1		LAND USE COMMISSION	
2		STATE OF HAWAII	
3		October 24, 2018	
4		Commencing at 10:00 a.m.	
5		Courtyard by Marriott	
6		King Kamehameha's Kona Beach Hotel Ballroom #1	
7	75-5660 Palani Road, Kailua-Kona, Hawaii 96740		
8			
9	<u>AGEND</u>		
10	I.	Call to Order	
11	II.	Adoption of Minutes	
12	III.	Tentative Meeting Schedule	
13 14	IV.	Action-A06-767 Waikoloa Mauka LLC, (Hawai'i) Hear evidence, deliberate and take action on order to show cause issued June 4, 2018	
15	VI.	Recess	
16			
17			
18	BEFORE: Jean Marie McManus, CSR #156		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

		2
1	<u>APPEARANCES</u>	
2	COMMISSIONERS:	
3	JONATHAN SCHEUER, Chairperson	
4	NANCY CABRAL, Vice Chair LEE OHIGASHI	
5	EDMUND ACZON GARY OKUDA	
6	DAWN N.S. CHANG	
7	RANDALL S. NISHIYAMA, ESQ. Deputy Attorney General	
8	STAFF: DANIEL ORODENKER, Executive Officer	
9	RILEY K. HAKODA, Chief Clerk/Planner SCOTT A.K. DERRICKSON, AICP	
10	RASMI AGRAHARI, Planner	
11	STEVEN LIM, ESQ.	
12	NATALIA BATICHTCHEVA  JOEL LaPINTA	
13	For A06-767 Waikoloa Mauka	
14	DAWN APUNA, ESQ. RODNEY FUNAKOSHI, Planner	
15	Deputy Attorney General State of Hawai'i	
16	RON KIM, ESQ. JEFF DARROW, Planning Program Manager	
17	Deputy Corporation Counsel County of Hawai'i	
18	County of hawar i	
19	IRINA McGRIFF	
20	Russian interpreter	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Good morning. This
2 is the October 24th, 2018 Land Use Commission
3 meeting.
4 Our first order of business is the adoption

Our first order of business is the adoption of September 27th, 2018 minutes. Are there any corrections or comments on the minutes? Is there a motion to adopt the minutes?

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So moved.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SCHEUER: Moved by Commissioner

Ohigashi and seconded by Commissioner Cabral to adopt
the minutes. Any discussion on the motion? All in
favor say "aye". Any opposed? The minutes are
unanimously adopted.

Next agenda is the tentative meeting schedule. Mr. Orodenker.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Tomorrow we will be here for continuation of this hearing, if necessary, and to adopt the order on the Kualoa Ranch's Important Agricultural Land designation.

On November 14th, we will be on Oahu for the Kapolei motion to amend, and the adoption of order in the Hale Mua matter.

On November 28th, we will be again here on

the Big Island in Kona for the HHFDC Lanihau and Shopoff status report. There's also another matter that will be on the agenda that day, Church Motion to Amend.

On 29th, we will be on Maui for Emmanuel
Lutheran, and any other matters that require adoption
of orders.

On December 12th, we have status report on Ka'ono'ulu Ranch and continuation of the Church matter that I previously mentioned. We will be on Maui.

On the 13th, we will be on Oahu for site visit for the Kapolei, Maui Kahana and Robinson.

That takes us through the end of the year.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are there any questions for Dan? Thank you, Dan.

Our next agenda hearing and action meeting on Docket A06-767 Waikoloa LLC to hear evidence, deliberate and take action on the Order to Show Cause as to why approximately 731.581 acres of land in the South Kohala District, Island of Hawaii, tax map key number (3)6-8-02:016, a portion thereof, should not revert to its former land use designation or be changed to a more appropriate classification issued on June 4th, 2018.

