1		LAND USE COMMISSION
2		STATE OF HAWAI'I
3		Proceedings held on 12-6-17
4		Commencing at 9:30 a.m.
5		Maui Arts & Cultural Center
6		Alexa Higashi Meeting Room
7		One Cameron Way
8		Kahului, Maui, Hawai'i 96732-1137
9		
10	I.	Call to Order
11	II.	Adoption of Minutes
12	III.	Tentative Meeting Schedule
13	IV.	Adoption of Order
14		SP17-409 Hono'uli'uli Wastewater Treatment Plant - Secondary Treatment and Support
15		Facility - State Special Use Permit No. 2017/SUP-2
16	٧.	HEARING AND ACTION
17	Tond	A15-798 Waikapu Properties LLC, et al.(Maui) To consider Petition to Amend the Agricultural
18	Distr	Use District Boundaries into the Rural Land Use ict for certain lands situated at Waikapu,
19	of Hav	ict of Wailuku, Island and County of Maui, State wai'i, consisting of 92.394 acres and 57.454
20	Distr	, and to Amend the Agricultural Land Use ict Boundaries into the Urban Land Use District
21	Wailul	ertain lands situated at Waikapu, District of ku, Island and County of Maui, State of Hawai'i,
22	acres	sting of 236.326 acres, 53.775 acres, and 45.054
23		
24	BEFORI	E: Jean Marie McManus, CSR #156
25		

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

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

		3
1	INDEX	
2	PUBLIC WITNESSES:	PAGE
3	Albert Perez	17
4	Robert H. Pahia Mike Foley	20
5	Kent Hiranaga Richard Mayer	3 0 3 2
6	Mike Takahara Stan Franco	3 7 3 9
7	Mercer Vicens	41
8	PETITIONER WITNESSES:	
9	Michael Atherton Direct Examination	47
10	Cross-Examination/County Cross-Examination/OP	53 55
11	Redirect Examination	67
12	William Mitchell Direct Examination	68
13	Netai Basu	o o
14	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	7 4 8 9
15	Mike Summers	
16	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	93 105
17	Cross-Examination/OP	109
18	Lisa Rotunno-Hazuka Direct Examination	119
19	Cross-Examination/OP	124
20	Hokuao Pellegrino Direct Examination	127
21	Cross-Examination/OP Recross-Examination/OP	141
22		T O O
23	Thomas Holliday Direct Examination	165
24	Stacy Otomo	177
25	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/County	177 181

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

			4
1	INDEX CONTINUED		
2	Steve Parabicoli	4.0.5	
2	Direct Examination	185	
3	Cross-Examination/County Cross-Examination/OP	195	
4	Cross-Examination/OP	196	
	Robert Hobby		
5	Direct Examination	201	
	Cross-Examination/OP	204	
	OFFICE OF PLANNING WITNESS:		
	Leo Asuncion	199	
	EXHIBITS RECEIVED INTO THE RECORD		
	Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 35	45	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 36	57	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 37	72	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 38	91	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 39	104	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 40	124	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 41	141	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 42 Petitioner's Exhibit 43	172 181	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 47	195	
	Petitioner's Exhibit 44	204	
		201	
	County of Maui Exhibits 1 through 4	4 6	
	Office of Planning Exhibits 1 through 11	4 6	
	Office of Flamming Exhibits i through if	40	

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

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Good morning. This is 1 2 December 6th, 2017 Land Use Commission meeting. 3 First order of business is adoption of the 4 November 21, 2017 minutes. Any corrections or comments on this? If not, is there a motion? 5 6 COMMISSIONER MAHI: I'll move. 7 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Second. CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Mahi moved 8 9 to adopt the minutes; Commissioner Scheuer seconded 10 the minutes. All those in favor, please say "aye", any 11 12 opposed? None. The minutes are adopted unanimously. 13 The next agenda item is the tentative 14 meeting schedule. Mr. Orodenker. 15 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Tomorrow we will be 16 here for continued hearing on the matters before us 17 today, if necessary. 18 January 24, we will be on the Big Island 19 for National Park Service Lanihau and HHFD status 20 reports. Also status report on Waikoloa Heights, 21 that is January 24th. 22 February 21st, continued proceedings, if 23 needed on this matter, and AO4-751 Pulelehua, Maui 24 Land & Pine motion to amend will be here on Maui. 25 February 28th, we will again be -- well, we

might be having a video conference to adopt the Order 1 2 of the Pulelehua motion. 3 And that opens up the calendar for the rest 4 of the year, although I would caution the 5 Commissioners we do have a lot of things fermenting. 6 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, Mr. 7 Orodenker. Commissioners, any questions about the 8 9 agenda? Thank you. 10 This is an Action meeting on Docket SP17-409, Hono'uli'uli Wastewater Treatment Plant 11 12 -Secondary Treatment and Support Facility-State 13 Special Use Permit No. 2017/SUP-2. 14 Let me update the record. 15 On November 21st, 2017, the Commission unanimously voted 6-0, 3 excused, to approve the 16 17 Petition for Special Permit. On November 28th, 2017, the Commission 18 19 mailed a Notice of Agenda for the December 6-7, 2017 20 LUC meeting to the Petitioner and Statewide, Maui, 21 and Oahu mailing lists. 22 Will the parties please identify themselves 23 for the record? 24 No one? Okay. 25 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chairman, I

wasn't present at the meeting but I reviewed the 1 2 transcripts, and the necessary documents that were 3 presented, and I believe I'm able to vote on this 4 matter. 5 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, Commissioner. 6 Commissioner Aczon. 7 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Mr. Chair, I also reviewed the record and November 21st transcript, and 8 I'm ready to vote on this document. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, Commissioner. 11 Commissioner Okuda, did you also review the 12 record? 13 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Mr. Chair, I was also 14 present at the hearing, but I reviewed the record and 15 I can deliberate and vote on this matter. 16 CHAIRPERSON WONG: For the public, this is 17 on Hono'uli'uli Wastewater on Oahu. 18 Is there anyone in the public that want to 19 testify about this matter? Okay, if not, thank you. 20 Commissioners, before you is the Form of 21 the Order granting Special Permit in Docket No. 22 SP17-409. Chair will entertain a motion to approve the Form of the Order. Commissioner Okuda. 23

As the person who made the original motion, I move

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Mr. Chair, thank you.

24

25

that the Form of the Order, which has been made part

of the record, be adopted.

And, again, I would like to state for the record that my motion previous and this motion is based on the specific facts and the specific circumstances of this specific Petition, and that's the basis for the motion. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Is there a second? Commissioner Mahi.

COMMISSIONER MAHI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Is there any discussion on this matter? Commissioner Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Mr. Chair, I'll just repeat for the record, even though there's nobody from the City and County here today, the general frustration we have with the manner in which this permit came to us.

And I do so partly that Wil Spence knows it's not only the County of Maui that we pick on.

MR. SPENCE: Fair enough.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you.

Is there any other discussion? If not, Mr. Orodenker, please poll the Commissioners.

 $\label{eq:executive officer: Thank you, Mr. Chair. } \\ \text{The motion is to Adopt the Order.}$

1	Commissioner Okuda?
2	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
3	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Mahi?
4	COMMISSIONER MAHI: Aye.
5	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
6	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Aye.
7	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral is
8	absent.
9	Commissioner Ohigashi?
10	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Aye.
11	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Wong?
12	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Aye.
13	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Scheuer?
14	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aye.
15	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Sorry, jumping around
16	there. The motion passes unanimously, six votes.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON WONG: I'm going to pass on my
19	coffee, so better for the next docket.
20	The next agenda item Docket A15-798 Waikapu
21	Properties. This hearing and action meeting on
22	Docket A15-798, a Petition for Land Use District
23	Boundary Amendment to Amend the Agricultural Land Use
24	District Boundaries into the Rural Land Use District
25	for certain lands situated at Waikapu, District of

Wailuku, Island and County of Maui, State of Hawaii, consisting of 92.394 acres and 57.454 acres, bearing Tax Map Key No. (2)3-6-004:003 portion, and to Amend the Agricultural Land Use District Boundaries into the Urban Land Use District for certain lands situate at Waikapu, District of Wailuku, Island and County of Maui, State of Hawaii, consisting of 236.326 acres, 53.775 acres, and 45.054 acres, bearing Tax Map Key No. (2)3-6-002:003 portion, (2)3-6-004:006 and

Will the parties identify themselves for the record?

(2)3-6-005:007 portion.

MR. GEIGER: Good morning, Chair,

Commissioners. My name is James Geiger here on

behalf of the Applicant. Also present is Michael

Atherton, who is the representative of the Applicant,

and Paul Mancini, who is also with my law firm.

MR. HOPPER: Michael Hopper, Deputy

Corporation Counsel for the County of Maui,

Department of Planning. With me is Planning Director

Wil Spence and Planner Tara Furukawa.

MS. APUNA: Good morning, Dawn Apuna,
Deputy Attorney General, Office of Planning. Here
with me today is Lorraine Maki, and Director Leo
Asuncion.

1 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Let me update the 2 record. 3 On January 20, 2017, the Land Use Commission mailed its Decision and Order Accepting 4 5 Petitioner's FEIS dated January 2017. 6 On January 23, 2017, the Land Use 7 Commission mailed OEQC a copy of its Decision and Order Accepting Petitioner's FEIS dated January, 2017 8 9 and Public Notice publication correspondence. 10 Between May 1, 2017 and November 6, 2017, the Commission received various filings from the 11 12 Parties, all of which have been posted to the 13 Commission website including Petitioner's amended 14 petition, various exhibit lists and position 15 statements. 16 On November 28, 2017, the Commission mailed 17 a Notice and Agenda for the December 6-7, 2017 LUC meeting to the Parties and Statewide, Maui and Oahu 18 19 mailing lists. Mr. Geiger, has our staff informed you of 20 21 the Commission's policy regarding the reimbursement 22 of hearing expenses? 23 MR. GEIGER: Yes. 24 CHAIRPERSON WONG: And you will respect 25 that policy?

1 MR. GEIGER: Yes, we do. 2 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. 3 Let me describe our procedure for today. 4 First, I will call for those individuals desiring to 5 provide public testimony on this matter to identify themselves. All such individuals will be called in 6 7 turn to our witness box where they will be sworn in. 8 A three minute time limit will be enforced. The Commission will then consider the 9 10 exhibits that the parties wish to offer into the 11 record, starting with the Petitioner, followed by the 12 County Planning Department and then the State Office 13 of Planning. 14 The Commission will then begin proceedings 15 on Docket No. A15-798 and the parties will present their cases in the same order. 16 17 The Chair will also note for the parties and the public that from time to time I will be 18 19 calling for short breaks. 20 Are there any questions on this procedures? MR. GEIGER: No questions from Applicant. 2.1 22 MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair. 23 MS. APUNA: No.

you have anything you wanted to state?

2.4

25

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Scheuer, do

1 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Yes, Mr. Chair. want to make a disclosure for the record. 2 3 As a volunteer, I serve on the board of the 4 Hawaiian Islands Land Trust, which is an accredited 5 land trust that can accept conservation easements on 6 various kinds of properties. 7 One of the proposed mitigation measures in this project is the issuance of a conservation 8 9 easement over a portion of the agricultural lands. 10 It's my understanding that there have been informal 11 discussions between the Applicant and the land trust 12 over -- the Hawaiian Islands Land Trust's conditions 13 where they might participate in the conservation of those lands. 14 15 So that's the issue -- I don't believe --16 first of all, I clearly have no financial interest in 17 the matter; and second, I don't believe it will cause me to be anything but fair and impartial in this 18 19 matter. 20 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any issues, Mr. Geiger? 21 MR. GEIGER: No. 22 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any objection from 23 County?

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

MR. HOPPER: No objection.

MS. APUNA: No objection.

24

25

1 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to make two disclosures. The first disclosure is that I met one of the Applicant's consultants Hokuao Pellegrino, and this was the circumstance of my meeting with him. When the governor first nominated me to serve on the Land Use Commission during my first partial term, Mr.

Pellegrino was suggested as a community resource who I might want to speak to on the issues of land use, cultural practices, and other things which may be of knowledge to help me get ready for confirmation, and if confirmed, my service on this Commission.

I don't believe my discussions with him will affect my decision or consideration of this matter in any way.

The second disclosure I would like to make is I have known Mr. James Geiger just in a professional manner in terms of cases that our law firm has handled in the Second Circuit here on Maui were involving cases within the County of Maui.

I do not socialize with Mr. Geiger. I found him to be an ethical, honest, well prepared attorney, but I do not believe that my knowledge of him will influence me one way or the other in terms

of this matter.
CHAIR

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any issues?

MR. GEIGER: No objection from Applicant.

And thank you very much for the compliment.

MR. HOPPER: No objection.

MS. APUNA: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commission Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Well, I live here.

Let me start off with, Paul Mancini was the person who hired me when I first came out of law school, however, I don't necessarily socialize with him, and from our conversation today, I haven't seen him in many years and we grow old together.

I don't believe my relationship with him will in any way affect my decision in this matter.

I also know Mr. Geiger, but only as a professional manner. I know one of the lobbyist, I believe, for Mr. Atherton is Senator Tanaka. He sometimes visits my office and drinks coffee with me.

I have not discussed this matter with him, and I don't believe my relationship of over 40 years with him -- 30-something years with him, would affect my decision in this matter.

Finally, I know Al Perez, Maui Tomorrow. He used to come before and sit down and sometimes

1	talk story with me and my wife about different
2	things. However, he hasn't done so since I've become
3	a commissioner, and therefore, I don't believe my
4	knowledge with him would affect my relationship
5	would affect any of my decisions in this matter.
6	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you.
7	MR. GEIGER: No objection from Applicant.
8	MR. HOPPER: No objection.
9	MS. APUNA: No objection.
10	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Mancini, you look
11	much younger than he does.
12	MR. MANCINI: Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'll remember that.
14	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Orodenker, if you
15	please public testimony. Sorry, Dan.
16	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: The first testifier
17	signed up is Albert Perez, followed by Robert Park.
18	CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in,
19	please?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you affirm that the
22	testimony that you're about to give is the truth?
23	THE WITNESS: Yes.
24	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Please state
25	your name for the record.

1	THE WITNESS: Albert Perez.
2	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed.
3	ALBERT PEREZ
4	Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the
5	truth, was examined and testified as follows:
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	THE WITNESS: I'm Albert Perez, and I'm
8	Executive Director of the Maui Tomorrow Foundation.
9	Maui Tomorrow supports the subject
10	redistricting request.
11	This Waikapu Country Town Project is
12	unusual for several reasons:
13	Number one, the developer has modified the
14	project in response to community concerns over the
15	years. For example, he agreed to limit the use of
16	stream water to leave more for natural flows.
17	His initial designs had rural lots
18	ascending the mauka slopes above Maui Tropical
19	Plantation. When community input said that this was
20	a bad idea, the design changed, and the rural/ag lots
21	were limited to a more compact area much further
22	downslope.
23	This developer is actually complying with
24	the land use approval process instead of trying to

skirt it. So it's unusual in that regard.

25

1 The Final EIS for this project was far 2 better than most of the others that we have seen. 3 Rather than the usual self-serving recitation of the 4 benefits, it actually discloses impacts and does a 5 fair job of evaluating secondary and cumulative 6 impacts of other developments in the surrounding 7 area. 8 This developer committed to placing 800 9 acres into an agricultural preserve, and has 10 encouraged regenerative and organic farmers on the 11 existing Maui Tropical Plantation to move across 12 Honoapiilani Highway and expand their operations. 13 Maui Tomorrow Foundation supports this 14 project, and hope other developers will learn from 15 the example of Mr. Atherton and sincerely work with 16 the community instead of just going through the 17 motions. 18 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any questions? 19 MR. GEIGER: No questions.

MR. HOPPER: No questions.

MS. APUNA: No.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners?

Commissioner Okuda.

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Perez, if I may ask, has Maui Tomorrow

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

opposed other developments in the county?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we have. Yes, we have.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And just so that the record is clear, could you give an approximate number of how many oppositions you're aware of, or can you give us an estimate for that? Maybe quite a few?

THE WITNESS: I would say over the years since 1989, probably in the hundreds, but I'm not sure. It's been a long time.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Given that context, can I ask you this question then.

Much of our -- or a lot of property here has been rated A and B soils conditions, and land will be taken out of agriculture probably in perpetuity. Does that raise any concern for you or your foundation?

THE WITNESS: Well, it does. But on balance, we think it's not a perfect project, you know, it's not perfect, but given what else is going on in the county, and we're trying to encourage people to be more conscious of the environment.

There's 800 acres that are dedicated if perpetuity to agriculture. So given the fact that the population is growing, and people need somewhere to live, this is probably the best that we have seen

1 in terms of a proposal of this nature. 2 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much. 3 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Anyone else, 4 Commissioners? If not, thank you. 5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Next witness is Robert 6 Pahia. 7 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth? 8 9 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 10 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name 11 for the record. 12 THE WITNESS: My name is Robert H. Pahia. 13 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed. 14 ROBERT H. PAHIA 15 Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 16 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 THE WITNESS: Good morning. I come today 19 to testify on behalf of Mr. Atherton and partners and 20 the development project that they're putting forth to 21 you. 22 Presently I'm a manager of Hoaloha Farms. 23 As of last year and for the last five years, we 24 farmed up on the slopes of Waikapu. And recently we 25 have expanded our operations to across Honoapiilani

Highway, where I was granted a 310-acre lease to do farming on that parcel of land described as that 800 acres.

I'm totally supportive of the project that is before you today. Governor Ige is talking about food security in the next couple of years, you know. Everybody knows that we are 90 percent we bring in all our food. And Governor Ige has mandated that we have food security within a couple of years.

Now, to obtain food security, we're going to need farm land. And I don't know of anybody else, any other developer that is trying to meet the community's needs for affordable housing and at the same time donating 800 acres of land to put in perpetuity for agriculture.

I'm currently what you might call a farmer, I'm a farmer of farmers. Currently I have about 12 different farmers that farm with me on that 300-acre parcel. So as far as promoting agriculture, as far as trying to meet the governor's standards, I think that this development and project is in direct alignment with what he's trying to achieve.

And I ask from you, you know, that land has been farmed corporately for 144 years. And now putting it in a land trust, putting in perpetuity.

Now, really what I'm trying to achieve is build the family farmers, giving family farmers an opportunity to farm, because you know what? If you're going to farm on HC&S, A&B lands, a small time farmer cannot get in, because they're only leasing land to people who can farm 100-plus acres, large acreage.

Okay, so the small time family farmer doesn't have a chance. And with this kind of project, he has given me the latitude to help the family farmer, to give them smaller parcels. And especially the young farmers, because it's hard for the young farmer. Being a farmer is tough. And to succeed as a farmer, especially if you're a family farmer, it's even more tough.

So because of this opportunity that was given to me, I in turn is helping the rest of our agricultural community, and in turn helping meet Governor Ige's mandate of creating food security in Hawai'i.

And I think we need more people doing these kind of projects. I mean, if we're going to have developers and development in Hawai'i, and they have large acreage, I think that this development sets a precedent for the rest of everybody else coming into Hawai'i, and wanted to help the community, build

affordable housing, but there has to be give and take 1 2 and I think they displayed that. 3 Again, I ask you to consider that, and I 4 ask you for your support in this project. 5 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, sir. Is 6 there any questions? 7 MR. GEIGER: No questions. MR. HOPPER: No questions. 8 9 MS. APUNA: No questions. 10 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Commissioner Aczon. 11 12 COMMISSIONER ACZON: You mentioned you have 13 300 acres on this lease right now. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER ACZON: How long is that? THE WITNESS: The lease is for 30 years. 16 17 COMMISSIONER ACZON: You mentioned you have 12 other farmers. 18 19 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 20 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Is that sublease? 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER ACZON: How long is that 23 lease? 24 THE WITNESS: That's the greatest thing. I 25 feel that I was blessed with 300 acres, and I didn't

try to grab the land just for myself, because I know 1 2 how it is being a farmer, and how to get land, and 3 how to get land security and water security. 4 Basically all I'm doing -- I was fortunate 5 enough to get it, so now I'm helping others, that's 6 basically how it is. 7 COMMISSIONER ACZON: How long are their leases? 8 9 THE WITNESS: 30 years. I don't charge 10 them a penny more for the lease rate that I receive, 11 and I don't charge them any more, just straight 12 across-the-board. 13 COMMISSIONER ACZON: As long as you have 14 the lease, they have the lease, is that what you're 15 saying? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Thank you. 18 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Anything else? 19 Commissioner Scheuer. 20 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: We visited your 21 property, part of your farm during our site visit. I 22 wanted to make that sure that was on the record. And 23 thank you for hosting us. 24 Very briefly, have you had -- can you

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

describe or contrast your current land arrangement

25

here with some of your previous efforts to secure
land here on Maui to farm?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Number one, to get even a small parcel with a long-term security is tough. And on top of that as to get water security is even tougher.

I'm sorry, can you repeat that again?
VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: No problem.

