going to consider the petition again is reconsidering the petition. So you're outside the time limits to do that under your own rules.

Additionally, under 15-15-100, it says that the LUC must take action within 90 days on the Petition. And it gives a variety of things that you have the power to do, which is to deny the Petition, to grant the Petition and enter a Declaratory Order, or to set a Petition for Evidentiary Hearing.

And if you set it for Evidentiary Hearing there are different time limits that may kick in in that circumstance if you're going in a different process.

But if you're going to take action, you have to do it within 90 days. And in this case, you did. You took action within 90 days and you entered a Declaratory Order. But that 90 days has now lapsed. And as a result, I don't believe that you can then take action on the Petition itself outside the time limits that are in your own administrative

1 rules.

And we went through the rules. We went through also the statute on the appeal. And from everything that we could see on this, it was very clear that right now the jurisdiction is with the appellate court. And besides that, you're outside your time limits to take action, whether you call it a recision or a reconsideration, which is really what it is.

So we do object to the Land Use Commission taking action on the Petition at this time period for a couple different jurisdictional reasons.

Did you want me to go into the underline or even --

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Just jurisdiction.

MS. WRIGHT: That's all on jurisdiction right now.

I'm willing to answer any questions anyone asks.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Mr. Hopper, does the county wish to make an argument?

MR. HOPPER: Perhaps briefly, but you can ask your Attorney General for advise on this matter.

We basically understood that this was an argument being raised. We found that out yesterday

essentially, so we don't have a whole lot to offer other than that the county doesn't believe that the declaratory ruling was in error, as you probably would have guessed from the county's filing, and believes that the court will most likely remand the case based on some clear Supreme Court law dealing with the issue that the declaratory ruling dealt with.

So it wouldn't see a reason why the Commission couldn't modify its declaratory order or rescind its declaratory order if it believed it was an error and would not see a reason why it would have to wait for the circuit court to do that if it found that it had made a clear error and wanted to correct that error and believes the court would most likely prefer that. But we can't speak for the court, obviously.

We have no case law that would deal with the Land Use Commission lacks the ability to rescind an order that it believes was in error for a variety of reasons. And does believe that that's the appropriate course of action in this case

Presumably, in scheduling the matter, it was determined the Commission can take that action and, again, the county apologizes, it does not have a

full rundown of the case law on this issue. It was made aware of it yesterday, but does believe that the Commission can rescind the order if it so chooses in this case.

In general, case law deals with the fact that, or states that commissions have the inherent authority to modify or otherwise deal with orders that it creates essentially that's giving the Commission the inherent authority to modify its own orders or rescind its orders after they're made if it believes they are error and doesn't think an error like this should be perpetuated and have to go through circuit court process because of a jurisdictional argument.

That's the county's position at this time.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Ms. Apuna.

MS. APUNA: So Office of Planning, we would support the Commission's revisiting the Declaratory Order if there seems to be an error. However, if the Commission feels concerned about the issue of jurisdiction, the Commission could go to the circuit court and ask that the case be remanded so that we could again do the Declaratory Order.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you.

MS. WRIGHT: May I address some of the

statements that were made?

2 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Go ahead.

MS. WRIGHT: Thank you.

I'm just addressing briefly the general tenor of what Mr. Hopper said, and that is where he said, well, you know you should have some sort of inherent authority to take a look at your own orders.

The general rule of law, and your counsel can advise you on this, is that either you have jurisdiction or you don't. It's not a matter of whether you desire to take another look or want to do certain action. There are times where that happens, I'm sure, with judges in their courts, with other situations.

The rule of law is that if you don't have jurisdiction, you just don't have it. It's not anything that's negative towards the Land Use Commission. It's simply a matter that, well, do you have jurisdiction to take action or do you not? And in this instance, I don't think you do so.

And I'm sorry, I don't know her name, but the other attorney general who spoke, she referenced the fact, which is kind of what I was saying, that if you want to take additional action, there is away to apply to the court and to ask the court to remand it

Wе

to you so that you could take additional action. 1 2 That's what I was talking about earlier, 3 that there are certain ways where the court can grant 4 you jurisdiction to take other action, but that 5 hasn't happened. So the jurisdiction remains with 6 the court. 7 That's all. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Thank you. Take that 8 9 into consideration 10 The Chair would like to entertain a motion for an Executive Session to consult with the 11 12 Commission's attorney regarding the Commission's 13 duties, rights, responsibilities and obligations with 14 respect to the Commissioner's duties, rights, and 15 responsibilities and obligations with respect to the 16 Commission's duties, rights and responsibilities 17 concerning DR15-54. 18 May I have a motion to enter into executive 19 session? 20 COMMISSIONER MAHI: I move. 21 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any second? 22 VICE CHAIR WONG: Second. 23 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Moved and seconded. 24 Any discussion?