1 Will the parties please identify themselves 2 for the record. I'll remind you to press your 3 buttons down so they light to make sure that your 4 microphone is on. 5 MR. LIM: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, 6 members of the Commission. Steven Lim representing 7 the Applicant and Petitioner Waikoloa Highland 8 Incorporated. 9 With me today are Mr. Valery Grigoryants, 10 who is the Vice President of Arch Limited, 100 11 percent shareholder, who is the in turn 100 percent 12 owner of Waikoloa Highlands, Inc., Natalia 13 Batichtcheva who is the President of Waikoloa LLC, 14 and Joel LaPinta who is our Project Manager. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe you also 16 have a translator with you. 17 MR. LIM: I was going to introduce her just 18 prior to the testimony of Mr. Grigoryants. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Hawaii County. 19 20 MR. KIM: Good morning, Chairperson and

MR. KIM: Good morning, Chairperson and Commissioners, Ron Kim appearing on behalf of Hawaii County, and accompanying me is Planning Program Manager for the Planning Division of the Planning Department for the County, Jeff Darrow.

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning.

MS. APUNA: Good morning Chair, members of the Commission, Deputy Attorney General Dawn Apuna on behalf of Office of Planning. Here with me is Rodney Funakoshi.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to take one minute to ask Dan to introduce our new staff member who some of you may not recognize.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With us today I would like to introduce our later member of our staff, Planner 4. Her name is Rasmi Agrahari. We would like to welcome her. She has only been here for two weeks, so she is completely lost, but we will get her there.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. Now let me update record.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Mr. Chair, before we proceed, may I ask or request the Chair ask that the interpreter identify herself by name, number one; number two, identify the language she is interpreting. And if you could swear the interpreter to promise to accurately interpret what is being said from English into whatever language she is interpreting, and from the language she is interpreting back to English, just so we have it for the record.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Okuda. 2 I was going to proceed in that matter later, but I'm 3 happy to take it up now. 4 Mr. Lim, please introduce by name the 5 translator whom you are using and what their expertise in translation is, and then I'll swear her 6 7 in. 8 MR. LIM: The translator is Irina McGriff, 9 M-c-G-R-I-F-F, and I'll ask her a broad question and 10 she can go into qualifications. 11 Ms. McGriff, can you please tell the 12 Commission your experience in interpretation of 13 Russian to English and English to Russian? 14 THE INTERPRETER: Good morning. As the 15 attorney said, my name is Irina McGriff and I'm court 16 appointed qualified interpreter of Russian language, 17 and federal immigration court certified interpreter in the State of Hawaii. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to swear 20 you in. 21 Do you swear or affirm that any testimony 22

Do you swear or affirm that any testimony you give will be the truth and that you will accurately and truthfully translate from Russian into English the matters that translate?

THE INTERPRETER: I do.

23

24

-000-1 2 IRINA McGRIFF 3 Was called as an interpreter to translate English 4 into Russian and Russian to English to the best of 5 her ability. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Does that address your concern, Mr. Okuda? 8 9 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Not to be too 10 technical, I would request that she also promise to 11 translate accurately English to Russian and Russian 12 to English both ways. 13 MR. LIM: I'll go ahead and do that just 14 for the short questions. 15 Irina, when was the first time that you met 16 the principals of Waikoloa Highlands? 17 THE INTERPRETER: Today at 8:00 o'clock in 18 the morning. 19 MR. LIM: How many times have you 20 translated Russian to English and English to Russian in the courts of the State of Hawaii? 2.1 22 THE INTERPRETER: I've been interpreter 23 since 2004, and I have interpreted over 300 cases. 24 MR. LIM: Do you promise and affirm to the 25 Commission today that your translation to English to

Russian and Russian to English will be true and correct to the best of your ability?

THE INTERPRETER: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Lim, I'm also going to ask that you include a resume or some qualification for inclusion into the record later.

Let me proceed in updating the record.

On September 6, 2018, this Commission held a meeting to consider and act on A06-767 Waikoloa Highlands, Inc's Motion to continue the hearing on Order to Show Cause. The Commission voted in favor of the motion and we set October 24th-25th, 2018 as the new hearing date.

On September 14th, 2018, the Commission mailed or emailed an Order Granting Waikoloa

Highlands Inc.'s Motion to Continue to the parties.

On September 20th, the Commission mailed an agenda notice of the October 24th to 25th meeting with a copy of the legal advertisement and Exhibit A.

On September be 25th, 2018, the Commission mailed an agenda notice of the October 25th through 25th meeting with copy of the legal advertisement and Exhibit A by certified mail.

On October 12th, the Commission received Statement of Position of the Office of Planning on the Order to Show Cause dated October 12th and
Waikoloa Highlands Supplemental Statement of Position
on the Order to Show Cause dated October 12th, along
with Exhibits 18 through 37.