I believe you used to farm on more Waihe'e side, yeah? So you've been through this process before.

Can you contrast your arrangements currently with some of your previous efforts to secure long-term secured places for farming?

THE WITNESS: It's very tough getting long-term lease with water security. I have farmed on Maui all over this island, because I've bounced around from one parcel to another parcel to another parcel, whether the landowner sold the land, they didn't want to give me long-term leases. It's really hard. It's very, very difficult.

And what I did was, I first started farming about five years ago up in Waikapu. And it really was just on a verbal agreement. You know, we have a written agreement, but really it was just a trust

issue.

It took me five years to create a relationship with Mr. Atherton and his partners, but in that time, I showed them that, you know, I was credible, and that the people that support me are credible.

So in that term he saw that I was trustworthy, then he extended the lands across Honoapiilani to me. But it's really, really tough.

So this these other farmers that I help, I just don't want to see them go through the same road that I have, being bounced all over this island trying to find land and water security.

So in my eyes, Mr. Atherton is really perpetuating agriculture in a solid way, because when he give me the lease, he gave me the latitude to help other farmers. He gave me the latitude to sublease.

And in turn, like I said, I got a 30-year lease, they get a 30-year lease. I pay X amount of dollars for my water, they pay X amount, not a penny more. Yeah, I'm helping them, but without their help, this could never happen.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Anyone else? Thank you,

25 sir.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Next person signed up 3 to testify is Mike Foley followed by Kent. 4 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you swear that the 5 testimony you're about to give is the truth? 6 THE WITNESS: I do. 7 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Please state your name for the record. 8 9 THE WITNESS: My name is Mike Foley. 10 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed with your 11 testimony. 12 MIKE FOLEY Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the 13 14 truth, was examined and testified as follows: 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 THE WITNESS: I'm a retired planner and 17 environmental consultant. I worked for 42 years, 18 including four years as Maui County Planning 19 Director, and I'm here today in a kind of unique 20 position. 21 I've testified many times before the State 22 Land Use Commission, but I believe this is the first 23 time that it has been in favor of a project. 24 My support for this -- and I'm speaking as 25 an individual not as a member of any board -- my

support for this project is because this project as has been stated is unique.

2.1

First of all, it's within the growth boundary of the Maui Island Plan. It's in Central Maui where growth is most appropriate because it's near existing infrastructure.

The other thing that makes this unique is that the Applicant, as has been described, not only met with the community numerous times, but he actually revised the project to address their concerns.

Another reason that this is unique is that the Applicant prepared a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement rather than fighting for an Environmental Assessment. I support the agricultural preserve of 800 acres, and I won't go into that because it's already been discussed. There's a variety of housing proposed in the project.

A total of 1433 units, variety of types of units, also including affordable units.

The infrastructure improvements include elementary school in the very essential extension of Waiale Road. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Geiger?

MR. GEIGER: No questions, thank you.

1 MR. HOPPER: No questions. 2 MS. APUNA: No questions. 3 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? 4 Commissioner Okuda. 5 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Very briefly, Mr. 6 Chair. 7 Mr. Foley, similar question that I asked earlier. Does it concern you that lands that are 8 9 rated A and B are being taken out of agriculture if 10 we approve this Petition? THE WITNESS: I would have to respond in a 11 12 similar manner as Albert Perez. It does concern us 13 whenever good agricultural land is converted to 14 development. But as you know, there's a tremendous 15 amount of undeveloped or available agricultural land, 16 most of it owned by A&B and Maui Land & Pine. 17 In this particular case, the Maui Island

In this particular case, the Maui Island

Plan recognized that the most appropriate location

for development was within the Urban Growth Boundary,

and this project is within the Urban Growth Boundary.

It doesn't have the constraints that we have in West

Maui and South Maui. So it's considered by the

County to be the most appropriate location for Urban

development.

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions? If
2	not, thank you, sir.
3	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Final testifier, Kent
4	Hiranaga.
5	CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in,
6	please?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you swear that the
9	testimony you're about to give is the truth?
10	THE WITNESS: I do.
11	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can you please state
12	your name for the record?
13	THE WITNESS: My name is Kent Hiranaga. I
14	have a prepared statement.
15	KENT HIRANAGA
16	Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the
17	truth, was examined and testified as follows:
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	THE WITNESS: Good morning, Chairman Wong
20	and Commissioners. Welcome to Maui. My name I
21	already stated my name. I want to thank all of you
22	for serving on this very important State Commission.
23	I am here to testify in support of the
24	Waikapu Property LLC application for District
25	Boundary Amendment for the proposed Waikapu Country

1 Town project.

I was born on Maui, and raised in Wailuku

Town. I served on the Maui Planning Commission

during the Maui Island Plan Review Process.

The proposed Waikapu Country Town Project is located within the Urban Growth Boundaries of the Maui Island Plan that was adopted by the Maui County Council. The proposed Waikapu Country Town Project will provide needed housing for residents of Maui.

This project is not targeted for nonresidents, for the nonresident housing market.

I urge you to respect the Maui Island Plan and approve the proposed District Boundary Amendment Application. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, sir.

MR. GEIGER: No questions.

MR. HOPPER: No questions.

MS. APUNA: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Go ahead, Commissioner Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aloha, Mr. Hiranaga.

THE WITNESS: Good morning.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I only ask this because it's been less than one year with your service for us. We remain very grateful for --

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

1	you're not employed by the Applicant, correct?
2	THE WITNESS: Correct.
3	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
4	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Last chance to give him
5	a hard time, if not, thank you. Next person, please.
6	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: We have four more
7	people signed up to testify. Mr. Dick Mayer.
8	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Good morning, sir.
9	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
10	CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in?
11	THE WITNESS: Yes, please.
12	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you swear or affirm
13	that the testimony you're about to give is the truth?
14	THE WITNESS: I do.
15	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can you please state
16	your name?
17	THE WITNESS: My name is Richard, usually
18	known as Dick, Mayer.
L 9	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed.
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
21	RICHARD MAYER
22	Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the
23	truth, was examined and testified as follows:
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	THE WITNESS: I was vice chair of the Maui

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

Island Plan General Plan Advisory Committee Group 2025. This plan came before the Island Plan committee, and it received a strong endorsement all the way through the process. Other projects were very controversial, this one went through, and I think overall everything I've read, seen and studied the EIS in detail, I believe it's a very good project, but do I have three issues that I would like to bring to your attention.

Number one, ohanas. In the EIS it mentions

146 ohana units, but the studies that were done,

traffic and other ones, do not include those ohana

units in their analysis, therefore, there will be a

lot more traffic from those units than might

otherwise be expected. They only considered the

actual units.

So I would urge you in your discussion, and when you put your conditions down, that you make a statement about ohana units.

I think it's also important to realize that they even though they say in the EIS 146 units, they do not mention all the other single-family homes in the project 6, 7, 8, 900 -- don't know the exact number of units that will be single-family homes where they make no statement about ohanas, will they

be allowed or not allowed? So I think that will have a huge impact on traffic in this area on school enrollments, wastewater, water needs, et cetera.

So I think it needs to be very much clarified exactly how many ohana units will be in the project, whether it be zero, as some of the traffic and other studies have indicated, 146 as the EIS indicated, or many more because there are no restrictions on all those single-family homes putting ohana units on their property. That needs to be clarified in your conditions.

Secondly, with regard to traffic itself, your DOT letter exhibit that came in made several statements about an agreement that will need to be still produced between DOT and the Applicant before it goes to subdivision approval. And I would hope that you strongly state that in the conditions that you will attach to any approval that you may be giving.

This is particularly important because I think the traffic study has not done as good a job as could have been done in analyzing the impacts of other surrounding developments which have already been entitled. A&B has already been entitled for 2,550 units nearby. Maui Lani still has somewhere in

the order of 900 more units that they will be able to put in. Kea Lani roughly 900; Pu'unani, even though it's been held back right now it still has optional entitlements for 600-plus units and several other developments on Waiale Road which could be developed.

The sum total of these around 6,000 units, including this project, means that the traffic on Waiale Road and Waiko Road in particular, as well as on State Highways will be considerable.

Those are all one lane in each direction roads at present. Those roads cannot handle the traffic. There will be a need by DOT and the County to require, and I would urge you in your conditions to make sure that the traffic situation in that area is up to par. You did not put those conditions on the other projects which already were entitled, but at least at this stage that has to be done.

The financing be available, otherwise all of those projects will be at gridlock cumulative, a serious issue.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Sir, can you --

THE WITNESS: I'll -- one last comment.

Regards to the financial page on your

Exhibit 24 that was submitted, I urge you to examine

it. There are four or five different owners of these

properties who have put their financial down, and all 1 2 have used largely the land value as their basic 3 asset, not a capital or other monies available to build the project. 4 5 I would like you to determine what the 6 financial situation is for the Applicant's 7 cumulative. Thank you. Generally I'm very much in 8 9 favor of the project with the conditions I mentioned. 10 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any questions? 11 MR. GEIGER: No questions. 12 MR. HOPPER: No questions. 13 MS. APUNA: No questions. 14 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Thank 15 you, sir. 16 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 17 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Michael Takahara, 18 followed by Stan Franco 19 CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in, please? Do you swear that you'll tell the truth in 20 2.1 your testimony? 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name 24 for the record. 25 THE WITNESS: Mike Makaiana Takahara,

Wailuku Sugar.

MIKE TAKAHARA

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: I come here in support of Mr. Atherton. And I'll tell you a little story why.

I grew up in Wailuku in little camp called Stable Camp, and people before, they very different from now. The people, when they made a promise, their word was their word, like what Mike has promised. There is an almost 1000 acres of agriculture land. You know me, I go fishing about three times a week, and I pass by, and I'm very touched. I miss my plantation life.

When I saw the farmers along Honoapiilani Highway, mahiai, banana, taro, papaya, sunflower, it tells me and shows me that the man is a man for his word. And when a person makes a promise, where I come from, it's a wholly covenant. It's a promise from the heart. It's not just words.

And then when you see the work being taking place, there is integrity, you know. It's not too much people that understand that, but I understand that. I grew up very simple. And when I was growing

1	up, my teacher told me the simple thing, and I grew
2	up in a very old school where the principal still had
3	the paddle. And my teacher, math teacher told me one
4	time, Michael, how do you know that this answer is
5	the solution to this problem? Show me the work.
6	And I'll tell you what is the solution.
7	When a person has integrity, the future is pono.
8	That's the answer. And that's what I really wanted
9	to share. My mana'o is yours, yeah.
10	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, sir.
11	MR. GEIGER: No questions.
12	MR. HOPPER: No questions.
13	MS. APUNA: No questions.
14	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Thank
15	you, sir.
16	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Next testifier Stan
17	Franco.
18	CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in, sir?
19	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
20	that you're about to give is the truth?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name.
23	THE WITNESS: Stan Franco.
24	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed.
25	-000-

2.1

STAN FRANCO

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: My name is Stan Franco, born and raised on Maui. I've been actively involved in an organization here called Face Maui for the last nine years. And for the last nine years our congregations and our churches that belong to Face has been saying that affordable housing is the primary issue facing our island, and they wanted us, the leadership of Face Maui to work on that issue.

So I was very surprised, very happy to hear a call from Coach, Mike Atherton invited us to meet with him and his staff. We've met with him over five or six meetings talking about what the people of Maui need from our point of view.

As Michael was talking just right now, and it touched me a lot, it's about people. It's about people. I think Mike has the right form of it. He has talked to us and the rest of the community over and over again to get the right formula as to what the people of Maui need and want in his development. He has community trails. He has affordable homes for people. He has integrated, he has mixed a community

which we are very much in favor of. 1 It is also -- the mix is market and 2 3 affordable together. So we think this is a wonderful 4 community. I was part of the GPAC, General Plan 5 Advisory Committee when this project was proposed. 6 We really, as an organization, have been 7 advocated for the last nine years for affordable housing on this island, believe this is the answer. 8 This is what we need to do. 9 10 Every developer needs to be like Coach. He 11 needs to come to the community and say I want to do 12 this. What do you think? What kind of changes 13 should I make to make it better for this community? 14 So I wholeheartedly support Coach in what 15 he's doing, and I ask you to support him too. Thank 16 you. 17 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Any 18 questions? 19 MR. GEIGER: No questions. 20 MR. HOPPER: No questions. 21 MS. APUNA: No questions. 22

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners?

Commission Okuda.

23

24

25

clarification, Mr. Franco, why do you call him Coach?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Just for

THE WITNESS: That's his nickname. That's 1 2 what he told me to call him, so that's what I call 3 him. 4 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. 5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Next person signed up 6 to testify is Mercer Vicens. 7 CHAIRPERSON WONG: May swear you in? Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 8 9 you're about to give is the truth? 10 THE WITNESS: I do. 11 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name 12 for the record. 13 THE WITNESS: Mercer Vicens. 14 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 16 MERCER VICENS 17 Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 18 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 20 THE WITNESS: My story on Mike Atherton 21 goes about 11 years ago when he and three other 22 partners purchased about 1927 acres along 23 Honoapiilani Highway. And actually it was -- they 24 purchased the land on good faith. They thought that 25 it was the right thing to do.

They were all mainland investors at the time. Mike chose to move to Maui at that time to represent his company here, along with one of his other partners. I've known him for all period of time.

I, in my previous career, was vice president of development for A & B Properties here on Maui, and spent about 30 years with Matson and A&B in management positions.

So I've been around the development arena.

I've seen developers come; I've seen developers go.

I've seen people come in and take the money and run.

That's the thing that drew me to Mike. Mike met with the community many, many times, and sold himself first and then the project later.

And I think that you heard Mike earlier, one of our testifiers, speak of integrity. And that's where I come from. I'm old school. If somebody says we're going to do this, and we're going to do it in the right way, I take them for their word and let them prove me wrong.

I think Mike has done that. He's gone to the community many, many times. He's done things for the community without being asked, cleaning up automobiles, cleaning up lots. Just doing things

that made sense to him, not as a developer, but as a member of the community.

And I think that's the thing that has impressed me most about Mr. Atherton, his willingness to listen, which many, many developers, as you well know, don't.

You also know that many developers come in and promise you affordable housing, and the numbers are staggering as to the number of homes that have not been built today, yet they were promised.

I have total faith in Mr. Atherton and his partners, primarily because of Mr. Atherton.

I believe that he comes from the old school, if I give you my hand and I give you my word, that's what we're going to do. And I believe you're going to see this come true.

It's one of the best projects that I've seen in my many years in land development including A&B projects.

So I come to you today to ask you to allow someone who has made Maui his home for the last 11 years, has become an integral part of our community, has supported the Maui Native Hawaiian Chamber and the Foundation by giving us a venue to hold our meetings at no charge. He has done this for

many community groups.

But we let them tell their story. I'm here today just to tell you what I know about Mr. Atherton and what I know about the project, and I believe that it will be good for our community. It will serve the needs of a mixed use of the community.

And today you've seen a wide spectrum of people testify, not only on one side of the ledger, but you've heard Dick Mayer and you've heard the Maui Tomorrow people come in support. Yes, there probably needs to be a few conditions, but let's not make it such a magnitude that you can't make the project work, because in the end, it's all about numbers.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can you please wrap up?

THE WITNESS: With that I would like to again reiterate that I support the project. The Maui Native Chamber Foundation supports the project, and we would like to see it go forward.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Any questions?

MR. GEIGER: No questions.

MR. HOPPER: No questions.

MS. APUNA: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Thank

you, sir.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. 2 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Anyone else wants to 3 testify on the Waikapu? If not, we're closing the 4 public testimony at this time. Mr. Geiger, please describe the exhibits 5 6 you wish to have admitted to the record. 7 MR. GEIGER: We have previously submitted to the Commission 1 through 35, which we have 8 identified on our exhibit list. And we would offer 9 10 in exhibits 1 through 35. I would note that Exhibits 12 and 13 have been revised and revised exhibits have 11 been submitted. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any objections from 14 County? 15 MR. HOPPER: No objection. MS. APUNA: No. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Hearing 18 none, Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 35 are admitted 19 into the record with the revisions of 12 and 13. 20 (Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 35, with 21 revised Exhibits 12 and 13 were received into the 22 record.) 23 CHAIRPERSON WONG: County, any exhibits? 24 MR. HOPPER: Chair the County of Maui has 25 filed a list of exhibits identified as Exhibits 1

```
1
     through 4. Exhibit 3 the direct testimony of Wil
2
      Spence was submitted at a later date, but we would
3
     move all four exhibits be admitted into the record.
 4
                MR. GEIGER: No objection from the
5
     Applicant.
 6
                MS. APUNA: No objection.
7
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners?
                So County's exhibits 1 through 4 are
8
9
     admitted to the record.
10
                (County of Maui Exhibits 1 through 4 were
     received into evidence.)
11
12
                Ms. Apuna any exhibits?
13
                MS. APUNA: Office of Planning has exhibits
14
      1 through 11 to admit to the record.
15
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any objection?
16
               MR. GEIGER: No objection from Applicant.
17
               MR. HOPPER: No objection, Mr. Chair.
18
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? State
19
     Office of Planning Exhibits 1 through 11 are admitted
20
     to the record.
                (Office of Planning Exhibits 1 through 11
21
22
     were received into the record.)
23
                Thank you. At this time we're going to
24
     take a short recess.
25
                (Recess was taken.)
```

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Geiger, can you
2	please proceed with the presentation of your case?
3	MR. GEIGER: Yes, Chair. We have already
4	been before the Commission on the EIS. What we would
5	like to do is move right into testifying, if that's
6	okay with the Commission. We'll call our first
7	witness will be Mike Atherton or Coach.
8	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can I please swear you
9	in? Do you swear that the testimony you're about to
10	give is the truth?
11	THE WITNESS: I do.
12	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Please state
13	your name.
14	THE WITNESS: My name is Michael Warren
15	Atherton.
16	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed
17	MICHAEL ATHERTON
18	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
19	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
20	and testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. GEIGER:
23	Q Coach, are you familiar with the Waikapu
24	Country Town Project?
25	A Yes, sir.

Have you provided written direct testimony 1 2 in connection with that? 3 Α Yes. 4 I'm going to hand you what is a document 5 that says Direct Testimony of Michael Atherton. 6 Is that your written direct testimony? 7 Yes, sir. Α Look at the last page. Is that your 8 9 signature on the last page? 10 Α It is. 11 Do you have any corrections or 12 modifications you need to make to your testimony? 13 Α No, I don't. 14 I don't want you to read your testimony, 15 but I would like you to talk to the Commissioners and 16 tell them what you believe is important from your 17 testimony with regard to their decision today. 18 Α Thank you, Jim. 19 Good morning, Chair, Commissioners. My 20 name is Mike Atherton. They call me Coach. And I'm 21 here today to talk to you about the District Boundary 22 Amendment on Waikapu Country Town. What was before 23 you back in February when we talked about the EIS and

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

I'm very proud of that EIS. And maybe --

now it's an FEIS, thank you very much.

24

you asked a question why they called me Coach. It was a fraternity name. I've had it all my life. I had a team and we would put together these kind of things, and try to end up in the World Series. So anyway, thank you very much, aloha.

Before I describe the project, I would like to tell you a little bit about us and about who we are and where we came from.

I grew up in California in a farming family li, and I am a farmer and have been growing coffee since 1974. 1979 I started buying lots and formed a construction company called Atherton Homes.

Currently I billed with my partners -- Albert Boyce is here today -- we build affordable housing. We've been doing it for a long time, over 30 years in affordable housing market.

But to be able to do affordable housing, I had to be able to go out and find a piece of property well in advance. You didn't buy lots down at the supermarket, you had to develop those lots yourself, you had to create entitlement to be able to have a future for your construction company to be able to build on.

So I did that in California for many, many years. I drumped up many master plans and I've been

doing this for a long time. So when I came to Maui, I told you that when we were at the EIS hearing. I came from Molokai, Coffees of Hawai'i. I came to Maui, and here we are today to talk about the District Boundary Amendment.

One of the first things I did was I noticed that this piece of property is concentric to the Central Maui growth. And in my business, you need to be concentric because the infrastructure and the cost of the infrastructure to expand them into new areas.

So I thought the geographic location was wonderful. When I met Avery and I went down and looked at the Maui Tropical Plantation. I had a vision, and I had a vision that there was a possibility to do what I did in California here on Maui. And this gave me that opportunity to be able to do that.

And we came and sat down and worked out a deal, bought the land. And the very first place I went was the community. And I've always done it that way. I've been in this business 45 years. The very first thing I do before I go do anything, I find out where I'm going before I go there. I meet the community, go back and forth, back and forth, get a lot of their input.

In this plan we have a very popular and very successful agricultural open space easement.

850 acres. That was not my idea. That was the idea of the Waikapu Community Association. I was listening to them, and trying to talk about how we were going to mitigate, and trying to go find support from the community. And it was the easement that really started me down the road to where we are today.

Then I get all that input and then I go meet the environmental community. We have a strong environmental community here on Maui, and I would mitigate with them and do the same thing. And then I would incorporate their concerns into my plans.