25

All those in favor say "aye". Opposed?

will now go into executive session. 1 2 (Executive session.) 3 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: We're back on the 4 record. Commissioners, you've heard the parties' 5 6 argument. Is there any discussion? 7 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I would like to make a motion. 8 9 I heard the arguments, and having conferred 10 with our counsel in executive session, I would like to move that we find that the Land Use Commission, 11 because of the case that has been filed in the Second 12 13 Circuit Court, we do not have jurisdiction to take up 14 the agenda, to have further discussion or take up 15 actions under agenda items V, VI and VIII. 16 CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Is there a second? 17 VICE CHAIR WONG: Second. CHAIRPERSON ACZON: A motion has been made 18 19 by Vice Chair Scheuer and seconded by Vice Chair 20 Wong. Any discussion? No discussion? Hearing no discussion, Mr. 2.1 22 Orodenker. 23 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 24 The motion is to dismiss agenda items V, VI 25 and VIII based on lack of jurisdiction.

1	Vice Chair Scheuer?
2	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aye.
3	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Wong?
4	VICE CHAIR WONG: Aye.
5	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Mahi?
6	COMMISSIONER MAHI: Aye.
7	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Cabral?
8	COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Aye.
9	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Commissioner Hiranaga?
10	COMMISSIONER HIRANAGA: Aye.
11	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Chair Aczon?
12	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Aye.
13	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Thank you. Mr. Chair,
14	motion passes unanimously.
15	CHAIRPERSON ACZON: That takes care of
16	agenda V, VI and VIII.
17	Agenda item VII is executive session to
18	consult with the Commission's attorney regarding the
19	Commission's duties, rights, responsibilities and
20	obligations with respect to pending litigation,
21	including Ho'omoana Foundation v. Land Use
22	Commission, et al., Civil No. 16-1-0160(3) and
23	Hearings Officer appointment for A89-649 Lana'i
24	Resort Partners-Manele.
25	Is there a motion to go into executive

```
session?
1
2
               VICE CHAIR WONG: So move.
3
                COMMISSIONER MAHI: Second.
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Discussion?
 4
                                                 Those in
      favor say "aye", opposed? Motion carries.
5
 6
                (Executive session.)
7
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Back on record.
8
                We have concluded or executive session.
9
                Commissioner Cabral, I believe we have a
10
     motion.
11
                COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Yes, thank you,
12
     Chair.
13
                I would like to make a motion that we would
14
     ask LUC staff and Diane from the AG office to
15
     investigate and come back to us with procedurals or
16
     recommendations on appointing a hearing officer for
17
     A89-649 Lana'i Resort Partners Manele.
18
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Is there a second?
19
                COMMISSIONER MAHI: Seconded.
20
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Moved by Commissioner
21
     Cabral and seconded by Commissioner Mahi.
22
                Any discussion? Hearing none, those in
     favor say "aye". Opposed? Motion carries.
23
24
                Agenda item IX, legislation status report.
25
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: There isn't much to
```

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

report on since the last meeting. House Bill 2617 has been set for conference committee to expand our powers. There's been some discussion on whether or not there would be any modifications to that bill.

A conference committee on the house side has been set. It is Representative Yamane,
Representative Yamashita, and Representative Becky
Pa.

The conference committee on the senate side is not -- we believe Senator Gabbard is waiting to see how that comes out.

CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any questions?

COMMISSIONER CABRAL: I think there was a senate hearing earlier this week you may want to report on.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I second Commissioner Cabral.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Excuse me for that.

Vice Chair Scheuer and Commissioner Cabral were reappointed -- not reappointed. It was a hearing in front of senate board of land committee where their confirmation hearing where it was determined that their names would be sent out to the four for confirmation, two other names were also sent down Commissioners, Dawn Chang, who used to be Deputy

```
Attorney General, her name was also submitted as at
1
2
      large, and Gary Okuda, an attorney, his name was sent
3
     down as well another at large position.
4
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: So it's going to the
5
      full senate?
6
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Yes.
7
                CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Congratulations.
8
               COMMISSIONER CABRAL: Thank you.
9
               CHAIRPERSON ACZON: Any other business?
10
               No other business, this meeting is
11
     adjourned.
12
                (The proceedings adjourned at 11:07 a.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

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

1 CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF HAWAII) SS. 3 COUNTY OF HONOLULU 4 I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify: 5 That on April 20, 2016, at 9:35 a.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 20th day of April, 2016, in 16 Honolulu, Hawaii. 17 18 19 JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156 20 21 22 23 24 25

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148 —