On October 15th, and LUC meeting agenda notice for the October 24th and 25th was sent to the Parties and the Statewide, Oahu and Hawai'i Island mailing lists.

Also on the same day, the Commission received a digital copy of WHI's Supplemental Statement of Position and Exhibits 18 through 37.

On October 23rd, the Commission received an email from the County containing an electronic copy of its Statement of Position, but it failed to meet the filing requirement of HAR 15-15-37 and is therefore not considered as part of the record.

First -- and will all members of the audience and public remember to please silence your telephones and electronics devices.

First in our procedures I will call those desiring to provide public testimony for the Order to Show Cause to identify themselves. All such individuals will be called in turn to our witness box

1 and I will swear them in prior to their testimony.

2.1

Second, we will consider the exhibits that the Parties wish to offer into evidence in the Order to Show Cause.

Next the Commissioner will then begin proceedings on the Order to Show Cause Docket AO6-767 beginning with Petitioner presenting its case, followed by County Planning Department and then the Office of Planning.

Petitioner may reserve a portion of their time to respond to comments made by the Office of Planning and the County.

It is my intent, as the Chair, to close the evidence in this docket and deliberate on this matter during the remainder of today and tomorrow. If we do not complete the proceedings tomorrow, the next meeting on will be at NELH on this island on November 28, 2018.

I'll also note for the parties and the public from time to time, I will be calling for short breaks.

Are there any questions from the parties on our procedure?

MS. APUNA: Yes, Chair, Office of Planning.

Actually not with regard to the procedures, but I

would like to submit that there is an error in the Statement of Position of the Office of Planning that I would like for the Commission to take note of.

On page 6, paragraph 3, and page 8 of our Statement of Position there is an error. We refer to Condition No. 9, which should actually be Condition No. 4.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for that clarification.

Are there any other questions on our procedures from any other parties. Mr. Lim, No. County, no.

Before we get started on public testimony,

I would like to ask for any disclosures from any of
the members of the Commission. I understand you have
a disclosure, Ms. Cabral?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes. And I apologize to the Commission and that for what is in part my error here also.

I wanted to let you know, Mr. Chair, that for the record I would like to disclose that I do know Mr. Joel LaPinta as real estate agent, and that I did receive an unsolicited phone call from him last week.

Mr. LaPinta informed me that he was calling

regarding the Waikoloa matter, and he continued to talk in what could appear to be an attempt to influence my vote in this matter. He made statements regarding the ownership of the property, and that ownership was distinguishable from the old former ownership.

He also indicated he was part of the current management group. He impressed upon me the need for Hawai'i to have additional housing that has been proposed that this project should be able to move forward.

I had repeatedly instructed Mr. LaPinta that he should contact the LUC staff, and that his attorney would be able to work with him and work with the staff on this matter.

I would also -- indicated that I should not have discussed anything with him, and I informed Mr.

Orodenker, our Executive Director who would be the one to discuss this matter with him.

I'm making this disclosure and bringing it to the attention of the Commission to ensure that full disclosure has been taken place with the public and that all parties and that has not been any ex-parte communication influencing the Commission's decision. Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 2 Commissioner Cabral. 3 Mr. Lim, I would like to ask you a few 4 questions regarding this disclosure. 5 Are you familiar with HRS Chapter 91, the Hawai'i Administratives Procedure Act? 6 7 MR. LIM: Yes, I am. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you also familiar 8 with Hawai'i Administrative Rules 15-15, the Land Use 9 10 Commission Administrative Rules? 11 MR. LIM: Yes, I am. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to note for 13 the record that a member of your client new 14 management team, Mr. Joel LaPinta, attempted to have 15 ex-parte communication with the Commission's Hawai'i Island representative, Nancy Cabral, which is in 16 17 violation of HRS Chapter 91 and the LUC 18 Administrative Rules. 19 These interactions appear to have been 20 intended to provide information to the Commissioner 21 outside of scheduled public hearings in order to 22 influence her vote. 23

This is an extremely serious matter and should not be taken lightly. The Commission is taking notice of this on the record and warning that