Then I go and I met Mike Summers and Bill Mitchell and we created the plan that we have put together. It's not my plan; it's our plan. It's 'everybody's plan. It's the community's plan. I think that's shown today by the amount of support that this project has had.

I'm proud of this plan. I'm proud of everything that we've been able to put together as a group. I have never done it any other way. In the whole 50 years I've been in business, first thing we do after we buy land is we go and communicate with

everybody who is going to be involved in what we're planning on doing.

I get my consultants and we create a map.

We take that map and go down to the county. We meet with the county and get their concerns. So it's a group effort. They call me Coach because I run with the team. This is my team. Everybody who comes here today is part of my team.

We have been able to take that idea, and I've been able to use it for many, many years, and I've been able to create lots. And I've been able to expand several different communities that I'm very proud of. I did a lot of building in a little town called Manteca, California.

Atherton Homes has a website. You're welcome to take a look, it's hiding. I want to be able to do that here in Central Maui. I had a vision and I want to be able to complete that vision.

So I'm very proud of this project. This is a community project. This is our project. And with that, I would humbly ask you for your support.

If you have any questions, I'm here to answer them.

MR. GEIGER: Thank you, Mike, we would offer Mr. Atherton's written testimony which has been

1 previously provided to the Commission as our next 2 exhibit in number which is 36. 3 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. 4 MR. GEIGER: With that I pass the witness. 5 CHAIRPERSON WONG: County. 6 MR. HOPPER: No objection to the submission 7 of the exhibit. 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HOPPER: 9 10 Q I just have a couple of questions. 11 You're familiar with the document known as 12 Maui Island Plan? 13 Α Yes. 14 Could you briefly -- first of all, the 15 project known as Waikapu, I think it's called Plantation Town in the document, is actually 16 17 specifically referenced in the Maui Island Plan 18 document, correct? 19 Yes, sir. 20 Could you talk a bit about the efforts that 21 you made during the creation of the Maui Island Plan 22 to have your project considered and made part of the 23 Maui Island Plan? 24 I attended over five years of hearings and Α 25 meetings putting together the Maui Island Plan with

my friend Reid, as representative of the community.

And we were be able to communicate, and we were able to take a lot of those old ideas that I told you earlier about, concentric growth, infrastructure and location and mitigation and open space.

So we spent a lot of time working with Wil and County of Maui on the Maui Island Plan, and we fortunately were able to be included in the Maui Island Plan. So when I was included in the Maui Island Plan, I moved to the next position, and we commenced to do the Environmental Impact Statement, and we brought that before you, and now we're before you with the District Boundary Amendment.

Q Are you generally familiar with the conditions that the County of Maui has recommended to the Land Use Commission for approval?

A Yes.

2.1

Q In general, are you amenable to the conditions, I guess, subject to working out the specific wording?

A Yes.

Q Thank you very much. I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP.

MS. APUNA: Thank you Mr. Atherton for your

1 testimony, I have a few questions. 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION 3 BY MS. APUNA: Are you authorized to commit and make 4 5 representations on behalf of the Petitioners? 6 I didn't understand. I'm sorry, I have a hearing issue. 7 8 Are you authorized to commit and make representations on behalf of the Petitioners? 9 10 A Yes, I am. And do you commit to the representations 11 12 made in the Petition? 13 Α Yes. 14 Are you able to commit to generally the 15 conditions presented by OP? 16 Α Yes. 17 On page 34 of the Petition it states that possible uses of the remaining 300-plus acres are 18 19 subdivided into larger, large ag lots for development 20 into the private ag park. 21 Do you know how large those lots might be? 22 There's only four lots, so they're 23 different -- they differ in size. I would say the 24 first one is the biggest one. It's about 700 acres.

Then we have several that are 300 acres.

- Q I'm sorry, I'm referring to the 300-plus acres that are, I guess, the remaining lands outside the rural.
- A Would this be the area here (indicating)?

 Would that be the area here, the combined

 300 acres right here (indicating)?
- Q I believe so. That would be the remaining acreage.
 - A What was the question?

- Q So I was wondering what -- it's proposed to be used as ag lots or a private ag park? So I wanted to learn more about what your vision was for that 300-plus acres?
- The area there is primarily the open space that surrounds the town, and not an ag park because I've been able to put an ag park here (indicating) below the Honoapiilani Highway. Maybe we put that together before HC&S left, and we were able to move down there. But that will primarily -- it's grazing land now. It's in pasture. I've been able to reach an agreement with Na Wai Eha about how much water we use in the Waikapu Stream for the cows. So right now we would just have ag lots, and those ag lots would have pasture.
 - Q Okay, thank you.

What is the current status of talks with the County for interconnection with the county's water system?

A Well, we have always had a desire to do a regional system in the area, and the reason is cost. And the reason those costs could be passed back in the form of affordable housing.

Currently we have an understanding with Alexander & Baldwin, and we're approaching the county now with the proposal in an attempt to see if it's possible to build a regional system in the area.

Q Okay. And as far as -- have you had any experience developing a project that included a private wastewater system?

A No, I have not.

Q On page 48 of the Petition it states that Petitioner expects to finalize an agreement concerning traffic mitigation cost sharing before the LUC completes action.

Is there agreement with the county yet on that?

A Yes, we have. My counsel, Mr. Mancini has met with David Goode on several meetings putting together a mitigation plan.

Q Thank you.

1	A Thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP, just for the record,
3	do you have any of objections to Exhibit 36?
4	MS. APUNA: No, no objection.
5	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Before I
6	ask for questions, any objections regarding
7	Exhibit 36? If not, Exhibit 36 is put into the
8	record.
9	(Petitioner's Exhibit 36 was received into
10	evidence.)
11	Commissioners, do you have any questions?
12	Commissioner Scheuer.
13	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Good morning, Mr.
14	Atherton.
15	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
16	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you for being
17	here today.
18	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
19	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: A bunch of the public
20	testimony, the very supportive public testimony had
21	to do with people's faith in the word that you've
22	given to them on various commitments.
23	Only because it came up during the
24	testimony that people distinguished your presence on

Maui and your commitment to Maui as opposed to other

1 developers.

I just wanted to ask you on the record: Do you have any plans or intent at this point to divest yourself of your interest after receiving your entitlement for this project?

THE WITNESS: No, do I not.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: You intend to remain and follow through with the commitment?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I plan to.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

(Commissioner Cabral present.)

CHAIRPERSON WONG: I want to state for the record that Commissioner Cabral has joined us today, just for everyone's 's information.

Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: You mention regional water system. Could you define to me what that is? Probably fuzzy brain today, and not able to determine what that really means, regional water system.

THE WITNESS: There an ordinance in Maui

County. We needed to identify a source for water.

We would fortunate when we purchased the land from

Wailuku Agribusiness we were able to purchase

groundwater rights on the mauka side of Honoapiilani

Highway, and I drilled five wills. And we tested the tells. The water quality is good. We have a water consultant in the audience, and he would be able to back that up.

So we put together a plan that would build a private water system and serve the project. We put together in our Draft EIS and in the proposal that it would be a dual water system, a system that I've done before in the West Coast.

And a dual water system is we only use potable water where potable water is necessary, because water is a very precious resource these days. Then we would be using ag water for all of our landscape irrigation and all the other areas.

Dual water system is a very successful endeavor that we have been on before. And that's more or less my proposals that's in my Draft EIS.

Now, at the same time for costs and expense, I have always had an intent or have an open mind to build a regional system. And if we did build a regional system, we were successful with Maui County, then the wells would become part of Maui County wells.

And we have an understanding that the wells are in good enough condition to where they would be

accepted by Maui County. Not all five, just Wells 1 and 2.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: When you mentioned regional system, that's separate from the private system you're proposing?

THE WITNESS: Right. We're a long ways away of trying to be successful here and come before you with a regional system. And if there's a change, we will have to let you know about it. In the meantime, I said in order for the opportunity to be able to build this affordable project in my lifetime, I wanted to come up with mitigation that would allow us to advance and move forward in case we weren't successful with a regional system.

My main desire on a regional system is a situation that creates a better deal for everybody because we'll be able to take that cost savings and pass it back in the affordable housing.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions?

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Atherton, if I can just ask a few questions here.

In your moving documents there's the use of the term, and I quote, "workforce housing".

Can you tell me how you define workforce housing? Is that by price point, or what type of definition with more specificity do you have with respect to defining the term "workforce housing" as it's used in your Petition?

THE WITNESS: Workforce housing is a phrase that's common in our industry. And it's used quite a bit in the Maui Island Plan. It's another word for affordable housing. In workforce housing, we have workforce housing, affordable housing in Maui County of 25 percent.

So my intent is to try to come in with the best cost I can. We do all the construction, so we are able to take some of the construction savings and pass that back to the buyers. And that was the term we put, workforce housing is affordable housing.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Are you using that term "workforce housing" in the same context as used with respect or used in ordinances passed by Maui County Council?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Do you have -- of the number of units that you plan or propose to build, what percentage would be workforce housing?

THE WITNESS: Well, I don't know anything

over the 25 percent requirement I have today. I'm still premature in finding out the cost. So I would have to answer that truthfully today that we were 25 percent today, and we hope to be able to increase that number by being able to bring this project in for decent amount of cost. So I still have a long ways to go before I could define actually how much percentage of the project will be workforce housing or affordable housing.

So I'm committed to 25 percent now, and I'm committed in telling you today that I'll do everything I can to continue that upwards of 25 percent. And I just need a little bit more time, little bit more facts to be able to put the whole thing together and answer that question properly.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I want to follow up on some of the points raised in the testimony of Dick

Mayer regarding ohana units and the property and your proposal.

If I understood his testimony correctly, he stated that your Petition indicates that somewhere around a 140 ohanas units are actually anticipated and occurring as a result of this District Boundary

1 | Amendment; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: He also stated that there's going to be a number of other parcels which may be eligible, at least under county ordinance, for ohana units; is that also correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: So are there going to be restrictions placed on those units when they're sold by you or successor companies to prohibit the building of ohana units?

THE WITNESS: I have no problem with that.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Because my understanding is the EIS did not anticipate the additional impacts associated with those potential units.

THE WITNESS: The EIS is an extensive document. We did our best to cover all the cost.

And a 140 units is all we want. We don't have a problem with putting the numbers 140 and giving me some type of restriction I can't have any more. And if I ever sold any lots that they couldn't build any more.

So to answer Mr. Mayer's concern, we have 1,433 units, plus 140 ohanas.

Thank you. 1 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: 2 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 3 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions? 4 Commissioner Cabral. 5 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, and my 6 apologies for being late. I had a subpoena in court 7 in Hilo today, so certainly not at a party. Speaking of water, and what I read -- and I 8 9 live in Hilo, so I have lots of water in my life. 10 live on catchment, no problem. But I'm very 11 interested because I realize that water is such a 12 necessity for all housing, and you have a lot of 13 information here about potable and nonpotable water, 14 and you're talking about a dual water system. 15 And I don't have all of the details from 16 what I've read, so I'm not sure I understand that 17 there's clearly agricultural and different things and the fire system would be for the non-drinkable water. 18 19 But have you had any considerations, and 20 because you're talk I think 960,000 gallons a day of 21 water and just 690 of nonpotable water. Just a huge 22 amount of water that is going to be used on a daily 23 basis when this project gets built out. 24 If there is any thought of having in each

of the houses, which I know plumbing is really

expensive, but if there -- would there be anything there which would benefit the community, benefit the homeowner, benefit everybody of having like your toilet to be serviced by non-drinkable water? You could have your faucets outside. You could have options. Obviously your kitchen needs to be drinkable water.

Have there been any considerations as we reduce our natural resources by population growth of any consideration in that regard with a dual system or is that being considered, or is that just outside and too expensive to think about?

THE WITNESS: No, the dual system, we only provide potable water where it's necessary. So your spigots outside, all your landscaping water, all the areas that are nonpotable, would be on what we call "ag water".

So it would be very specific, and as we get down into the development process, we will be able to answer that question exactly by how many units and how many different gallons a day that means. 900,000 comes from the county standard per household per day times the amount of units we have.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you for the consideration in that regard. Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions? 2 Mr. Geiger, redirect? 3 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. GEIGER: 5 You were asked the question by State Office 6 of Planning about whether or not there was a plan in 7 place or agreement in place with the County concerning traffic. 8 9 I just want to clarify that testimony. 10 There's been discussions, but it's my understanding 11 that there's no agreement in place, correct? 12 Α No, discussions only. 13 And you were also asked if you were in 14 agreement with the conditions that the State had 15 proposed generally, correct? 16 Α Yes. 17 And you recognize one of the conditions is that there has to be some memorandum of understanding 18 19 or memorandum of agreement about the traffic, 20 correct? 21 A Yes. 22 MR. GEIGER: Thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, Mr. Atherton. 24 Next witness, please. 25 MR. GEIGER: We would call Bill Mitchell.

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in,
2	please?
3	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
4	you're about to give is the truth?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can you please state
7	your name?
8	THE WITNESS: My name is Bill Mitchell.
9	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Geiger, please
10	proceed.
11	BILL MITCHELL
12	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
13	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
14	and testified as follows:
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. GEIGER:
17	Q How are you familiar with the Waikapu
18	Country Town Project?
19	A I am project landscape architect.
20	Q Did you have any other familiarity, or what
21	else did you do?
22	A Also land planner as well as landscape
23	architect.
24	Q Did you prepare written direct testimony in
25	this matter?

- 1 A Yes, I did.
- 2 Q I'm going to hand you a document, which is 3 entitled your written testimony, is that correct?
- 4 A Yes.

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Does your signature appear on the last page?
- 7 A Yes, it does.
 - Q Do you have any modifications or corrections or additions to the testimony?
- 10 A No.
 - Q Again, as with the last witness, I don't want you to read your testimony, but tell the Commission the important parts of the testimony from your perspective as to their decision-making process.
- 15 A Certainly, thank you.
 - Good morning, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to share with you a little bit about the project.
 - I think Mr. Atherton and the other testifiers have done an excellent job in sort of summarizing many of the qualities and the attributes of the project.
 - We do have a copy -- I think you're familiar with the project master plan up here on the board. And just, again, orienting you to the project

located here in the existing Waikapu Corridor along the Honoapi'ilani Highway. To the north is Wailuku, to the south is Maalaea. Two lopes to the project, a mauka and makai portion, you can see here separated by the agricultural lands to the south, and then the rural lands and agricultural areas to the west of the mauka portion of the project.

What really has made this project unique as you -- if you read my testimony, is the ability to incorporate a lot of open space and walkability, open space corridors to make the community really accessible to people without having to get into their automobiles to get to services, to get to recreational portions of the project.

A couple things I might point out is we have the main corridor from what is the existing Maui Tropical Plantation, right here (indicating), a main street corridor that runs east/west. Then we have a parkway corridor that runs north and south.

And the uniqueness of this project also is set up by Mr. Atherton's vision to take what is now a really wonderful amenity to Maui County, Maui Tropical Plantation, and really build the town center around that.

And that town center would then occur in

the master plan here (indicating) that's where the Maui Tropical Plantation is.

As you can see, and as described in my testimony and the master plan and the FEIS documents, the housing surround these open space corridors, and really creates not only a walkable community, but a community that's desirable to live in, just because there is open space around it, which is not always the case in new developments. And Mr. Atherton's vision of creating landscape and open space and park space has made this project pretty exciting for myself as a landscape architect and planner to see and be involved in.

So we appreciate that opportunity, and I'd be happy to take any of your questions.

Q Thank you, Bill. No further questions. We would offer again the same thing as with Mr.

Atherton, his written direct testimony, offer it as next exhibit in order which would be 37.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: County?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HOPPER: No objection, and we don't have questions.

MS. APUNA: No objection to the exhibit and no questions.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, do you

have any objections to Exhibit 37? If not, it needs to be put in the record.

(Petitioner's Exhibit 37 was received into evidence.)

Commissioners, any questions? Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Have to make up for lost time.

In your -- in this concept that I'm envisioning from what I've read and what I've seen when we did our site visit, in your efforts to be able to move people on foot or on bicycle or non-car, non-automobile type methods, is there a way to be able to -- in your area, not knowing what is mauka and makai, so that lower portion then you've got that main roadway that kind of bisects your entire project, is that your pathway, but is there a way to get across that main highway of yours, without having to go through a stoplight or a round-about, is there a way under or over?

If I was on my bicycle, could my kids bicycle across there without me thinking they're going to get run over by a speeding bullet?

THE WITNESS: That's a good question, and it is being studied. I don't have an answer. That

is something we will work with DOT in options, if possible, to create a way to get either under or over the highway.

We do anticipate that section of highway to be much slower design speeds. But that is part of the plan is to be able to easily access the mauka and makai portions on foot or bicycle.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I think I read some of it, but it's hard to keep it all straight, considering a lot of round-abouts as opposed to stoplights.

THE WITNESS: That's correct. They're effectively proven. They work well. They're traffic calming, and they're also a landscape amenity. So it's kind of a win/win. So we're using those and incorporating those in the project where we can.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions,
Commissioners? Redirect, Mr. Geiger?

MR. GEIGER: No redirect.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you, sir. Next witness, please.

MR. GEIGER: Our next will be on traffic,

Mr. Netai Basu.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth?

1	THE WITNESS: I do.
2	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can you please state
3	your name?
4	THE WITNESS: Netai Basu.
5	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please proceed.
6	NETAI BASU
7	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
8	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
9	and testified as follows:
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. GEIGER:
12	Q Good morning. How are you familiar with
13	the Waikapu Country Town Project?
14	A I've been engaged since 2013 in traffic
15	planning and traffic impact analysis to this project.
16	Q The court reporter may want you to talk
17	into the microphone, since she's already busted me
18	twice this morning.
19	A I've been engaged since 2013 in traffic
20	planning and traffic impact analysis for this
21	project.
22	Q Did you prepare written direct testimony
23	for this project?
24	A I did.
25	Q I'm going to hand you a document and ask

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

you: Is that your written direct testimony?

2 A It is.

- Q And does your signature appear on the last page?
 - A It does.
 - Q And this was already submitted to the Commission but do you have any additions or corrections you need to make to the written direct testimony?
 - A I don't.
 - Again, as with the other witnesses, just asking you to please highlight for them your testimony, the things that you believe will be helpful in making their decision on this District Boundary Amendment.
 - A Well, very good.
 - Thank you and good morning. I appreciate the chance to come before you today. I trust you can hear me.
 - Traffic impacts associated with this project in connection with the other developments in the area and the existing level background traffic is plainly of interest to the community and to your group, and it was to me professionally.
- In the testimony I've laid out all the

steps we took as the project manager, leader of our company since the project, and we took through the analytical process, so I won't go through all that right now. I'll give you a quick overview of some of the steps we took, and if you want to talk about any of that further, go ahead and ask questions.

The first thing we did was look at trip generation overall of the proposed development because that gives us an idea of the magnitude of traffic.

And then we looked at the site plan working with Bill and Mike Summers, we provided comments on access and circulation, and as they described it went through several iterations as the project developed over the years.

I visited the site. Traveled through

Central Maui. Looked at the neighboring areas which are under development or planned for development to get a sense of the context in which this new development in this neighborhood would be built.

Arranged for new baseline traffic data to be collected at the study intersections. Wrote a detailed memorandum to Planning and Public Works and DOT, laying out what we thought was the right scope of the traffic study, enumerating the assumptions

regarding background growth for different development.

Roadway improvements, what plans had been funded. What should be assumed in regards to both of those. And what the horizon years for the study. So all of this we did an early pre-consultation, laying out the parameters of the study before we did it.

Then we went through and executed that. We were fortunate that we were able to obtain the State's travel, the main forecasting model for the island.

Islandwide computerized traffic model. We looked at that. We added detail, both in terms of the land use and the network in the Central Maui area, because like any countywide model, it may not have sufficient detail right in the area where we what to look.

So we added that network detail. Compared the volumes in there against the baseline volumes, and we were convinced that this tool would do a good job of projecting traffic and analyzing traffic.

Cumulative development projects. Comments was made about some of the other projects nearby which were planned and the magnitude of. Based on the detailed review of information from County

Planning and the other TIAR's, TA's, and TIS's that we were able to obtain, we included roads from over 40 projects in the Central Maui area, as well as other ones elsewhere in the islands.

Among those are Waiale, Maui Lani, Kea

Lani, and Pu'unani residences -- and this is all

documented in the traffic impact analysis report, but
each one is included in its entirety except for

Pu'unani residences which we assumed to be 40 percent
built out by 2026, because that's a long-term project
as we understood it, so we didn't include all of
that.

The County has a level of service standard D, seeking to maintain or achieve ALISH D as a metric of operational efficiency for traffic.

So we took that as a threshold of significance. If an intersection is projected to operate at E or F, we look for ways to mitigate that back to D or better.

There's a limited number of tools in the toolbox to do this, because the level of service is based on traffic volume at a certain intersection with certain characteristics. So we looked at roadway widening, whether it's additional through lanes or turning lanes, signal timing, techniques or

phasing techniques, introducing a protective left-turn lane, for instance, can reduce overall delays if that's one of the critical moves.

our study.

In the Draft EIR -- I'm sorry, Draft EIS, the assumption was that the Waiale bypass would be in place. It was assumed to -- we talked to a lot of different people. There was not concrete certainty but it seemed like that's an assumption when we get

So there's certain things that can be done.

So the forecast in the Draft EIS are based on that bypass being constructed.

There were six intersections which were found to be operating ALISH at E or F. Of those, even without the addition of the Waikapu Country Town Project, five were forecasted to be operating at -- (indecipherable).

So it's the combined effect, the existing, cumulative development and this project together which leads to forecast conditions.

This is the way these studies are done.

We identified a series of mitigations which could achieve ALISH D or better at each one of the impacted locations, documented those, and recommended certain ones to be made by this development, certain

other ones to be made by other developments based on fair share calculations we made.

That was the recommendation, not conclusion. It was a point of discussion to carry this further.

Following review of public comments from the Draft EIS, it was decided that it was appropriate to go ahead and do a whole new analysis scenario without that extension of Waiale Road in place. So what did that. That's included in the Final EIS.

And found that instead of six intersections which would need mitigation, there were nine. Now of those nine, there were four which require more mitigation. One which requires less. And four for which the improvements would be the same, similar.

I'll take a moment to go through the four which require more mitigation. Would you like to see a slide pointing to these?

CHAIRPERSON WONG: If the Commissioners don't mind, I wouldn't mind seeing a slide, please.

While we are waiting for the slide, sir, what's -- can you explain what level D, E and F mean?

THE WITNESS: Back to grade school or college, there is a letter grade that was assigned for many years, it's used in transportation planning

```
1
      assessment, A through F. A being free flow,
2
     uncongested, minimal delay for all approaches. F
 3
     being overcapacity. At least one approach will have
 4
     to wait for more than one cycle for all the vehicles
5
     to clear. And it's based on average vehicle delay at
6
     the intersection whether it's stop controlled or
7
      signalized.
                So A, B, C, D, comfortable, E and F, more
8
9
     delay for parties traveling on the road.
10
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you.
11
                THE WITNESS: Thank you, Jim, for putting
12
     this up.
13
                VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Can we clarify what
14
     exhibit we are looking at?
15
                THE WITNESS: This is Figure A from the
16
     TIAR, which is appended to the EIS. I think also
17
     Figure 1, I put it in the Executive Summary as well.
18
                In this figure north is up. And this road
19
      is Honoapiilani Highway, Route 30, and this is
20
     Kuihelani. Here's the project site (indicating).
21
                So we analyzed four intersections along
22
     Maui Lani Parkway and along Waiale Road, and several
23
     within and adjacent to the site and further down here
24
      (indicating).
```

So we tried -- we scoped this out in a way

25

that we were looking for impacts, where we thought they might occur and be directly related to this project.

This is (indecipherable) -- where the Waiale bypass would be.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Can you point that out again?

THE WITNESS: (Indicating.)

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Okay, thank you.

THE WITNESS: Today Waiale Road stops at the creek, at Waiko Road it T's off. The bypass will be just about a mile long. But what it would do effectively is create a third corridor for northbound traffic through the central part of the island.

Because today there are two arterials, and this would be a major collector, a third route.

It's been in many plans over the years and it seemed like the right thing to assume.

So to come back to where I left off, thank you for suggesting I put up this figure.

Four intersections which would need more mitigation are at each end of the Waiale bypass. The assumption is that if the Waiale bypass were built, each end of it would be signalized. We reviewed the EIS and prepared for that. And that was a part of

that project, that the roadway would be built along that approximate alignment, and each end of it would be signalized. So in the width bypass scenario, that was a baseline condition.

If the Waiale bypass is not built to achieve ALISH D or better, those intersections would still need to be signalized. Those are two locations where more mitigation would be needed without the bypass in place.

The other two, one is at Kuihelani and Honoapiilani, the northern most intersections (indecipherable) -- and Honoapiilani. The TIAR recommended modifying the eastbound and westbound approaches to provide a single left through and a right from the conditions that had been in place in 2013, and dual southbound left-turn lanes to go into the new development makai side of the road.

Since that time, the County has improved the east and westbound approaches to provide a single left through and a right, but the dual left-turn lane has not been implemented.

If the bypass were not there, to achieve ALISH D we identified certain other improvements, a northbound dual right-turn lane and also modifications to the westbound approach, dual turn

lanes, plus the through lane.

And that we felt -- we looked at available maps and identified a likely need to acquire right-of-way at that point to fully implement that. If that right-of-way couldn't be obtained, then that improvement couldn't be fully made. But if it were ALISH D would be achieved.

The last location where there is more mitigation is just north of the project site at Waiko Road and Honoapiilani. If the bypass were in place, no improvement would be needed to that to achieve or improve ALISH D, there was no impact. But without the Waiale bypass in place, the traffic which that would be carrying would have to travel on one of the other available parallel routes, leading to a finding of a deficit there.

So we have I identified improvements to the eastbound and westbound approaches to reconfigure the westbound/eastbound, and then to widen the westbound approach. And also to widen the northbound approach and departure to carry a second through lane.

The right-of-way there on the east leg, the makai lane, is 47 to 50 feet wide, and we don't think that is sufficient for that improvement.

So that's the other place where it looks

like right-of-way would be needed if that were to be fully implemented.

And I can talk about the other improvements if you like, or any other aspect of the traffic study.

One other thing I wanted to, based on comments I heard this morning, and it's already been spoken to, but I wanted to point out, in the TIAR we assumed 146 ohana units were developed, and treated them as apartments, rather than as single-family homes, so second units.

I'm available for questions if you like.

Q (By Mr. Geiger): I have a couple of follow ups.

I think it's in your testimony, but is it correct that in your traffic studies you also analyzed these other projects, the Maui Lani, Kea Lani, Pu'unani and Waialae project?

A Yes, indeed.

Q And I think there was a question of an earlier witness about handling pedestrian crossing over Honoapiilani Highway. Any consideration into that?

A Yes, and before we get to that, let me augment my answer just now.

As part of the consideration of those four projects spoken of, we reviewed the EIS's,

Environmental Assessment TIARs for them as the case may have been, and pulled out as much detailed information about each of the projects as proposed or approved as we could find in terms of location of that development within the project area, roadway improvements right in that neighborhood.

So we did our best to accurately represent them based on the information available to us.

To answer your second question, yes. And I have some slides that I can share with you.

Commissioner Cabral, I think you asked the question about helping people get across the road.

Why don't we? Here we do. Come back to this one, please.

I hope everyone can see, this is a figure of the site plan where we lettered five locations, A, B, C, D and E. A, B and D are among the three -- 14 analyzed intersections in our study. They're proposed to be fully signalized. Intersection E off to the east is proposed to be a round-about; and intersection C -- B -- C, intersection B is not. So that would be a mid-block crossing. So that would be the kind of thing that I think you're speaking to

especially.

Let's skip ahead to the next slide. This is an aerial photograph of a fully-improved signalized intersection showing crosswalks, and there would be pedestrian head walk/don't walk signals, and pedestrian movements would be controlled by the signal. We're all familiar with this. This is in a lot of ways considered the highest level of pedestrian protection. There are certain timing techniques and other things that can be done, but this is typical.

Three of those five locations are proposed to be signalized. At mid-block crossing

Honoapi'ilani Highway this would not be. There is certain things that can be done, and we definitely recommend and intend to work with DOT to find the right solution for this.

High visibility crosswalk with advance warning signs, yield markings on the pavement, potentially a pedestrian refuge. If there were four six-lane roads, we would definitely recommend considering that, not necessary for two-lane road. Skip ahead.

Here we see the sharks teeth indicating pedestrian crossing up. There is the crosswalk, and

here's a solar powered rapid repeating rectangular beacon, which is one of the pedestrian enhancements that can be made to improve safety.

It's basically a pedestrian signal.

Pedestrian presses the button and the lights will flash yellow alerting drivers that there is some activity there and they should be extra caution.

There is another pedestrian signal called a hawk where there's two red balls above the yellow, and this is used in many locations for the same purpose. It's not a full traffic signal, but it's a pedestrian warning signal. And it tells the drivers that there's pedestrians there and they have priority.

These are among the treatments that we would expect to work with DOT and the County to get to -- to find the right solution for this location.

The suggestion was made about an under-crossing or over-crossing, and it's been my experience that pedestrians will take their choice path, and if there is an over-crossing available and at grade crossing available, unless there's a fence or some insurmountable barrier, the grade separation will go unused largely.

But it's a possibility too. It's another

89 1 treatment, but based on what I know now, it doesn't 2 seem necessary there. 3 MR. GEIGER: I have nothing further. 4 think we've already offered the testimony in. 5 CHAIRPERSON WONG: County? MR. HOPPER: So the testimony, we have no 6 7 objection to the testimony, obviously. MR. GEIGER: It's the next exhibit in order 8 9 would be his written testimony which we would offer 10 as 38. 11 MR. HOPPER: I have no objection. I just 12 had a few questions on cross-examination. 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. HOPPER: 15 Could you point out again Waiale bypass 16 road that you discussed in your plan? Where the 17

bypass would be?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is a good figure. It's on the eastern or the makai perimeter of the project site of the developed area. It forms essentially the boundary between the ag land and developed area. I can point to that if you like.

- Just for the Commissioners benefit.
- The northern edge of the site is Waiale Street.

1

2

Q Thank you.

3456

And then in your discussion you said in the Draft EIS you had assumed that that road would be constructed at the time of the project build out, but that in your receiving comments and Final EIS, you had decided to create an alternative where that road would not be built at the time the project was

8

9

7

A That's correct.

constructed; is that correct?

10

11

12

Q To do this -- in doing so, though, you assumed a sort of a worse-case scenario where if that road was not built, that there would be adequate mitigation measures at least to deal with that road

the growth within this project and surrounding area,

all of the other network improvements elsewhere, the

only thing different was the lack of this connection

so that Waiale would continue to T-off as it does

today. We developed an alternative mitigation

program for that scenario, yes.

In the second scenario we assumed all of

1314

15

not being there?

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

Q And I don't know if you're familiar with the County's proposed conditions, but it sounds like in general the plan is going to be to have the specific improvements that will be done by the

developer memorialized in agreement with the County for County roadways, and the State or State roadways, generally speaking; is that your understanding?

A Understanding and expectation, yes, both.

Q And those would be appropriate conditions to have on the project to require those agreements to be entered into?

A Yes.

Q And then also the issue has been discussed a bit about comprehensive review of Central Maui traffic with not just this project, but other projects.

Do you think that that would be an appropriate endeavor in order to study for sort of the various projects as a group in conjunction with the State, County and perhaps the Maui Metropolitan Planning Organization to do a comprehensive review of the Central Maui traffic issue; do you think that would be a worthwhile endeavor?

A Do it comprehensively at not just this project but several others that are mentioned, but everything all taken together?

O Yes.

A Yes. I think that it could be difficult to tie some of the improvements back to projects which

may be fully entitled already, if there are any of 1 2 those, but certainly for projects in the pipeline, as 3 it were, this is a way too tie those improvements to 4 those projects. 5 Thank you. I have no further questions for 6 the witness. 7 CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP. 8 MS. APUNA: No questions. 9 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Okay, for Exhibit 38? 10 MS. APANA: No objection to Exhibit 38. 11 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, any 12 objections to Exhibit 38? Exhibit 38 is moved into 13 the record. 14 (Petitioner's Exhibit 38 was received into 15 the record.) 16 Commission, do you have any questions? No. 17 Thank you. Do you have redirect? MR. GEIGER: No redirect. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Let's take a one-hour break for lunch now so we can warm up and 20 have lunch. 21 22 (Noon recess taken.) 23 CHAIRPERSON WONG: We're back on record. 24 Mr. Geiger, do you have your next witness, please? 25 MR. GEIGER: We do, but I understand you

1	wanted to hear from the last witness.
2	CHAIRPERSON WONG: That's okay.
3	MR. GEIGER: Then our next witness would be
4	Michael Summers.
5	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Summers, may I swear
6	you in, please?
7	THE WITNESS: Sure.
8	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you swear or affirm
9	that the testimony you're about to give is the truth?
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Will you please state
12	your name for the record?
13	THE WITNESS: Michael Summers.
14	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Geiger.
15	MICHAEL SUMMERS
16	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
17	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
18	and testified as follows:
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. GEIGER:
21	Q Good afternoon, Mike. How are you familiar
22	with the Waikapu Country Town Project?
23	A I've been working on this project since
24	about 2008, and have been involved in the master
25	planning, but also the EIS or that document and the

- agricultural impact assessment and the sustainability 1 2 plan.
- 3 Did you prepare a written direct testimony in this matter. Yes, I did?
 - I'm going to hand you a document. Is that your written direct testimony?
 - Α Yes, it is.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Does your signature appear on the last page?
- Α Yes, it does.
- You signed that back in late October, early November. Do you have any additions, corrections or modifications to that?
 - Α No, I do not.
 - As with the other witnesses, I don't want you to read the testimony, but please address the Commissioners and let them know the information you think is important for their decisionmaking.
- Thank you very much.
 - Let me begin by thanking you all for your service, and thank you for the time you've invested into this project.
 - I'm going to really just touch on two issues. One would be providing some kind of rational or justification for the proposed urbanization; and

then I'm going to speak briefly to the project sustainability plan.

And as you're familiar, the whole process of getting a District Boundary Amendment from Agricultural land to Rural or Urban land is a very rigorous process, and there are a number of criteria that need to be addressed, so I'm just going to speak to kind of four of these very major kind of criteria, they cross different paths and different sections of various HRS statute.

Of the four really significant criteria would be: Does this request conform with State and County policies?

And the second one would be: Is the request going to have a very significant impact on the availability of agricultural lands?

Third important criteria would be: Will this request have significant impact upon the agricultural industry?

And finally: Is the request appropriate in the context of planning for future urban growth? Is it suitable for urbanization?

Let me just kind of briefly touch upon those four criteria. With respect to conformance with State and County policy, as you're familiar in

the FEIS there's a very, very thorough assessment of how the project complies with the Hawaii State Plan and the various Functional Plans, and as noted, the project will result in the urbanization of ALISH Agricultural lands.

But in doing so the Urbanization, the proposed Urbanization is addressing some very important needs of the community, namely providing for housing and economic development.

So then the issue becomes, when carrying out this development of housing, providing for economic development, are you doing it in a manner that protects the environment? And are you doing it in a manner that preserves natural resources?

Those are very, very important components for the Hawaii State Plan and the Functional Plan.

And I think in the FEIS document, while acknowledging we are impacting our agricultural land, we're serving as very important goals in the jacket of the Hawai'i State Plan.

With respect to County policy, one of the most important criteria would be: Does this request comply with the Maui Island Plan. The Maui Island Plan was adopted in December of 2012, and it establishes a directed growth strategy for the County

```
1
     of Maui. I don't know if we have a slide of that.
2
                So if you look at this, the Maui Island
 3
      Plan is really very instrumental from a policy
 4
     perspective with respect to this project, because it
5
      does a couple of things.
 6
                One, it establishes the planned growth.
7
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Excuse me. What is this
8
     document? Where is it from?
9
                THE WITNESS: This is actually from the
10
     Maui Island Plan.
11
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Is it part of an
12
     exhibit?
13
                THE WITNESS: Yeah, and it's incorporated
14
     into our FEIS.
15
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: What number or
16
     Exhibit 1?
17
                THE WITNESS: I don't recall the exact
      figure in the FEIS, but we can find that out for you.
18
19
                This is a planning map that is in the Maui
      Island Plan. I added a few -- essentially this is
20
21
     the planned growth area that was established in the
22
      County of Maui for the project, for both the Urban
23
      land and Rural land.
24
                And this is important because this is
25
     actually the Agricultural Preserve that was
```

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

established by the County of Maui for this project.

So as you can see, this project is implementing the Maui Island Plan both in the context of addressing development needs for Urban and Rural lands, and also for protecting Agricultural lands.

Now, the Maui Island Plan is also important for the fact that it really represented a major effort over about six years of rigorous technical analysis and community outreach.

Now, the second issue as far as criteria would be concerned would be to look at how would this impact the availability of Agricultural lands. And so, you know, we did prepare an Agricultural Impact Assessment, and obviously the project will lead to Urbanization of Agricultural lands.

But then will the project essentially limit the availability of Agricultural lands to an extent where it would have a negative impact for future generations?

And in our ag impact assessment we looked at a variety of different factors. One of the factors was the availability on Maui Island of LSB ALISH A, B and C lands, which is high quality Agricultural land. We found the proposed request represents about one half of one percent of currently

undeveloped A, B and C lands.

Now, relative to State Agricultural
District lands, we found that the proposed
Urbanization represents about one-fifth of one
percent of Agricultural District lands on Maui.

So clearly Urbanization of the land are not significantly impacting the availability of resource land for future generations.

So then the third question becomes: Well, are you impacting the Agricultural industry? And as discussed in the Agricultural Impact Assessment, the project will not impact the Agricultural industry for a variety of reasons, most important being that there are approximately 1,077 acres that will remain in Agriculture, and of this land, approximately 800 acres is being set aside as Agricultural Preserve that will be protected in perpetuity. The other 77 acres, which are kind of the mauka land -- so this red line here (indicating) shows the 800 acre Agricultural Preserve. And these other lands in here (indicating) represent the 277 acres of ag lands.

Now, as the Applicant noted, the Applicant is committed to limiting the subdivision potential on those mauka ag lands to know more than five lots.

And bear in mind, there's no proposition to subdivide

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

those lots anyway, but the ag preserve lands, there will be no development of housing on those lands.

Now, the reason it's important to establish an Agricultural Preserve is because what it does is it reduces or eliminates the pressure for Urbanization.

When you take away the pressure for Urbanization, you allow the land owner to not only feel comfortable making a long-term lease, but generally you take away the pressure that might build upon a landowner to have higher lease rents.

Essentially farmers become much more interested in investing in agriculture, because that is essentially the only available economic use for those lands. That's very important for the agricultural industry.

So then the final question becomes: Is this location appropriate for Urbanization? And quite clearly the County of Maui in its development of its Maui Island Plan felt this was an important location for Urban development.

To the north you have the town of Waikapu, and to the east, you have lands that were recently acquired by the County for a large regional park and community facilities. Just beyond the county land,

you have the approved already entitled Waiale

Community, and to the west you have the West Maui

mountains, which will remain undeveloped and largely

open space. And to the south beyond the proposed

urbanization, you have the 800-acre Agricultural

Preserve.

And you also have created essentially a nice separation between the community of Ma'alaea and Waikapu, and that was a policy that, not only is in the Maui Island Plan, but it's also something that the community felt very strongly about.

So in summary, while the request will result in the Urbanization of Agricultural land, the proposed change in land use is in conformance with State and County policies. It will not significantly impact the availability of Agricultural resource lands. It will facilitate agricultural development. And the location as determined by the County through the Maui Island Plan process is appropriate for Urbanization.

Let me just quickly speak to the

Applicant's Sustainability Plan. The Applicant is

very much committed to implementing sustainability

practices. And the Sustainability Plan essentially

looks at energy conservation, water conservation,

protecting surface and groundwater resources, reducing solid waste generation, protecting agricultural resource land, and promoting health and wellness.

Applicant will proceed with include mitigating automobile use through smart community design, promoting walking, bicycling, and transit use by investing in those facilities. Establishing the Agricultural Preserve. Establishing a riparian buffer along the Waikapu River. Developing a dual water system for potable water irrigation uses.

Implementing renewable energy programs which may include rooftop solar and ground solar farms; and implementing BMP's to capture and treat runoff, including bio-retention to facilitate groundwater recharge.

So anyway, that's my testimony, but I have -- do have a few other little points I would like to make with respect to prior testimony.

And one of those just has to deal with the issue of the ohana units. And I know this was raised by Dick Mayer in his testimony.

So just to add a little bit more explanation there. We are dealing with a 146 ohana

units. That is what was presented in the EIS. The ohana units were addressed in the traffic study, and they were addressed in the assessment of water demand and wastewater demand, the infrastructure kind of demand.

Now, in the Draft EIS, the population impact of the ohana units was not addressed, and we agreed with Dick's comment that they should have been addressed. So we incorporated that into the Final EIS, and we also updated our assessment of the ohana units impact of parks and community facilities like police and fire.

Now, the ohana units, in our Project

District Ordinance, we will have a limit of 146

permitted ohana units, and there will be standards

most likely that replicate the County standards, for which lots qualify ohana units.

So that's how that will be addressed. I don't believe I have anything else to speak to.

Q For the Commission's reference, the first slide was Figure 1B in Appendix G. And I don't have any further questions. Thank you, Mike.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: What is this one going to be?