24

you need to advise your clients to avoid any further 1 2 ex-parte contact with any of the Commissioners. 3 Any and all future communications need to 4 be through the Commission's Executive Officer, or staff or the Deputy Attorney General. 5 6 Is that understood, Mr. Lim? 7 MR. LIM: That's understood you. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Now, I'm going to 8 9 proceed with public testimony. 10 Is there anybody desiring to provide public 11 testimony? 12 Sorry, are there any other disclosures from 13 any of the other members of the Commission? Hearing 14 none. 15 Are there any individuals desiring to 16 provide public testimony on the Order to Show Cause? 17 I have a list in front of me. First is Ms. Julia Alos? Excuse me if I've 18 19 mispronounced your name. Come forward. Sit in the 20 chair, turn on the microphone. I'll swear you in and 21 then you will proceed to say your name, your address 22 and continue with your testimony.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth?

Good morning, and thank you for being here.

23

24

1 MS. ALOS: I do. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, please 3 proceed. 4 5 6 -000-7 JULIA ALOS Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the 8 truth, and examined and testified as follows: 9 10 THE WITNESS: Good morning everyone on the 11 Commission and other people in the room. My name is 12 Julia Alos. I'm a resident of the South Kohala 13 District in Waikoloa Village and testifying in person 14 and on my own behalf regarding Docket A06-767 15 Waikoloa Mauka LLC's Order to Show Cause. 16 I'm an active and engaged community 17 volunteer and feel that this developer's lack of progress and diligence that our community -- has our 18 19 community very concerned on a host of levels that I 20 will address, as well as my findings from the 2.1 research on the matter. 22

In addition to my previously submitted testimonies, electronically for August 21st and orally September 4th hearing and presented on my behalf by Cindy Kester, I wish to submit this

23

24

additional information regarding my community's concern about the intersection improvement at Waikoloa Road, Paniolo Avenue and Pua Melia Street.

I want to thank the LUC for the exhibits that were provided on their website, which was a great amount of information for me to garner this testimony today.

My humble opinion deduces that the hibernating bear, Waikoloa Highlands, has been poked and awakened by the LUC, hence the hearings.

Please afford me this occasion to direct you to some of these exhibits on my stance on this issue.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Alos, we have your written testimony, which is lengthy. Can I ask you, for now at least, to summarize your main points for us so that the parties, and if the Commissioners, if they are inclined, to have opportunity to ask you questions.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

I just wanted to address the energy conservation measures with their design. I also feel that with respect to -- what's important here --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I didn't mean to throw you off. Take your time. We want to get to

the main points.

THE WITNESS: Very fine.

I put in here that I feel that the sustainable Hawai'i initiative should be taken into consideration as they're moving forward with their developments as there has been such delays in compliance with the 2045 goals for the State of Hawai'i.

I also mentioned that I feel that -- with regards to the intersection, it seems from exhibits that I've seen that the Work Order and Agreement, Exhibit 22a, that the Plaintiff has paid a lot of money already towards this development, this part of the work, and I'm hoping that that will be considered as you make your decision moving forward. And I've listed the invoices on that.

Also included was Julian Ng's traffic analysis that he did for this intersection that we're concerned about.

Let's see, Carlsmith Ball stated the
Waikoloa Deed for Plumeria LLC was on May 1st, but it
was noted June 1st, a little discrepancy there. Now,
I guess, Plumeria LLC is now Peaceful Ventures. They
changed their name.

Also so in addition Waikoloa Mauka said it

intends to provide affordable housing under County Rules, which requires 20 percent of the units to be affordable low to moderate income household.

The developer has also planned to open space for hiking and biking, et cetera. And I wanted to address that.

My comment is, according to what I've read, 20 percent of the total units amounts to 400 homes equates to 80 credits. I believe Plumeria, which is not Pua Melia, when it transferred over, is only planning on doing 32 units on the 11.8 acres, and includes almost a quarter of the property that's being conveyed to commercial zoning for possibly A hardware store.

And let's see. In summary, based on the aforementioned, I want to stress that I'm greatly concerned about the safety of our are intersection, the future development of Waikoloa Plaza and a Waikoloa library land which is on Pua Melia Street, southwest side of Waikoloa Road.

I'm wanting compliance with the affordable housing which is desperately needed. These are big issues and topics and the Waikoloa Village

Association, and extending community at large, and there are many electronic footprints on apps next

door, Facebook and community meetings that include
Waikoloa Community Leadership Council, South Kohala
Traffic Safety Committee. Recent candidate forums,
political campaign meetings, and it's currently being
addressed as a Subcommittee members with the South
Kohala Development Action Planning Committee since
April.