MR. GEIGER: This one is actually Figure

16, it looks like 16, but I think --1 2 THE WITNESS: It's in the FEIS. All those 3 figures are listed in the FEIS. Maybe I didn't speak 4 to that. That is our agricultural kind of master 5 plan, and that was in the FEIS. 6 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Just wanted to say that 7 because we have a court reporter, we have to state what figure is being shown. And I'm looking at -- I 8 think it's Figure 26. 9 10 MR. GEIGER: While Mike is checking on that, I would offer as our next exhibit, which would 11 12 be Exhibit 39, Mike's direct written testimony. 13 CHAIRPERSON WONG: While we are waiting, 14 County, any objection to the exhibit? 15 MR. HOPPER: No objection. 16 MS. APUNA: No objection. 17 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, any objection on this exhibit? So Exhibit 39 is now put 18 19 into the record. Thank you. 20 (Petitioner's Exhibit 39 was received into 21 evidence.) 22 THE WITNESS: So, yeah, in the FEIS that 23 would be -- in the Final FEIS, this is Figure 26A. 24 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. 25 County, do you have any questions?

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

MR. HOPPER: Just a few, Mr. Chair.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. HOPPER:

Q Could you go back to the directed growth map that showed the growth boundaries? Could you explain a bit about what the growth boundaries mean for the Land Use Commission's benefit?

A Sure. And I'm sure Mr. Spence can add to this, you know, but essentially the growth boundaries that were developed, and in this case this is actually a small town growth boundary, were developed by Maui County in an attempt to understand where the most suitable locations for future Urban and Rural development would be in the context of population growth that was projected through 2030.

So they have an entire chapter that deals with establishing land use policies and guidelines to help make those kinds of decisions, but what they did was, they identified the growth boundaries, and then they developed an allocation of units to those growth boundaries based upon, you know, standards for livability.

And our project, or this project, is a portion, accommodates a portion of the projected growth on Maui, in this case 1433 units. The area of

the island -- let me just say, the population that needed to be accommodated outside of already entitled areas was about 10,500 units, if I recall correctly. So we're accommodating about 1433 of those 10,500 units.

And this was a process that Maui County went through for a number of years involving technical studies and community outreach. I don't know if that makes sense, is that addresses your question.

Q I also wanted to identify, for the record, the map Figure 1B from Appendix 9G -- I'm sorry, Appendix G, as previous stated, just for the court reporter. We have all seen it, but just for the court reporter.

So essentially the growth boundaries would mean, according to the plan, this area is approved for the development as proposed?

A Well, it's approved in the context of the Maui Island Plan, but there are entitlement changes that we need to go through with the County, including a community plan amendment and a change in zoning.

Yes, it's from a policy perspective, we're implementing the policy of the Maui Island Plan.

Q Just for the purposes of the document Maui

Island Plan, this project is recognized as a project that's in the plan, that's been put into the plan, essentially?

A That's correct.

Q The County of Maui provided, in its exhibit, I believe Exhibit 2, the other additional excerpts from the Maui Island Plan -- actually Exhibit 1, additional exhibits from the Maui Island Plan, and in that plan there is actually a reference to a project called The Waikapu Tropical Plantation Town. Is that this project?

A Yes, that's correct. Well, that description would describe the Island Plan's vision for this project area.

Q Thank you.

So not only is -- does the plan include district growth boundaries, but actually specific reference to the plan itself?

A That's right.

Q Additionally, could you expound a bit on the additional entitlement the project will need should the District Boundary Amendment be approved?

A Yes. So should we be approved for this
District Boundary Amendment, then the next step would
be to essentially get a Community Plan Amendment,

because the project area for the most part is in Agriculture and Project District 5, which is Maui Tropical Plantation, so we would need to get Community Plan Amendment, and then need to get a change in zone, and we will be pursuing a Project District Application for the change in zoning.

And that will be a process or require us to go to the Maui Planning Commission and the Maui County Council.

Q And are you familiar with the proposed conditions by the County of Maui for this project?

A Yes.

Q Condition one, I just wanted to read that, as proposed states that: The Petitioner shall develop the project in substantial compliance with the planned growth area rational and goals and objectives, policies and implementing action described in the Maui Island Plan for the project known as Waikapu Tropical Plantation Town.

Do you believe that's an appropriate condition for this project?

A Yes.

Q The last question. You stated that in your Proposed Project District Ordinance, you had planned to actually limit the ohana units allowed to 146, so

that even if normal county zoning for residential, 1 2 for example, would allow ohana units, Project 3 District Ordinance would not allow more than 4 146 units? 5 A We're acceptable to that. 6 I just wanted to make sure that was a 7 representation you made? Ohana units, yes. We represented that we 8 9 would have a 146 ohana units, and that's what we plan 10 on implementing. 11 Thank you. I have no further questions. 12 CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP. MS. APUNA: We don't object Exhibit 39. 13 14 I do have questions. 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. APUNA: 16 17 Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Summers. 18 I have a few questions. 19 For the record, can you state the ag 20 quality of the petition land? 2.1 Sure. I don't have my study in front of 22 me, but the great bulk of the land is ALISH land, and 23 Land Study Bureau A and B. 24 And for the 800-acre ag preserve, what is Q 25 the ag quality for that, or is it the same?

Yeah, it's the same ALISH for the most 1 2 part, A and B. 3 And then you said that there would be no 4 housing within the 800-acre ag preserve. Does that include farm dwellings? 5 6 There will be no farm dwellings in the ag. 7 Thank you. Q CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, do we 8 9 have any questions for the witness? Commissioner 10 Cabral. VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'm confused, I'm sure, 11 12 because you just referenced it, but I made notes on some of it -- that's part of why I'm confused. 13 14 My understanding, as you just referenced 15 that the petition area is located in what you call 16 Wailuku-Kahului Community Plan, and that was from 17 2002 or something. And you're within the community 18 plan, but you're not in compliance with the region 19 community plan. Yet earlier you said that this 20 project is in compliance with the Island Plan. 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Those are two different

THE WITNESS: That's correct. Island Plan essentially is the Island's directed growth strategy.

groups, different plans, different entities?

23

24

25

Like a land use plan for the entire Island of Maui.

And the Community Plan is a more -- it's a separate document, has not been updated. The Island Plan was completed in 2012, like you mentioned, the Community Plan in 2002.

At some point in time the County of Maui will update the Wailuku-Kahului Community Plan. As we go through this process in a sense we will be updating the Wailuku-Kahului Community Plan to conform to the Maui Island Plan.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aloha. I have some questions about the Sustainability Plan.

Conceptually I'm trying to understand what it is.

This is not a normal -- not that it's a bad practice, but it's not a normal practice for a developer to propose a Sustainability Plan.

So like what actual function will it have during the course of developing the area?

THE WITNESS: That's a very good question.

You know, essentially the Sustainability
Plan is taking a look at the project from kind of a
different lens. How can we develop this project to

mitigate the project's impacts on natural resources and the environment as we obviously develop the project, but also as implemented over time, right.

So by proactively looking at these issues and putting forth a vision what specific policies and actions that you intend to implement or evaluate the implementation, then just like the master plan in the context of developing housing, you're moving forward on a concurrent track to minimize the other project's impacts.

So for example, energy use, right? You can use energy in the context of driving, and you can use energy in the context of heating or cooling your building. You can offset those energy demands by how you design your project to try to minimize automobile use, or how you design your buildings to try to limit the amount of energy that the structure consumes.

Likewise, you can say, okay, well, we can preserve energy through conservation, but might we also develop energy. So you can design your project develop energy through rooftop solar, or you can identify areas of the land that might be suitable for things like solar and develop -- that would just be one kind of direction looking at the energy side.

Now, you would do the same thing for water

use. You would do the same thing in the context of developing the project footprint in areas that minimizes impacts to cultural resources and natural resources.

But essentially, as we move through this process with the county, we will have a Project District Ordinance and Design Guidelines, and one of our chapters in the Design Guidelines will be the Sustainability Plan broken into more specific actions that we're going to be pursuing.

So, it's just recognizing the importance of environmental sustainability, and taking actions to mitigate your impact on the environment and natural resources.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: So I think at the very end of your explanation you got to what I think I was asking about, some version of the Sustainability Plan will be proposed as being incorporated into the Project District Guidelines and then adopted by ordinance by the Council?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, there will be a reference to the Design Guidelines in the Project District ordinance. They will be incorporated into the project's Design Guidelines and used as a daily kind of an implementation tool by the developer as

they move forward with the project.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: So to get a little more specific, I observed that because this is partially my professional work, a number of the proposed goals and objectives are non-quantified and aspirational rather than quantified and specific.

Could you comment on why you developed the Sustainability Plan without a sort of substantial set of quantified goals?

THE WITNESS: I think we do have a few quantified goals in the Sustainability Plan, but some of them are aspirational. And I think, you know, as we move forward and we look at -- look specifically at some of the implementing mechanisms to move forward with the Sustainability Plan, for example, low flow fixtures and things like that, we'll have a better understanding from a design perspective, you know, what that quantifiable kind of metric might be.

We can set a standard like let's try to mitigate our energy use by 25 percent, or let's conserve 30 percent of our water over traditional practice.

I don't think we are quite there yet in the context of the details to be able to make that kind of a statement at this time, but, you know, as we

move forward with the development of our Design

Guidelines, et cetera, we will be developing more

specific details.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I mean some places where there are quantified guidelines, for instance, your objective on page 18 of the Sustainability Plan, "Reduce the overall project demand for potable water use by 30 to 50 percent."

THE WITNESS: Let me just say the idea of using nonpotable water for irrigation, right. The County of Maui acknowledge that just doing that would limit your water demand by about 30 percent, so that 992,000 gallons per day would be 30 higher if we weren't committed to using nonpotable water.

Now, we say 30 to 50 percent because, might there be other things that we can do to further mitigate our water demand.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: 30 to 50 percent of what?

THE WITNESS: Of your 992,000 gallons times 1.3.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Regarding the irrigation, and if you want to defer to a later witness, my understanding from reading the Petition is that the dual-water system will actually rely on

groundwater for both systems; is that correct? Or is that incorrect understanding? Because they're five wells, two of which are being proposed for use in the potable system. My understanding the other three wells are providing groundwater to the nonpotable system.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's a good question.

This is where you kind of get into the details. If

you look at our study, we have a variety of different

sources of water. One being the nonpotable wells,

one being potable wells for potable water use.

We have also looked at, in the context of private wastewater reclamation facility, what might be the availability of reclaimed water for the site.

And then for the agriculture lands, we've taken a look at stream water. We have an application in for stream water.

So there is a variety of different water sources that would be used for nonpotable irrigation use, including the agricultural land. I wouldn't really feel comfortable going into much more detail than that. We might have somebody here that might be able to answer your questions.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Will there be somebody later?

1 MR. GEIGER: Yes, there will.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Then just a final question about the Sustainability Plan. Correct me if I'm wrong and I missed it. It sort of does not consider cultural issues as part of sustainability issues?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think that's a good question. I think our FEIS is very, very much grounded in protecting cultural resources. And, you know, I can't say that we have a specific cultural resources plan that we've developed separately for cultural resources. We talked about developing a cultural resources plan.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: This is more of a comment perhaps, but I think one of the reasons why testimony has been very supportive of this project is because despite the -- I mean, Waikapu is part of Na Wai Eha, it's a hugely cultural important area. At least conceptually, what is being proposed is an attempt to modernizing, try to have the Waikapu Country Town really engage and respect the cultural history of that area.

So I find it odd that in the Sustainability Plan it's as if the Sustainability Plan could exist for development in California or somewhere else. It

1 | doesn't really explicitly integrate the place.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think your comment is a very good comment. And, you know, we have a consultant who lives in Waikapu, who's been working with us on cultural issues. I think we kind of envisioned a stand-alone cultural resources plan. I don't know that we have gotten there yet developing it, but we certainly wouldn't be opposed to incorporating a section into our Sustainability Plan that memorializes some of those recommendations.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Not do go even farther beyond what I should have said, but just to make my final point clear. I think across Hawai'i where we have started to view cultural and natural resources not as distinct categories, but as an integrated whole, we have gotten a lot farther.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions? If not, do you have any redirect?

MR. GEIGER: No redirect. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Next witness please.

May I swear you in, please?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth?

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name
2	for the record.
3	THE WITNESS: Lisa Rotunno-Hazuka.
4	LISA ROTUNNO-HAZUKA
5	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
6	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
7	and testified as follows:
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. GEIGER:
10	Q Hi, Lisa, how are you?
11	A Good, thank you.
12	Q You're familiar with Waikapu Country Town
13	project?
14	A Yes.
15	Q You're familiar because you were the
16	archaeologists on the project?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Did you prepare a written direct testimony?
19	A Yes, we did.
20	Q And you also prepared the archaeological
21	report?
22	A Yeah.
23	Q I'm going to hand you what I hope is your
24	written direct testimony.
25	A Yes.

- 1 Q Is that your signature on the last page?
- 2 A Yes, it is.

- Q Did you have any modifications -- you signed it about a month ago. Did you have any modifications or changes or amendments?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q Identify by page number and line, if you would.
 - A On page three -- sorry, page 12, line 3 after the word "preserved", we would like to add in: "and with the implementation of monitoring", and then the rest, "as recommended in our report".
 - Q Thank you, Lisa.
 - As with the other witnesses, please don't read your testimony, but highlight for the Commissioners the portions of your work that you believe will be of assistance to them in making their decision.
 - A Good afternoon, Commissioners. We conducted an Archaeological Inventory Survey in 2013. And during our survey, we found four sites -- there was a total of five sites. One was a portion of Waihe'e Ditch, which was already present. And then we found four new sites that were comprised of sugar plantation, irrigation complex, a World War II

bunker, a retaining wall, and historic artifact scatter. And those sites were designated Site 7881 through 7884.

And the sugar plantation irrigation complex is a series of auwai or ditches. There's sluice gates and a reservoir.

Slight 7882 was the retaining wall, it's just a little L-shaped rock retaining wall that supports the soil along the slope.

Site 7883 was a World War II military bunker. And Site 7884 was the historic artifact scatter.

When we prepared our survey, for an area that's as large as this project as well as with all the sugarcane cultivation and some of the development, the first thing that we do is we go and do a real intensive background research. And what we try to do is focus the information that we've obtained from the background, and help decide where we're going to do testing in the project area.

And during the background research, we look at previous archaeological studies in the area, where they found their sites; what type of sites they found. And then we look at the historic information, where there are former Land Commission Awards,

Grants, and how the land was utilized.

And once we have that information, we try to compile everything onto a development map. And so we'll look at where development is going to occur; and what we found in our background research. Then we'll go out and we'll walk the area and see if there's remaining surface sites left. And if there's not, then we'll utilize that background research to try to decide where to do testing. And we focus the testing in areas where we hope to obtain the most positive results.

So during our background information we decided to focus most of the testing where the LCAs were. And we did about 150 trenches, and had maybe three that contained historic artifacts. So it was some broken bottle glass, and metal and some ceramic shards.

So that the backhoe trenching was primarily negative. Most of the sites that we found were the ones I discussed before, and they were on the surface.

So we do walk the whole area proposed for development. Everybody lines up, we're spaced maybe ten, 20 feet apart, and we just walk the entire project area. And, again, we only found those

1 surface sites.

That's basically about it. Because we had the negative results of testing, we will do intensive monitoring. So during construction, any time you have ground altering activities, we'll have one archaeological monitor per piece of equipment. So they'll stand by that person the whole time they're digging to make sure that no inadvertent finds are recovered.

Q Just a couple follow ups.

We don't have a monitoring plan developed written yet, but there is going to be a monitoring plan, correct?

A Yes. We will submit an archaeological monitoring plan as we proposed in the report. Once that's accepted, then we can proceed with the construction and the monitoring activities.

Q I have nothing further. But we would offer Lisa's written testimony as Exhibit 40. Again, that has been previously provided to the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: County, any objection?

MR. HOPPER: No objection, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP, do have any

objection?

MS. APUNA: No objection.

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commission, any
2	objection to Exhibit 40 with the changes that were
3	stated today? No objection. Exhibit 40 is submitted
4	to the record.
5	(Petitioner's Exhibit 40 was received into
6	evidence.)
7	CHAIRPERSON WONG: County do you have any
8	questions?
9	MR. HOPPER: No questions.
10	CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP?
11	MS. APUNA: Yes.
12	CROSS-EXAMINATION
13	BY MS. APUNA:
14	Q Thank you for your testimony. I have a
15	couple questions.
16	Were any burials found in the Petition
17	Area?
18	A No.
19	Q And first Site 7881, the irrigation
20	features, and 788, bunker, will a Preservation Plan
21	be in place prior to grading and construction?
22	A Yes. So we will develop the Monitoring
23	Plan as well as the Preservation Plan, and those must
24	be accepted before any permits can pulled, grading or
25	building.

1 Q Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, do you have any questions? Commissioner Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aloha. Can you explain briefly for us what your methodology was in selecting your trenching sites, particularly in reference to the Proposed Development Plan?

THE WITNESS: So we do look at the areas where there is proposed development. We also put trenches -- it's like an overlay. We look at the development, where the LCAs were, and we would focus our trenching in those areas, where there is LCA, and where a proposed development is. But we also want to get a representative sample of areas outside. If there weren't any LCAs or grants, we still wanted to test the area so that we could get a representative sample.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Did you look at areas where people applied for Land Commission Awards but were not awarded them?

THE WITNESS: Yes. All the LCAs and grants that we saw listed, it didn't matter if they were awarded or not, we still tried to test those.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: So you went through the records applications?

T	THE WITNESS: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Which is better than
3	many firms do, they only look at actual awards even
4	though one out of ten or fewer were awarded.
5	THE WITNESS: Right, very few were awarded.
6	VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Was there consultation
7	with any recognized cultural descendants for other
8	properties in this area during your work?
9	THE WITNESS: We did consultation with some
10	people in the area, not recognized descendants or
11	anything, but I believe someone else conducted that
12	research, Jill oh, Hokuao Pellegrino did the
13	cultural assessment.
14	MR. GEIGER: Who will be testifying next.
15	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any redirect?
16	MR. GEIGER: If there are no other
17	questions from the Commissioners, no.
18	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you.
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.
20	MR. GEIGER: We would call Hokuao
21	Pellegrino.
22	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Do you swear or affirm
23	that the testimony you're about to give is the truth?
24	THE WITNESS: Yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name
	<u> </u>

——McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148—

1	for the record.
2	THE WITNESS: My name is Hokuao Pellegrino.
3	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Geiger, please
4	begin.
5	HOKUAO PELLEGRINO
6	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
7	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
8	and testified as follows:
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. GEIGER:
11	Q Thank you for coming to testify.
12	How are you familiar with the Waikapu
13	Country Town Project?
14	A I was asked to conduct a Cultural Impact
15	Assessment in 2012. And I've known the Applicant for
16	about ten years now.
17	Q And did you prepare written direct
18	testimony in this matter?
19	A Yes, I did.
20	Q Also did you prepare any reports in this
21	matter?
22	A Yes. I prepared two reports, Cultural
23	Impact Assessment and Ka Pa'akai analysis.
24	Q I'm going to hand you what is your written
25	direct testimony. Is that testimony you prepared in

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

1 this?

2 A Yes.

Q And does your signature appear on the last page?

A Yes.

Q You signed this about six weeks ago. Do you have any additions, corrections, modifications you wish to make to the testimony?

2.1

2.4

A No.

Q Thank you.

Again, as with the other witnesses, we don't want you to read the testimony, but please speak to the Commissioners about the items within your area of expertise that you believe is helpful to their decisionmaking.

A Sure, no problem, thank you.

Again, aloha mai kakou. My name is Hokuao Pellegrino. As was mentioned earlier, I was a consultant. I was contracted to put together the Cultural Impact Assessment beginning in 2012, and final completion in 2014.

I am also resident of Waikapu, and all my life born and raised there. And I have an extensive background in research around cultural landscapes,

and in particular, Waikapu and the Na Wai Eha region.

I've been conducting research and published articles

and documents in regards to this region for about

20 years now.

I'm not going to read all my testimony, but
I have a couple maps that I would like to show that
references the different areas that I notated within
my testimony, beginning with an exhibit that is
included in the Cultural Impact Assessment. And this
is, I believe it was Figure 4 within the Cultural
Impact Assessment, and titled Palapala Aina O Waikapu
Ahupua'a, and it's a cultural landscape map for
Waikapu Ahupua'a, which was a critical piece in
understanding the overall scope of this ahupua'a.

When I was asked to conduct this Cultural Impact Assessment, I made it clear that on my part that this would be a very extensive and in-depth research document that would include all aspects of the ahupua'a as it relates to the greater region of Na Wai Eha, and in particular this project.

And so within this Cultural Landscape Map, it incorporates all of the major important sites within the ahupua'a boundaries, beginning with the pae aina (phonetic) or actual traditional boundary of the Waikapu Ahupua'a, which is the second largest

1 | ahupua'a in the Na Wai Eha region.

And I apologize if this is not super clear.

I'm not going to be referencing any particular names,
but more so just the highlighted portions.

And as you can see in the Waikapu Ahupua'a in yellow, start off with that, is part of one of the most expansive sand dune systems in Hawai'i.

And these remnant sand dune systems are at this point in 2017 quite sporadic and are found in places in Waihe'e, Wailuku and in Waikapu.

The areas highlighted in red are where over 120 Land Commission Awards were awarded within this region, both in mauka portion, and also in the makai area near Ma'alaea Bay.

It is important to notate this, because about 30 percent of the Land Commission Awards that were claimed in Waikapu are actually within the Applicant's land asset, not necessarily within the development plan, but within the overall scope of the land that is owned by the Applicant.

I think at this point we can go to the -so in the project area, and again, I apologize,
probably have to minimize this all the way to the
overall scope of this map. This is a map that was
also provided within the Cultural Impact Assessment

and the Ka Pa'akai analysis. However, I did recently do a few modifications just to show an overlay of the boundaries as well as particular references to mitigation measures that were provided within my analysis.

So in pink or red, however you see it, I'm somewhat color blind, that is the overall scope of land for the Applicant. And this is -- let me step back. This is actually an 1882 map, one of the earliest, if not the earliest map of the overall ahupua'a of Waikapu that was done by Monserrat. This particular map provides all of the Land Commission Awards and Grants that were awarded at the time of the Mahele and after the Mahele.

It also includes, because this is obviously after Western contact, lands that were in cultivation at that time 1882 which was under the Waikapu Sugar Plantation prior to the purchase of that plantation by Wailuku Sugar Plantation.

What you see in blue, dark blue coming all the way down that is the Waikapu Stream. What you see in yellow are the sand dune systems that are within this particular map. What you see in light blue which is -- Jim, at this time, you can zoom into that.

Those parcels of land in blue are privately owned and are the only remaining kuleana lands that are intact today of what was once about 1200 acres of land -- 120-plus land claims that were at the time Mahele awarded.

What is interesting to note is that there are 52 claims of Land Commission Awards and Grants within the Applicant's parcel. Of those 52 Land Commission Awards, of which I conducted about a 400 page report that included every single Land Commission Award, Royal Patent Grant, foreign testimony, native register, as well as the original survey maps.

In analyzing all those, we were able to determine exactly what the land use was at that time and the impact that Waikapu Sugar and eventually Wailuku Sugar had of those lands. Of the 52 Land Commission Awards that were documented within the Applicant's overall land base, 36 of those were impacted prior to the Applicant under the management of both Waikapu and Wailuku Sugar Company.

And those impacts -- we don't need to go into detail -- those remaining parcels that are intact within the Applicant's area is outside of the Development Plan and are located in the mauka region

-- Jim, if you could scroll up to the top -- so the pink is the land base for the Applicant, not necessarily where the project is, but just showing you the overall scope of the land owned by the Applicant. And the development is more in this lower reach here (indicating).

But as you scroll up, these pieces, these parcels of kuleana lands which are outside of the Development Plant are intact parcels and will remain as-is and preserved, and possibly restored for traditional cultivation. Most of those parcels were ancient house sites, as well as traditional agricultural business related to loi kalo or taro farming.

What you see in the top area here is the Reservoir No. 1 (indicating). And this particular reservoir is fed by what is known as South Waikapu Ditch and tunnel system or intake that is located outside of their particular land.

As it comes through this particular ditch, there is now a current interim instream flow standards release point that provides about 2.9 million gallons back into the stream of about a 4 million gallon a day output of the overall Waikapu Stream.

Located here in the green, which was

notated quite a bit throughout the Cultural Impact

Assessment as well as the Ka Pa'akai analysis, is one

of the largest, if not the largest dryland koaia

forest, which is a sub species of koa, Acacia koa is

the botanical name up on Maui.

And this particular five to ten-acre parcel is being preserved and managed by a hui of Waikapu residents and non-profit organization known as Hui Malama O Waikapu. And they have a 30-year lease with the Applicant to preserve these sites. And to date since 2012 they brought over 1000 students up to that particular area for educational programs around conservation and natural cultural resource management.

As we scroll down -- and I guess I'll begin with one of the major points that was brought up in the report for some sort of mitigation measure was this ditch system here (indicating). The original south -- actually scroll down, right there, perfect.

This area is known as the South Waikapu kuleana lands, which originally, of course, incorporated all these other lands prior to the development of sugar industry.

These remaining lands here (indicating) of

which there's about ten private landowners, rely on the water resources that come from the Applicant's -- the reservoir that's on the Applicant's land known as Reservoir No. 1.

One of the major challenges that was brought up, although the project is outside of this traditional irrigation system, in the year -- around the year 1900 when the South Waikapu intake was established, the original auwai system for these lands, which actually began here (indicating), and not .75 miles above that, came directly from the stream. Now the water comes from Reservoir No. 1.

And I bring this up because one of the issues that was brought up in the Cultural Impact Assessment was ensuring, first of all, that this water source would always remain, and that there would be no adverse impact.

But that there was some issues in regards to the treeline and loss of water. And so one of the mitigation measures that was brought up, which the Applicant has met with the community numerous times on, was how to ensure that water was managed properly through the system.

And right now it's open ditch. And one of the mitigation measures we are looking at piping this

entire system, which will protect the traditional customary rights of these users of water, these kuleana users, most of which are all lineal descendants.

The Waikapu -- Waihee Ditch, excuse me, was also referenced in the Archeological Assessment as being protected, and this spot right here (indicating) is where the ditch intake begins as it goes underneath Waikapu Stream -- of course it begins in Waihe'e, but it crosses the Waikapu Stream here (indicating) and continues on towards Ma'alaea.

And I know under the work that was done under archaeology that would be protected.

In addition you have the North Waikapu kuleana lands, and although these lands are adjacent or across the Applicant's lands, in the report that was conducted, there was I would say at least half of the interviews conducted were of residents from this particular area, those that have lineal ties to these kuleana lands.

And one of the major concerns was ensuring that their water source was going to be protected as well of which it is. And ensuring also that they have access into the back of the valley for traditional and customary rights related to gathering

of native plants of which has been conducted for many generations now.

And that has been mitigated and no challenges on that end.

One of the last areas I wanted to discuss is these two parcels here (indicating). Originally when I was conducting — the beginning of this Cultural Impact Assessment, the Applicant's Development Plan included doing some development in this particular area (indicating). After we did the Cultural Impact Assessment we found that there were two kuleana parcels which we call Mahi Parcel 1 and Mahi Parcel 2 still owned by the Mahi family. Actually originally it was the Puleloa (phonetic) family and married into the Mahi family.

And after meeting with this family that now lives on Oahu but still owns these lands, they wanted to ensure, one, that they had perpetual easement to these properties, and that they wouldn't be impacted by the plan.

In discussing this early on with the Applicant, what he did was actually move the development outside of these parcels, which kind of began in this area here (indicating), and completely excludes both Mahi Parcel 1 and 2, as well as giving

a large green buffer. So that the development doesn't literally abut these parcels of land, but gives space in between them.

If we can scroll all the way down, Jim.

So in conducting analysis of every single Land Commission Award and Grant in this particular region, I found a couple things quite interesting.

One is that when you read documents such as these, they usually reference the particular land use 90 percent of the time related to agriculture. What I did find very interesting was this particular -- so interesting in this particular Grant 2747 to Eugene Baugh (phonetic) which I will disclose was my fourth grade grandfather. He notated in this particular -- which I have probably seen far and few, was that he identified known burial sites in this particular aspect of the Na Wai Eha sand dune system. Doesn't disclose exactly where it was, and just to notate that this Grant 2747 was over 100 acres. Part of this grant is located within the Applicant's land base, but the rest below is located under the County ownership.

So I wanted to make a note of this, and you know, part of my background is not just anthropology but also archaeology. And it's -- when conducting

1 this type of analysis, these are all kind of silos.

2 You have Archaeological Report and you have a

3 | Cultural Impact Assessment, for me it was integral as

4 we did the revisions of this for me to do some

5 analysis on the archaeological studies.

And in the Ka Pa'akai analysis I included a couple mitigation measures, one supporting the fact that in any form of development, especially in this region, that there should be some -- there definitely should be some archaeological monitoring, which was notated earlier as a plan will be conducted, because in this region, unlike knowing that sand dunes were typically used for burial sites, this particularly area was actually called out under this grant.

There was one other parcel that notated as having a cemetery, but that parcel is not included anywhere near the Development Plan. And if you want, I can point that out for you, but it's just mauka by the Waihe'e Ditch.

So the Maxwell Cemetery was located right here (indicating). And, again, I didn't have the opportunity to actually do the development overlay to see exactly where that is in relationship to these parcels, but that's something that if you need clarification, I can easily provide.

I think at this point -- do you have any questions?

Q Just a couple follow up.

I'm going to hand you the Cultural Report,

I think that you identified the first figure we
looked at. Could you tell the Commission -- that's

Appendix F and which figure is it?

A Appendix F for the Palapala Aina O Waikapu Figure 4.

Q Then I'm going to go a little bit out on this, and I think it would be helpful just to kind of have a -- if we look at the Development Map, and you can kind of show the Commission.

Eugene Baugh (phonetic) parcel that has -- you can see here -- this is the old Google map. This is all developed now with the most recent Spencer Home project, but that sand dune system comes right through here and goes all the way down there (indicating).

As I mentioned it just kind of skirts the bottom part of that plan. And I believe this is the proposed school. But it crosses Waikapu Stream here (indicating) and that Eugene Baugh (phonetic) parcel is located in this particular area (indicating).

1	Q Tropical Plantation would be where?
2	A Tropical Plantation general area is right
3	there (indicating).
4	Q And you identified the Mahi parcel.
5	Roughly where would they be.
6	A Mahi parcel is right there in the greenbelt
7	(indicating).
8	Q We would offer Hokuao's direct written
9	testimony as Exhibit 41.
10	CHAIRPERSON WONG: County, do you have any
11	objection?
12	MR. HOPPER: No objection.
13	CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP?
14	MS. APUNA: No objection.
15	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners?
16	Exhibit 41 is so moved and tendered.
17	(Petitioner's Exhibit 41 was received into
18	evidence.)
19	MR. GEIGER: Thank you. Nothing further.
20	MR. HOPPER: No questions.
21	CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP?
22	MS. APUNA: Yes.
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY MS. APUNA:
25	Q Thank you, Mr. Pelegrino, for your

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

testimony. In your written testimony there is a 1 2 couple of statements that you make, and I'm wondering 3 if you believe they should be conditions of approval. 4 The first statement is on page 12 of your 5 written testimony, and it says: 6 Prior to any work, it would be advised that 7 the developer of the proposed project consult with neighboring south kuleana lo'i kalo farmers and Hui O 8 Na Wai 'Eha to ensure that infrastructure 9 10 improvements have minimal to no adverse effects to 11 traditional and customary rights and practices. 12 Do you believe this should be a condition 13 to the approval? 14 Α Yes. 15 And on page 18 you state: A permanent 16 easement for these families, which I believe you're 17 referring to the Kauihou and Mahi families? 18 Α Yes. 19 -- is recommended to ensure that both 20 Native Hawaiian families are able to exercise any 21 traditional practices in the future. 22 Do you believe this should also be a 23 condition of approval? 24 Yes. And if I may a comment on that. Α

I believe at the time that I did this, I

25

believe there currently is an easement agreement for the Kauihou properties because there's been some work on that particular kuleana since the initiation of this plan. But that would go for the Mahi Parcel as well. I would recommend.

Q Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, do you have any questions? Commissioner Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Aloha, Mr. Pelegrino.

THE WITNESS: Aloha.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I'm really following up from the questions from the Office of Planning.

You had a number of statements you made in your written direct testimony. Are there other statements in your written direct testimony that you're hoping to see as potential conditions?

One was -- I'm not sure if it's entirely captured by OP's statement -- but had to do with the mitigation related to water, both active reduction of demand from Waikapu Stream for this development, as well as the commodification of the current ditch system to ensure both quantity and temperature issues.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that particular issue with water related to the South Waikapu kuleana auwai

has been a long-standing issue based on interviews
that I conducted go beyond many, many years, if not
decades. And although this particular resource is -or this auwai system is outside of the scope of the
project, I believe that the Applicant went out of his
way to ensure not only that the access to this water
would continue as a traditional public trust purpose
and resource, but also that it would be maximized in
the form of an efficient system developed.

And so what has occurred is discussions around instead of having this open ditch that has caused flooding at times and caused sedimentation runoff into the stream, that there would be a pipe system coming down, and instead of the water entering the reservoir, there would be a direct system straight from the ditch down through a pipe system to these south kuleana auwais. So there wouldn't be water feeding a reservoir that stagnates, and the water is warm and then feeds a six-inch pipe that goes down about 1.2 miles to the south kuleana users, but would be piped initially from that source so that there would be no stagnation.

Does that answer your question?

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I believe you were indicating that the developer has already committed

to doing such a project, not necessarily related to the --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Are there other statements in your direct written testimony in addition to the ones that were specifically called out by Office of Planning that you're hoping to see as conditions?

THE WITNESS: I believe the only other one was in regards to access for lineal descendants to the Waikapu Valley. Currently that's never been an issue, but because there will be impacts to the lower areas of the lands, ensuring that there is a clear access point for traditional customary right practices to gathering, whether it's for medicinal purposes, for seeds, for propagation of native plants along the side that's being managed by Hui Malama O Waikapu, as well as the fact that lineal descendants have scattered their ashes in the back of the Waikapu Valley, but ensuring access is available for descendants, while at the same time I believe it was mentioned that it would not be opened up for the entire Island of Maui to trek back there, but for protecting those public trust purposes and traditional customary rights.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: And I have a final question. If the Applicant is successful in getting their redistricting and other permitting, a lot more people are going to live in Waikapu, which in and of itself can have impact on exercising of traditional

customary practices.

Do you have any thoughts or recommendation how those kind of issues might at least -- some education or other efforts might be directed towards that.

THE WITNESS: Sure. Well, when this plan was developed, I had discussed with the rest of the team that it was my hope that this would be a living document and that it would be incorporated. I think you mentioned a little bit about that in your questioning around Sustainability Plan.

But that cultural resource management and understanding of one of Maui's most historic sites be incorporated in all facets. And what that would be -- there's been some discussion on that. I can't necessarily point out a particular thing, but, yeah, I mean with the fact that there is going to be more people in this area, the question is, as you stated, how that would impact who have those traditional customary rights or practices.

At the forefront was access to water, and I believe that's being mitigated in one of the earlier plans as well, outside of what was notated regarding the Mahi Parcels was that there was development that went close to the top of the Reservoir No. 1, and the major concern was that that was, you know, right at the base of the opening of the Waikapu Valley, ensuring that, you know, not just traditional customary rights and access were being protected, but also the unique ecosystem and native habitat which is already in a fragile state as being protected for those traditional customary rights that they be left there and preserved in perpetuity.

And so at that time the planned changed, and you now have a much larger offer, and hopefully deters people from just randomly going up there and disturbing the fragile sites that are up there, both archaeological and on the natural resources.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Mahi.

COMMISSIONER MAHI: I have more of a comment than a question.

Just want to mahalo you for the research and the hanakoikoi (phonetic), the rigorous work you've done to maintain and take care of those

families. These are the things that we're trying to do in so many other parts of our moku aupuni, and so I just want to congratulate you. Mahalo nui.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I do have a question, somewhat pointed, I think.

I'm going to guess that, based on your area of expertise and study of this particular area of the archaeological and cultural resources of this area that you probably personally know more about that subject than anyone else alive, is that possible?

Probably the rest of us can read the manual there.

And think it's interesting that we don't have people objecting to this development. And I see you here and I feel like my fellow commissioner indicated that you're aloha for this subject and for the people and the concerns past, present. So my question is for the future.

Are you in favor of this development? Can you answer that first?

THE WITNESS: Can I answer that?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I think you can, I don't know. I'm just a lay person, I don't get paid to be here. I'm just curious as to what you feel about that, because I mean we sit here with that

question. We know people need more housing. We know we need to do something. And then I think what I hear you're trying to do is let's make sure we do it with this kind of care and concern. And I think we have a developer that is trying to put that care and concern. And from what I read has made accommodations based on findings in different areas of what needs to be protected.

So I wanted to see, what would you if you were voting on this?

THE WITNESS: Can I share a little something in regards to that? I'm going to be really honest. It's a question that I probably ask myself every night when I go to bed, not just relationship to this project, but just what is happening in general in the ahupua'a that my family has been there for generations.

And honestly, nothing is perfect, you know, this is beyond a good start. I believe that when I started this project, I made it clear that, you know, I'm going to write it as it is, and I'm going to be very clear and thorough in the work that I conduct, not just because that's where I live, and I'm passionate about protecting and perpetuating, you know, the cultural history of this place, but that

it's not just about one person, but it's about a community.

I think that this project goes above and beyond in many facets and brings together a more even integrated community versus others that I've seen which are part of a community, but they're segregated off, you know, with fences, and no walking areas that go from one project to the next. I don't see that here.

I also see a unique case where you have agriculture that's being perpetuated. I'm not going to dive into all of that, I think there was enough testimony around that. That's unique, very unique.

You know, Na Wai 'Eha, it was the largest contiguous kalo growing region in all of Hawai'i.

That's been documented over and over again. There's no place in Hawai'i in terms of traditional agriculture in relationship to kalo cultivation that compare to Na Wai 'Eha.

And to see not just a number on a paper of 800 acres being preserved in agriculture, but actually seeing, only a year or so after the last sugar plantation closed, seeing almost 30 percent of these lands come back into cultivation in diversified ag and providing that food back into the community,

that is something that you're not seeing any more.

In regards to the traditional customary rights -- and I'm in a unique situation, because I wear multiple hats, and water resources are dear to me. And when this was ongoing, and this project was ongoing there was also in the middle of a current contested case, and there were measures put in place to ensure that the water resources of Waikapu are being protected. And that again is unique here where the Applicant was able to engage in the community and have those frank and hard discussions versus, you know, just skirting behind a lawyer and trying to do it behind closed doors. That's appreciative.

So again, I'm giving the pluses. Obviously this is going to be the largest development project that Waikapu has ever seen in modern day. And it is my hope that if I do support this project, that a document such as this -- you cannot commemorate a place just on paper. It has to be alive. And it was my hope that when I conducted this report, and why I did what I did, was so that not just particular recommendations, but all aspects of why this place is so special is included in the fabric integrated completely throughout this project.

How that's done, I mean, you know, are we

commemorating the original Land Commission Awards and names by commemorating those into the street names?

Things like that that are outside the box. You know, when the Applicant had mentioned earlier, early stages that they were going to do a river park, I kind of balked at that because there was no water in the river -- so why have a river park -- river park meaning that it was going through a park, not a water park kind of thing.

And now if you drive to Kealia Pond you can see how the Waikapu Stream and the water that's been put back in the stream has been beneficial to the entire Waikapu, and not just this project but the entire community.

So I skirted away from the answer. I answered as best as I could.

Overall, I am supportive of it. And I think if done right, and done as it has been shown on paper, it has opportunity to be a model not just for other projects on Maui, but throughout Hawai'i. That would be my hope.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much for that answer to a difficult question.

Also hopefully on a lighter note, based on your large maps and that, and you're talking about

basically a sand bar, meaning sand-like oceanfront 1 2 sand is there, is that correct, is that what you were 3 referencing? 4 THE WITNESS: Sand dune. 5 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: So you have sand dunes 6 through there that's typically oceanfront, correct. 7 THE WITNESS: No, those are liquified liquified sand dunes. Not going into the geology, 8 but prior to the West Maui mountains and Haleakala --9 10 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: But at one time though, 11 that's my question, all of this area at one point was 12 oceanfront property; is that correct? 13 THE WITNESS: Little bit of both maybe. 14 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much for 15 the information. Thank you for your aloha. 16 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioner Ohigashi. 17 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to 18 know, Waikapu area, wasn't there a ranch or cattle 19 grazing being done over there. 20 THE WITNESS: Historically? 21 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yeah, historically? 22 THE WITNESS: Some of the first cattle that 23 was introduced to the Island of Maui actually was 24 brought to Waikapu and raised along the central

plains of Maui, which is known as Ke kula O ka ma'o

25

ma'o (phonetic) or ka ma'o ma'o, that includes the lower areas of Waikapu as well as Wailuku.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was it introduced after Western contact, obviously, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Did it have an affect on the cultural uses of that area?

thank you for the question. I don't want to get too much into this, but if you ever want to read

400 pages of Mahele information that was provided there is some really interesting things about Waikapu and Na Wai 'Eha in general, not just cattle ranching, but also raising goats on Land Commission Awards.

There were numerous claims that included testimonies that they were raising animals and the impacts of animals on some of the traditional agriculture ag lands, cows running rampant and destroying some of the walls. But other than that, I think the most impact that ran -- that Waikapu area occurred in this Central Maui Plains as well as upper watershed.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The only reason I asked that, my family has stories about my grandfather working in Waikapu, I was just curious

```
1
      about that.
2
                The second thing that I want to know is Vic
 3
     and Paulett Wallet your father and mother?
 4
                THE WITNESS: Yep.
5
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I have to disclose
 6
      that my family, my wife especially is very close to
7
      the Pellegrinos, and her closeness and friendship
8
      with them will have no effect on my decision.
                THE WITNESS: I did not know that.
9
10
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any objection?
                MR. GEIGER: No.
11
12
                MR. HOPPER: No.
13
                MS. APUNA: No.
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Anything else,
14
15
      Commissioner Ohigashi?
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: No.
16
17
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Five-minute break before
18
     we continue questioning.
19
                (Recess taken.)
20
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP, do you have more
      questions?
21
22
                MS. APUNA: Yes, please.
23
                        RECROSS-EXAMINATION
     BY MS. APUNA:
24
25
                The sand dunes, they are located -- that
           Q
```

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

you talked about, are they located in the Petition area?

A Very small portion in the south -northeast corner, excuse me, against -- here
(indicating) they literally go like this. So this
area here (indicating).

Q Oftentimes there are burials found within the sand, so would you recommend, or was it a consideration to have that portion of the sand dunes within the Petition area protected?

A Good question, thank you.

So unfortunately, I will say that this entire portion of the sand dune system had already been impacted by sugar plantation. So despite that, my proposal was that there should definitely be archaeological upon monitoring when conducting work in that particular area, but there isn't any dune left.

The only dune that's left in the entire ahupua'a of Waikapu is the Japanese cemetery on East Waiko Road which is adjacent to the Applicant's parcel of land. Probably less than an acre of what was approximately three, four, 500 acres of sand dune systems that existed at one time.

It doesn't mean to not ensure that there is

1 sensitivity around those areas, especially that 2 particular grant to Eugene Baugh specified that there 3 was known burials there. And we know that Eugene 4 Baugh's parcel actually crosses the Applicant onto 5 what is known as the Waikapu Gardens, the Spencer 6 project, the Waikapu Gardens here (indicating). And 7 the Japanese cemetery is right here (indicating). 8 And when they were conducting work, and

when I look at archaeological work that was conducted for this particular parcel, they did find, inadvertently find burials in this lower portion here adjacent or behind the dune system of the Japanese cemetery.

So, again, that speaks for itself, I think.

- Q So archaeological monitoring for that area is recommended?
 - A Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Thank you.
- CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, are there any other questions? Commissioner Scheuer.
 - VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: If I may, one more.
 - And this is based on some of your responses particularly to Commissioner Cabral's question and some of my questions about the Sustainability Plan.
 - I realize we're going fairly far, or were

able to go deeper and more thoughtfully on this because of how much the Applicant has done already in working with the Applicant.

But my question, we have Sustainability

Plan that suggests encourage and/or mandating low

flow fixtures for residents. And solar water

heaters, other things. Ways that new people to this

community can live in this community with the

environmental footprint.

What can we do for these people who come -some of whom may actually be lineal to this place,
some may not have genealogical ties to Hawai'i at
all.

What can be done to realize that they are living in Waikapu?

THE WITNESS: I have my own recommendations.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Okay with me sharing them.

I mean other than the fact in honoring the place names, not just the original names of those that -- those original claimants of those particular lands in some shape or form, whether it's utilizing street names. I think what has already happened, and I'll start with this.

When, prior to the development of this report, the Maui Tropical Plantation had reached out to the Maui Historical Society and had asked to put together an entire cultural history of Waikapu that would be integrated throughout the revised -- what I call the 2.0 -- I can say that because in Hawai'i I used to drive the tram, and had a lot of fun, and actually -- well, I won't get too deep into that.

But because I already had a passion for this particular research field and history of Waikapu, when I read that first manuscript of the tram tour, I had asked my boss at that time if I could revise the entire thing incorporating the cultural history of that place.

And since then, although it's changed somewhat, it still gives life back to, not just malihini that come and go throughout the plantation area, but also to many residents to understand what is Waikapu. What is the meaning of Waikapu. And so part of this work that was conducted with the Maui Historical Society, of which I am on the board of, was asked -- of course, they asked you going to write the history of Waikapu, call Hokuao.

So we put together a couple dozen different panels and historical photographs that were woven

throughout the plantation at that time.

There is a very fragile ecosystem, not just within the entire mountain range of West Maui, but definitely within Waikapu where there's especially a number of endangered species and plants.

The Acacia koa that I spoke of before, it is not an endangered species, it's not necessarily a species of concern, but definitely is a species looked at as being protected in some shape or form.

And knowing that this historic forest that about 60 percent of its trees are still alive and being protected by this Hui Malama Waikapu, on Applicant's land, is being protected.

I think integrating native habitat of that particular place within the Development Plan, whether that's in the landscape, I think is an integral part.

I know throughout the islands now, everybody jumped on the native plant bandwagon, but being former ethnobotany professor at the University of Hawai'i at Hilo, I can tell you it's not just about planting native plants within a particular project, but ensuring that the native plants that are incorporated in the landscape are utilized within from species that are from the area.

And the koaia, because of how fragile that

ecosystem is in that particular five to ten acres site is, there was a concern at one time where there was going to be koa forest that was going to be now established below in the Applicant's area. And we had brought up that.

I'm not a botanist, but I can tell you there can some be some hybridization with Acacia koa. And we weren't -- didn't want that occurring in the native forest. So we started planting koaia from seeds that were collected from the area. We were working with a number of botanists from Maui to ensure that those species are being protected.

So I think things like that -- you really have to think outside the box, because it's not a matter of telling the story, just putting a lot of panels up, this is Waikapu, this is what it once was. It should be in some shape or form, this is what Waikapu once was and this is how Waikapu is continuing to be perpetuated based on its foundation of a rich agriculture and cultural history.

And I think with the Cultural Resource

Management Plan, I think we can really create some

methods around that. There's room for growth.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions?

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Hokuao, thank you for your testimony. I didn't think I would see you so soon. And I, again, promise the fact that I spoke with you before my initial confirmation will not affect how I view any of this.

2.1

Having met with you, and I think the quality of your work demonstrates that the recommendation I got earlier was the correct recommendation, come talk to you.

You are an active kalo or taro farmer, correct?

A Yes. My wife and I and family reside on our family kuleana land right adjacent to the Applicant's land and we raise about an acre-and-a-half of wetland kalo.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I don't want to become a witness in this proceeding, but having seen what you do, it's quite impressive.

What do you believe will be the impact of this development if the Petition is granted, the Boundary Amendment is granted, and the development takes place as has been described and proposed?

What's the impact to what you are doing right now with respect to taro or kalo farming?

THE WITNESS: I don't personally -- I don't

believe there would be any direct impact in regards to say water resources, meaning that this particular project is going to be utilizing groundwater resources, both for their ag and the dual-water system that is being proposed.

None of that, I believe at all, even though
I think there might have been some confusion that
surface water has been looked at and utilized, but
it's for their agriculture, not necessarily for the
dual-water system, so that definitely is important to
notate.

But for the most part, you know, the proceedings of the interim instream flow standard, a contested case, although that's still ongoing, I believe the Applicant has made it clear that the only use of Waikapu Stream would be utilized for cattle troughs, which is much more minimal than what was historically used for those lands from the Waikapu Stream.

The impact on the south kuleanas which have much more stronger relationship to this particular project and potential impact, I would just go back to what I had mentioned earlier about the efficiency of the system.

I did -- glad you brought that up as well,

because there was one other thing I did miss in my testimony was that there is a possibility for an alternative source for protection of those traditional customary rights for kalo farmers on the south side, that is to actually restore the original auwai system that fed those kuleana lands instead of the water coming from the reservoir to the first kuleana land, which is about 1.2 miles, and of course that ditch system goes into the valley another -- I'm not exactly sure, maybe three-quarters of a mile -but that could completely be eliminated with the restoration of the traditional system that once was in place for those lands which would only have -first of all the direct source would be the stream, and the area in between that source and the first land kuleana parcel would only be less than a quarter of a mile.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That would be the most beneficial, but there are other landowners in play other than the Applicant, which can make that challenging. But that would be -- I put that as an alternative in there.

But in terms of the north kuleana auwai system and north kuleana taro farmers which I reside on, there is no impact whatsoever.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much

1 for your testimony. 2 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions? 3 Redirect. MR. GEIGER: No redirect. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Next 6 witness, please. 7 MR. GEIGER: We are going to call Thomas 8 Holliday. 9 CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in, 10 please? 11 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 12 you're about to give is the truth? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name 15 for the record. 16 THE WITNESS: Thomas Holliday. 17 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Geiger, you may 18 proceed. 19 THOMAS HOLLIDAY 20 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 21 Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined 22 and testified as follows: 23 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GEIGER: 24 25 Q How are you familiar with the Waikapu

—McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148——

Country Town?

A Well, we've been doing work, our firm, the Halstrom Group and now CERE on Maui for about 40 years we have done work throughout the area, and we have been involved in this particular project about three or four years.

Q You provided a marketing analysis for the project?

A Yes.

Q Did you prepare direct written testimony on this project?

A Yes, I did.

Q I'm going to hand you what I hope is your written direct testimony. Is that it?

A On legal paper, but yes, it looks very much like mine.

Q Is your signature on the last page?

A That is my signature.

Q You signed it about six weeks ago. Any additions, corrections or modifications?

A None to the facts stated in there. I do have some insights following the presentation that I would like to share based upon some of the things I've heard here.

Q Again, I would like the other, witnesses

please don't read it. Please give the highlights for the Commissioners.

A I don't mean to put you to sleep. It was interesting hearing about a piece of land, that's on of the great things about Hawaii, is learning about pieces of land.

But I'm just going to bore you with some numbers but I hope this helps you meet the needs of what your tasks are.

We basically designed a three-part study.

One, to determine whether or not there is market demand for the proposed project and its inventory.

Two, what is the economic impact on Maui and statewide community resulting from the development.

And three, what's the impact on the public purse in regards to cost and benefits associated with the project as it's built and operated over time.

The first stage is the market study, and the answer is, yes, there's a market demand for the proposed units. Based on County of Maui Planning Department Long Range Division Projections, those done by the State DBEDT through 2040 and using census data from 2010 census and 2011 to 2015 rolling data.

We estimate that there is a demand for about 13,300 homes, non-resort homes in the Central Maui planning area by 2035. Even if you take everything, and the county does a great job of all of the proposed developments, and there's like 39 projects in this area proposed. But even if all of them were built out on a timely manner, there would only be about 7,300 units without the subject. So that means there's going to be about 6,000 unit shortfall in housing supply in the Central Maui area over the next 20 years.

We also analyzed pricing and unit types, how big they should be built; what they should be sold for. And it's safe to say that with the type of product that is going to be built at Waikapu, much of it, even though the portion will be designated workforce housing as required, they will meet that requirement, a significant portion of the market priced units will be considered affordable to those making 100 to 140 percent of household income.

So it's very well-suited for the market that is exists out there that will be absorbing it.

We also looked at the commercial aspect of it. It's not a significant number, but it's intended to meet the neighborhood needs of the residents

without making them go off-site so they have kind of sustainability in their own community.

There will be some demand from passer-bys, and the hopes are that a specialty or destination-type commercial village can grow there as well, something that would be like Paia over here, or Hanapepe on Kaua'i. Something that would draw both visitors and locals into an area where the craft shops, boutiques, restaurants, and that will give people, small market people who live in the community and elsewhere on Maui a chance to market their goods in a local fashion.

So having shown there was a demand, the next step is to determine if it's an appropriate site from a market perspective. It certainly is. People talk about centrally located. This is truly a centrally located site on Maui, with ease of access to Wailuku, Kahului, South Maui, West Maui, and those are the employment areas and economic areas.

It has desirable climate. It has access via two highways, which is very rare on a neighbor island. It is going to have a wide variety of inventory, and it's a certain significant size, shape. It's water. It's got ag uses. It's got cultural uses. Everything about this property points

to the master plan being proposed is a highest and best use of the real estate which is the most important issue.

And based upon our analysis of the market and the appropriateness of the subject site, we anticipate it will take about 11 years to reach full absorption, and basically from groundbreaking through stabilization would be a maximum of 14 years, at which time all the houses will be full, all the commercial sites will be full and it will be operating on a stabilized basis.

The second step is economic impact analysis. Just a quick overview. The project will bring in -- this was 2015 dollars -- will bring in \$644,000,000 in capital investment, about 817 million total new dollars for the Island of Maui, and it will also bring in about 32 million new dollars that's beyond what the residents -- that's new dollars onto the island.

During its 14-year build-out stabilization period, there will be about 9,000 total years of construction, commercial, maintenance and other jobs created. And then upon build out there will be 746 full-time equivalent jobs throughout the community, which would generate about \$27 million in wages.

When it's fully absorbed, there will be about 3,921 residents in the project, and that's exclusive of the ohana units which would be about another 210 people.

And they will have household incomes totaling about \$156 million a year.

Just a note, one of the things we do in addition to models that we build to test these, which are highly focused direct and indirect for the specific project, we also test the state input-out economic model against the results, and in every case the outcome from the state model shows a higher impact of taxes, job creation, and economic activity than our own models do.

In regards to fiscal analysis. Just to summit up, during the absorption, build out and absorption period, the State will receive net benefits, that's taxes less cost, of 82.7 million, and an annual stabilized benefit of 2.9 million. The County will receive 42.3 million during the build out phase, and a net benefit of 4.2 million dollars a year thereafter.

- Q Thank you, Tom. Bottom line this is a good project?
 - A Oh, this is a good project.

1 MR. GEIGER: We would offer Mr. Holliday's 2 written testimony as Exhibit 41 -- 42. Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON WONG: County, do you have any 4 objection? 5 MR. HOPPER: No objection. 6 MS. APUNA: No objection. 7 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, any objection? Exhibit 42 is entered into the record. 8 9 (Petitioner's Exhibit 42 was received into 10 the record.) 11 MR. GEIGER: I think Tom has a couple more 12 comments. 13 Α Just a couple of market insights. 14 interviewed a lot of people who live there, brokers 15 who deal with it, and people on Maui love Waikapu, 16 they really I do. It's just a highly desirable area 17 that they would enjoy living in because of the 18 climate, the beauty, the central location. 19 From a market perspective, you look back 20 and go, yeah, people have known that for 1000 years because people have been living in Waikapu and 21 22 prospering. 23 And nowadays we're just looking at a new

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

modernization of what's been a desirable area since

about 1000 years or more ago.

24

25

Secondly, you know, one of the great things about this, this is a well-worked master plan. And that's not something you regularly see for the common man. You know, I mean for upper end and resort stuff, yeah, they spend a lot of time putting together a master plan and amenitizing it, and dealing with all the issues. Here you have something that's meant to be for the working class and for those with incomes at the lower end of the market level. And here you're going to get a real master plan community.

And it's wonderfully diverse, and it's a small town, agricultural. It's got the cultural and farming amenities. All of these things are going to contribute to an ambiance that creates a true town, not just another subdivision somewhere, but can drawn together to give the people of Waikapu Country Town a feeling that are a different space within the real estate spectrum.

And traffic, with the two highways, it's like they bought their own view. They'll always have access to a good thing.

Lastly, I was thinking sustainability from a market perspective. You were talking about sustainability from a planning perspective.

When you talk about sustainability in a market, what that means is you got to get people to stay there for generation after generation. If people just up and move, it's not really a sustainable community. It's people coming in and going out. This community can be sustainable. It has every type of housing available from entry level workforce, very low income, all the way up to what would be considered some really nice homes on acreage up on the hillside. So that would allow people to stay in that community for extended times, and multi generations, and that's what builds a town is that sustainability. And you have to have a diverse product in order to make it work.

You also have to have product for the unconventional. I want to be able to live somewhere where I can have my art shop or work shop right there with me. So live-work area.

So all of those aspects that are within the central plan in the central location with neighborhood, commercial, parks and school, that's what creates sustainability from a market perspective.

Q Thank you very much. We'll pass the witness.

1 CHAIRPERSON WONG: County? 2 MR. HOPPER: No questions. 3 CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP? MS. APUNA: No questions. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, do you 6 have any questions? Commissioner Okuda. 7 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. 8 Holliday. 9 In preparing your study and report, what 10 range and price did you have regarding the prices 11 anticipated for this housing project? 12 THE WITNESS: Well, within -- it's a broad range, first of all, because you're going to have 13 everything from workforce housing, as required, that 14 15 would be some which would be sellable or rentable to 16 households making less than 80 percent, all the way 17 up to million dollar plus homes on some of the 18 acreage lots up on the outside. 19 We, when we did our analysis for property 20 tax purposes, we assumed that the average 21 multi-family unit would be 804 square feet, and would 22 have a price of about 325 to 350,000, which puts it 23 at affordable and above for the 80 to 100 percent 24 household income group.

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

And for single-family homes we figured an

25

```
average of about 1620 square feet, within a range
 1
2
      from 1200, 1300 to over 3,000 square feet for the
 3
     nicer ones, and with the average price of about 570
 4
     to $600,000 or so, which would make it affordable to
 5
     households who are making up to 140 percent of
     household income.
 6
7
                So it works out well that the product that
     the developer wants to put on this spot is for the
8
9
     widest part of the demand pyramid on Maui.
10
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA:
                                     Thank you.
11
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions?
12
     Any redirect?
13
                MR. GEIGER: No redirect.
14
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Next witness, please.
15
     Before we start, Mr. Geiger, how many more witnesses?
                MR. GEIGER: I have three more who are
16
17
     present. I think we can do them in the next hour,
18
     hopeful.
19
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: We are going to try and
20
     quit around 4:00.
21
                MR. GEIGER: I was trying to schedule it
22
     that way.
23
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear in, please?
24
                Do you affirm that you'll be -- you'll
25
      state the truth in your testimony?
```

1	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
2	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name
3	for the record.
4	THE WITNESS: My name is Stacy Otomo.
5	STACY OTOMO
6	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
7	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
8	and testified as follows:
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. GEIGER:
11	Q Stacy, you're an engineer, correct?
12	A Correct, civil engineer.
13	Q And your exposure, experience with the
14	Waikapu Country Town Project is with regard to the
15	civil engineering aspect?
16	A That's correct.
17	Q Did you prepare written direct testimony in
18	this matter?
19	A Yes, I did.
20	Q Did you also prepare engineering analysis
21	in this matter?
22	A We prepared a preliminary engineering
23	report.
24	Q I'm going to hand you what hopefully is
25	your written direct testimony. And is that the
	McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148

- 1 | testimony that you prepared?
- 2 A Yes, it is.
- Q Is that your signature on the last page of that document?
 - A Yes, it is.
 - Q Do you have any additions, corrections or modifications to the written testimony?
 - A I have one housekeeping item on page 3, line 21. If we can delete the word "wastewater", and on line 22 delete "that", and add "to prepare the preliminary engineering report".
 - Q Any other changes?
- 13 A No.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Again, Stacy, as we've done with the other witnesses, please don't read your testimony, but provide for the Commissioners the information you believe is necessary for their decision-making process.
- 19 A Good afternoon, Commissioners, Chair.
 - We were retained by Coach, I'll call him Coach in 2009. This is the first time I've worked with him, and when he approached me I was -- I had mixed emotions. I was happy to work on this very large project, interesting.
- 25 Again, when we go through entitlements, I

know one of the Commissioners brought this up, was he going to get the entitlements and skip out of town?

And eight years later, I want to share with you what I've learned about Coach.

He listened very well, for one thing. He always asks us for opinions. He takes it to heart. If he disagrees, he will tell us he disagrees. By the same token he's really quick to pat you on the back when you have a good suggestion or good recommendation.

That being said, I think from previous testimony you've heard that he's open to community meetings, group meetings, meeting associations, and always incorporating the comments that they had into the site plan.

And over the years, it morphed and morphed and morphed until we have what you see in the Final EIS, which I think is a very good plan.

That being said, as far as the engineering items on there, I'm thrilled in the sense that there's a lot of open space, green space, parks on the site plan. In my opinion, it makes it very easy for us to address drainage concerns using low impact development techniques.

In terms of wastewater and the water, I see

this as a stand-alone project. He has his own water source on the property. He's willing to do a stand-alone plan for possibly a joint venture with the County or other developers -- stand-alone in terms of the water and wastewater.

In terms of the traffic, I think you heard the traffic engineer bring up some areas of concern.

I feel that we can adequately, once those areas that are of concern are identified, I am confident that we can come up with a solution on a design to mitigate the traffic issue.

I think in a nutshell, I think this is an ideal civil engineering project, and look forward to moving forward with it if we get the blessing of this Commission.

- Q Anything else or is that it?
- 17 A No, short and sweet.
 - Q Thank very much.

2.1

We would ask that Stacy's written direct testimony be offered and admitted as I believe Exhibit 43.

22 CHAIRPERSON WONG: County?

MR. HOPPER: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP?

MS. APUNA: No objection.

-McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148-

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners? Hearing
2	none, Exhibit 43 with the changes as stated is
3	accepted.
4	(Petitioner's Exhibit 43 was received into
5	evidence.)
6	MR. GEIGER: Thank you. We pass the
7	witness.
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. HOPPER:
10	Q Just briefly, and I know there are separate
11	witnesses for water and wastewater to be called.
12	You stated water and wastewater sources are
13	stand-alone for the water source. Your
14	understanding, at this time there's not an agreement
15	with the County to accept the wells provided on this
16	project?
17	A My understanding is there have been
18	discussions had. I'm not 100 percent sure if it's
19	been finalized, but I know there have been
20	discussions with the County.
21	Q At this time though, there are plans to
22	operate private water system if necessary if that
23	dedication does not happen?
24	A That's correct.
25	Q The same could be said for wastewater,

there are plans to own and operate a private
wastewater system if that is required?

A That's correct.

MR. HOPPER: Thank you. I have no further

MR. HOPPER: Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP?

2.1

MS. APUNA: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, any questions? Commissioner Scheuer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I'm going to trying to get at my potable-nonpotable dual system.

My understanding from reading your written direct testimony is that a number of wells have been drilled, some of which will provide potable water and some of which will provide what is considered in your report to be nonpotable water. But all water is being drawn from the Waihe'e aquifer.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: If the -- and the Commission might chuckle and anybody else who lived through Lanai might chuckle as we go down these roads.

Are these wells that you're saying are nonpotable, are they actually potable sources of water, but not being used in a potable manner?

water quality of all five wells are real good. The nonpotable wells -- and Coach can correct me if I am wrong -- I'm -- one of them may not be down all the way into the so-called groundwater, meaning below sea level. It may be getting water from a source higher up than the actual groundwater itself.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Will there be another witness who is able to clarify some of these issues?

MR. GEIGER: We have the hydrologist coming tomorrow.

THE WITNESS: Just to be clear, I think it is the Waikapu Aquifer.

VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Did I say Waihe'e? I meant Waikapu.

The point that I'm trying to delve into is that I think having a dual-water system is a good practice, but if you're putting potable water into both sides of the system, it's not necessarily reaching to the level that you're trying to get at.

THE WITNESS: There's also a second component to this on the wastewater plan. The thought is to bring it up to R1 source and use that as a nonpotable source which could possibly be mixed with the well water. So those two sources would

```
1
     comprise the nonpotable system.
 2
                VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: I look forward to
 3
      further clarification on that issue.
 4
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other question?
 5
                I just have one. In terms of, R1 you
 6
      stated you wanted to bring it up to R1, the water,
7
     wastewater?
                THE WITNESS: We had the wastewater
8
 9
      consultant after me, but that was the plan on the
10
     treatment plan.
11
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any redirect?
12
               MR. GEIGER: No redirect.
13
               CHAIRPERSON WONG: Next witness, please.
14
               THE WITNESS: Thank you.
15
               MR. GEIGER: We are going to call Steven
     Parabicoli.
16
17
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Good afternoon, sir.
18
     May I swear you in, please?
19
                Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
20
     your about to give is the truth?
21
                THE WITNESS: I do.
22
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can you please state
23
     your name for the record?
24
                THE WITNESS: Steven M. Parabicoli.
25
                CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Mr. Geiger.
```

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

1	STEVE PARABICOLI									
2	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the									
3	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined									
4	and testified as follows:									
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION									
6	BY MR. GEIGER:									
7	Q Good afternoon, Steve.									
8	A Good afternoon.									
9	Q Your expertise is in what?									
10	A Water and wastewater. Most of my career									
11	has been in the wastewater industry.									
12	Q And you have provided direct written									
13	testimony in this matter?									
14	A I have.									
15	Q I'm going to hand you what will be your									
16	direct written testimony. First of all is that the									
17	testimony that you prepared?									
18	A Yes, it is.									
19	Q Does your signature appear on the last page									
20	of that document?									
21	A Yes, it does.									
22	Q Do you have any additions, modifications or									
23	corrections you need to make to your testimony?									
24	A No, I don't.									
25	Q Again, as with the other witnesses, we									
	McManus court reporters 808-239-6148									

don't want you to read your testimony, but speak to the Commissioners about information that you feel they would find helpful in making their decision.

A Sure. I'm here to tell you will about the wastewater system being proposed for the proposed development.

First of all, I've been involved in water and wastewater since the late 1970s here on Maui. Worked in both public and private sector. Most of my time is with the County of Maui Wastewater Reclamation Division. And I've operated wastewater treatment plants and managed the recycled water system and program. And my last few years I was the program superintendent for all the wastewater treatment plants throughout the whole county.

I retired in 2014, and then shortly thereafter joined Mana Water, which is a very small company that the goal is to introduce an innovative wastewater system to Hawai'i. The system was developed in Budapest, Hungary by a company called Organica Water.

What is really cool about the system is it treats wastewater in a very green fashion. It literally uses tropical plants at the heart of the system. Traditional wastewater systems that I've

operated are typically use the activated flush process, which is a very traditional way of treating wastewater.

This proposed system actually uses a lot less energy, produces way less sludge and produces very comparable effluent or treated water as traditional wastewater technology. And it also uses a lot less land.

I've always been interested in augmenting wastewater treatment with natural systems such as using plants. So when I learned about this system I was very intrigued.

In April 2015 I actually had the opportunity to travel to Hungary and visit a number of these facilities throughout the countryside. And I was very impressed. I spoke to the operators, learned that these systems are very easy to operate as compared to other facilities. And I was just amazed that when you're walking through the facilities, you don't even know you're at a wastewater plant. You feel like you're in a botanical garden, and there was no odors.

So I thought I would show you just a few slides to give you a idea what these facilities look like and how they operate.

The traditional facilities have both a very large geographical and psychological imprint.

Pictured on the left is I think a real picture of the Lahaina Wastewater Facility. It's a classic example of a very large centralized wastewater treatment system with a very big treatment plant that served a very wide, wide area, long transmission lines conveying wastewater, which is very problematic because you get a lot of odors.

And then once you treat the water, the wastewater to high standards where you can reuse it, then you have to convey that water all the way back. And that's very expensive, because you have to put in infrastructure, such as pipelines, storage tanks just to get clean water back to where it came from.

That was probably the number one hurdle which has kind of hindered the County in reusing a lot of this treated R1 water that they produce, the cost to develop infrastructure.

So a solution is the Organica Wastewater
Treatment System. In instead of a rather ugly
looking industrial appearance, you have a botanical
garden-like effect where these plants are not
actually treating the wastewater, but they're
actually sending their roots down into the basins.

And the root zones actually provide an ideal habitat for the beneficial micro-organizations, the bacteria, protozoa that use in the wastewater treatment to grow and prosper.

And in doing so, you're walking through the facility, and you think you're in a botanical garden and not even at wastewater plant.

The way it works, on the left you have your traditional pretreatment system, your screening and your grit removal. Then you have these series of cascade reactors. They're called food chain reactors, and they're aerated on the bottom as traditional activated sludge, and they also have these bio-modules with media, artificial media and then of course the plants with roots going down about three to six feet.

And as you go through each zone, you develop various ecologies. And when you get to the end, you basically have a predation, some of the higher advanced organisms are feeding on some of the lower organisms. By doing so you produce a very, very stable and clean effluent. You follow that treatment up with traditional filtration, and then you'd have R -- disinfection and you have R1 water.

So this is just a close-up of the food

chain reactor. You'll notice the plants on the top with the roots going down, and then your engineered media, which is shown by these squares, then the bottom your aerated, diffused air coming up to keep right aerobic conditions in those reactors.

So typically you have a lot more organisms in such a system. You have more than four times number of microorganisms. This allows you to make a much smaller treatment plant to treat the wastewater because you're intensifying the wastewater process.

So, again, the plants that are selected are locally available. They're not anything that is not available here. Most of these are tropical. Many of them you would recognize you're growing in your backyards. And that's why I was kind of attracted to the system, because you know, in Hungary they grow these plants in green houses because it gets very cold there, but in some of the warmer climates where they have these systems, they don't even need green houses, they basically use shading structures, and that's what's being proposed for the Waikapu Country Town Project.

It's very esthetically pleasing treatment plant. I can tell you, most people don't really like to have wastewater treatment plants in their

backyard, but this system they would be happy to have it.

So it's a very compact system. You have your food chain reactors on one area, then you have all the other components, your plant headworks where the wastewater comes in. Your solids handling. Your control room. It's a very compact system that I believe will fit very well in this proposed project.

Just a couple of examples. This is a facility that was put in Shenzhen, China. That's about I believe couple 100,000 gallons a day there. It treats for about seven, 800 people. You can see they just stick them in the neighborhoods. This is a facility that was put in British Columbia Sechelt. The houses, right next door. Very, very close proximity to the wastewater treatment plants.

And, again, another historical location in France with a castle right there, residences right next to the treatment plant, which is kind of unheard of nowadays with conventional wastewater treatment systems.

So another component that I think is important is there will be an education center at this facility, and that's not only to train the operators, but also to educate the community. When I

was with the County, a lot of what I did was public outreach and education, trying to gain support for using recycled water and whatnot.

Also did a lot of career days, went to public schools. And I was trying stimulate interest in young people to maybe get into this industry.

Currently, I teach a class at the college here on Maui. An entry level water, wastewater operator class. We're trying to get new young people, local people to get into this industry, because there's a shortage of certified operators statewide. It's not easy to pass those certification exams.

Having given a lot of tours, there this thing called the "yuck factor". When people walk around a wastewater plant, they kind of get grossed out. That can be somewhat of are hurdle to attracting new people into this industry. But I think if they were to tour a facility like this, that might change. I think this is a key component of this project.

Again, when I went to Hungary, a lot of people go to these wastewater plants and actually picnic at the facilities, so that's saying something.

So I just wanted to share a couple slides

of some renderings of the Waikapu Project. Here is the facility just showing the food chain reactors with the plant.

You'll notice on the left solar panels.

This kind of prompts me to talk about sustainability.

Just about everybody else has so I have to say a few things.

How does this wastewater system contribute to sustainability? Well, first of all, 100 percent of this R1 water that will be produced will be reused. It's not going to be injected through injection wells. It's going to be reused primarily for agricultural irrigation.

R1 water if you don't know, is the highest quality of recycled water recognized by the State Department of Health. And it can be used with very few restrictions. It can be used on food crops.

Lots of different things.

So this water will greatly allow this project to be sustainable, because R1 water will displace a lot of the surface and groundwater that would have been used for this agriculture irrigation.

Secondly, I mentioned these plants. This system uses about 30 percent less power than conventional systems; produces about 30 percent less

sludge, and uses less than half the space of a traditional treatment system. And we're also looking at including PV panels.

So just again, just showing a little profile of the facility. Showing the stations on the left and the control room on the right.

I really feel with this system, not only will it help protect the environment, protect public health, produce a very reliable source of recycled water, it's going to be a source of community pride for years to come.

This is a place that the folks that live in that area, you know, this is going to be one of the first facilities of this nature in the state, and I think this is going to be an eye-opener for the industry that I work in.

So thank you for the opportunity to be here today. Any questions?

MR. GEIGER: Thank you, Steve.

We would offer -- and I'm going to mess you up here -- this will be Exhibit 47, his written direct testimony. I called the witness a bit out of order.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: County, any objection?

MR. HOPPER: No objections.

McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148—

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP?
2	MS. APUNA: No objection.
3	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, any
4	objection? If not, Exhibit 47 is entered.
5	(Petitioner's Exhibit 47 was received into
6	evidence.)
7	MR. GEIGER: Thank you. With that we pass
8	the witness.
9	CHAIRPERSON WONG: County.
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. HOPPER:
12	Q The Applicant's proposal is to build a
13	privately-owned and operated system substantially
14	similar to what you have published rather than to
15	hook onto the county system?
16	A That's correct.
17	Q I don't think that you addressed exactly,
18	or approximately how big of an area would be required
19	for a system of this nature for this project?
20	A I believe it's about correct me if I'm
21	wrong I believe about a half acre, around there.
22	And the system is being designed for 650,000 gallons
23	a day.
24	Q And the proposal would place it somewhere
25	approximately close to the project area?

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

1	A Yes, it would be close to the agricultural
2	area. I can show you. I believe it's right about
3	down here (indicating) if I'm not mistaken.
4	Q Would part of the plan to be share with
5	other users potentially who would need that capacity,
6	or is it just for this project?
7	A Well, I think the ultimate goal was to
8	perhaps partner with some of the other projects in
9	the area, but this system right now is just being
10	designed for the Waikapu Country Town.
11	But it is a system that would be able to be
12	expanded by adding more food chain reactors and more
13	infrastructure at the facility in the future.
14	MR. HOPPER: Thank you, I have no further
15	questions.
16	CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP?
17	CROSS-EXAMINATION
18	BY MS. APUNA:
19	Q How many gallons of R1 per day would be
20	produced?
21	A As much as the water comes into that plant
22	would be R1 water produced, so the plant is being
23	designed for maximum of 650,000 gallons a day at peak
24	dry weather flow.

MS. APUNA: Thank you.

25

1 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, any 2 questions? Commissioner Scheuer. 3 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you. 4 This would not feed into the dual system 5 that would be available for agricultural use on the 6 Agricultural Preserve? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: And this plant would 8 be sited on the 800-acre Agricultural Preserve. 9 10 THE WITNESS: I believe it would be right 11 next to it. It's going to be -- I'm not exactly sure 12 if it's on the actual preserve, but it's going to be 13 very close proximity to that. 14 VICE CHAIR SCHEUER: Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Any other questions, Commissioners? Redirect, Mr. Geiger? 16 17 MR. GEIGER: No redirect. 18 CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. 19 I'm just going to do something out of 20 order. Commissioner Okuda cannot make it tomorrow, 21 so Commissioner Okuda, before we forget, do you want 22 to ask some questions. 23 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes, thank you to 24 everyone, and Chair, for allowing me to add something 25 out of order. And it's a question I would like to

ask the Office of Planning, if the Office of Planning wouldn't mind answering this question.

I do assure everyone, including Chair and fellow Commissioners, I will read the transcript and all of the documents that are submitted, so I can adequately deliberate on this matter. But my question to the Office of Planning is basically this —— and please don't interpret this question one way or the other, just a question I have and I would like the input of Office of Planning.

The land that is being covered by this petition is A and B designated agricultural land.

And when we look at the Hawai'i State Constitution,

Article XI, Section 3, you know there is an expressed provision that says the state shall conserve and protect agricultural lands from diversified agriculture, increase agriculture self-sufficiency, and assure the availability of agriculturally suitable lands, and the provision continues on.

So here we're taking prime ag land and irrevocably taking it out of agriculture basically.

Does that trouble the Office of Planning in any way?

MS. APUNA: We will have the Director address your question.

1	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in,
3	please?
4	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
5	you're about to give in this docket is truthful?
6	THE WITNESS: I do.
7	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name.
8	THE WITNESS: Leo Asuncion, and I'm the
9	Director of the Office of Planning.
10	LEO ASUNCION
11	Was called as witness by the Office of Planning, was
12	sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified
13	as follows:
14	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Can you answer the
15	question?
16	THE WITNESS: Sure. Thanks for the
17	question, Commissioner Okuda.
18	I think in this regard, right, there is
19	going to be trade-offs on both sides. While we are
20	taking X amount of prime ag lands and turning it into
21	Rural District, quote/unquote, urbanizing it for the
22	Waikapu Town Project, there's also that side where
23	he's in perpetuity preserving agricultural land
24	that's part of the bigger property.
25	So I think that's the trade off that we see

——McMANUS COURT REPORTERS 808-239-6148—

that we don't technically have a problem, even though it might seem like we're supposed to be protecting prime ag land, LSB rated A and B land, but we are also getting something in perpetuity as well. And I think if you look at the acreage it's actually greater that amount that is and being preserved in agriculture for perpetuity.

2.1

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And just so that we keep everything above board, even though I think this is really, really distant, 30-plus years ago I represented Mr. Asuncion on a totally unrelated matter.

But just to put your testimony into context, you are trained as a professional planner and have had years in the planning profession, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And so is it fair to say that you do not believe that approval of this Petition would violate any obligations or duties we have under the Hawai'i State Constitution?

THE WITNESS: I do not believe so.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. And thank you, Chair and everyone, for allowing me to ask the question out of order.

1	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Just for the record.
2	Does anyone have any objections?
3	MR. GEIGER: No objection.
4	MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair.
5	CHAIRPERSON WONG: OP, any objections?
6	MS. APUNA: No objection.
7	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Thank you. Mr. Geiger
8	do you want to continue with your witness?
9	MR. GEIGER: We have one more witness. I
10	don't think it will be very long, Mr. Robert Hobby.
11	CHAIRPERSON WONG: May I swear you in,
12	please?
13	Do you affirm you'll be telling the truth
14	in your testimony?
15	THE WITNESS: I do.
16	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Please state your name
17	for the record.
18	THE WITNESS: Robert Hobby, environmental
19	consultant.
20	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Mr. Geiger.
21	ROBERT HOBBY
22	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
23	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
24	and testified as follows:
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION

```
1
     BY MR. GEIGER:
2
                Are you familiar with Waikapu Country Town
 3
      Project?
 4
          Α
                I am.
                Why are you familiar with the project?
5
           Q
 6
          Α
                I did the surveys.
7
                The flora and fauna survey?
           Q
                Flora and fauna survey.
8
          Α
9
                Did you prepare direct written testimony in
           Q
10
     this matter?
11
          Α
               I did.
12
                Did you also prepare a report in this
13
     matter?
14
          A
                I did.
15
                I handed you what hopefully is your written
16
      direct testimony. Is that correct?
17
          Α
                Yes.
18
                And your signature appears on the last
19
     page?
20
               On the last page, yes.
21
                Do you have any changes, corrections,
22
     modifications you need to make since you signed this?
23
                Yes. On page 4 one typo, sixth line from
24
     the bottom. Solanum americanum is popolo not pololo,
```

so it's P-O-P-O-L-O, that's it.

25

Q Thank you.

As with the other witnesses, I don't want you to read your testimony, but why don't you please tell the Commissioners what you learned with regard to this project that would be of assistance to them in their decision-making process.

A I conducted a survey of the entire property on foot walking through the whole area, pretty diverse area including some cultivated agricultural land, sugarcane primarily, and some area above the road including the rest of the area up there, and I did an inventory of all the plants that were on the land and all of the wildlife which includes birds, mammals, insects, whatever, and analyzed this information and wrote a report indicating that I didn't find anything of great significance.

There was one endangered insect that I addressed called the Blackburn Sphinx Moth, and that was the only thing and I addressed that. So that's basically it.

Q Bob, you understand that with regard to the moth, the host, if you will, is the tree tobacco plant, correct?

- A That's correct.
- Q And mitigation measures with regard to the

tree tobacco plant will be put in place, correct?

A That's correct. The tree tobacco plant is not a native plant, but it is a host plant for the Blackburn Sphinx Moth, which is on the endangered list, so while the tree tobacco plant is not protected itself, it's a host plant for the moth. So during that period when it's in association with the moth, it has federal protections during that period.

And the Fish and Wildlife Service has protocols for how to remove that plant, those two plants that I found without harming or killing the Blackburn Sphinx Moth or its larvae or eggs. So that was how that was addressed.

Q Thank you. We would offer as our Exhibit 44 Mr. Hobby's written direct testimony with the amendment as noted.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: County, any objection?

MR. HOPPER: No.

MS. APUNA: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON WONG: Exhibit 44 with changes is accepted.

(Petitioner's Exhibit 44 was received into evidence.)

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ GEIGER: Thank you. We pass the witness.

1	MR. HOPPER: No questions.
2	MS. APUNA: Yes, one question.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY MS. APUNA:
5	Q OP has offered a condition that the U.S.
6	Fish and Wildlife Service should be consulted with
7	regard to the measures that may be needed for the
8	Blackburn Sphinx Moth.
9	Do you think that's a reasonable condition?
10	A I think the report goes to a series of
11	people who review it, and Fish and Wildlife Service
12	is one of those people that would get this report to
13	comment on and respond, and that covers that point.
14	Q So you don't object to the condition that
15	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be consulted on
16	mitigation measures for the moth?
17	A No.
18	Q Thank you.
19	CHAIRPERSON WONG: Commissioners, any
20	questions? Any redirect.
21	MR. GEIGER: No redirect.
22	All I was going to go say is, given the
23	suggestion from earlier that we conclude our
24	presentation for today, we do have four witnesses
25	scheduled for tomorrow.

1			CHAI	IRPERS	ON WC	ONG:	Wit	th	that,	let's	adjo	ırn
2	for	today	and	recon	vene	at	8:30	to	morro	w morn	ing.	
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												
21												
22												
23												
24												
25												
				McMANUS	COURT	REPO	RTERS	808-	-239-61	48		

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF HAWAII)) SS.
3	COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on December 6, 2017 at 9:30 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 6th day of December, 2017, in
16	Honolulu, Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	/S/ Jean Marie McManus
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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