Workforce and affordable housing are so critical, now more than ever, with homeless rates rising, and home prices rising, and casualties of Pele. It is paramount that the County stand firmly on the 20 percent minimum so as not to price our keiki out of paradise.

Mahalo for your time to allow my testimony to be entered today, and your patience for listening to me.

These developers have a lot of documents.

It was very confusing to follow as you can see. I

did my best as I said to do with all the information

I had to better understand this case, and I hope that

my testimony, as reflected today, is clearly

understood to be true in front of you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Does the Petitioner have any questions for the testifier?

1 MR. LIM: Thank you. 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. LIM: 4 Good morning, Ms. Alos. 5 Α Good morning. 6 So the things that are important to you 7 that could be provided by this project are the 8 roundabout intersection at Waikoloa Road and Paniolo Drive? 9 10 Α Correct. 11 And the development of more workforce and 12 affordable housing? As well as -- I don't think I mentioned 13 Α 14 also a promise of some common areas as well. 15 Some common areas? Yeah, for bike and hiking trails, et 16 17 I think that was where the golf course was cetera. 18 supposed to be. You understand that if the Commission 19 20 reverts the project down from agricultural -- excuse 21 me -- from Rural to Agricultural, that the project is 22 not likely to proceed and those benefits to the 23 community won't be happening? 24 Α I do. 25 No further questions.

```
CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Hawaii County?
1
2
               MR. KIM: Hawaii County has no questions.
3
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning.
 4
               MS. APUNA: No questions.
5
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? Ms.
6
      Chanq.
7
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good morning, Ms.
8
     Alos. Just a few questions.
9
                How long have you lived in Waikoloa?
10
                THE WITNESS: 18 years.
11
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: So you've lived there
12
      since this project was approved in 2008?
13
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Did you participate in
14
15
     the 2008 proceedings?
                THE WITNESS: I did not.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: As a resident of
18
     Waikoloa, do you pass by this property every day?
19
                THE WITNESS: Nearly every day.
20
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Can you tell me what
21
     kind of improvements or how has the property has been
22
     used since 2008?
23
                THE WITNESS: I've seen nothing.
24
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.
25
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
```

Nothing further. Thank you very much. 1 2 I'll next call Anita Glass. 3 MS. GLASS: The last testifier covered my 4 points, so thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anybody else from the 6 public wishing to provide testimony on this matter? 7 We're completed the public testimony. I'll now move on to exhibits. Mr. Lim, 8 9 will you please describe exhibits you wish to have 10 admitted to the record? 11 MR. LIM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We'd ask 12 that the Commission enter into the record the pleadings submitted by the Petitioner to include the 13 14 exhibits that are listed with the Motion to Continue 15 filed with the Commission. Also with our Statement of Position filed with the Commission. And the last 16 17 was the October 12th, 2018 Supplemental Statement of 18 Position. 19 And we ask that that be entered into the evidence, into the record? 20 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any 22 objections on this from the County or Office of 23 Planning? 24 MR. KIM: No objection from the County.

MS. APUNA: No objection.

```
1
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
2
     Hearing none, Petitioner's exhibits are submitted
3
     into the record.
 4
                (Petitioner's Exhibits were received into
5
     evidence.)
 6
               County, do you have any exhibits you wish to
7
     enter into the record?
8
                MR. KIM: No, thank you.
9
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And, Ms. Apuna.
10
                MS. APUNA: Yes, Office of Planning would
      like to submit Exhibits 1 through 4 as part of our
11
12
      Statement of Position.
13
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any
14
     objections to Office of Planning's exhibits from the
15
     parties?
16
                MR. LIM: No objection from the Petitioner.
17
                MR. KIM: No objection from the County.
18
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: From the Commission?
19
     Hearing none, Office of Planning's exhibits are
20
     admitted into the record.
21
                (OP Exhibits 1-4 were received into
22
     evidence.)
23
                And, again, I'll mention, Mr. Lim, it would
24
     be good to have some written documentation of the
25
     qualification of your translator. If you can bring
```

1	that forward at later time for consideration of
2	inclusion into the record.
3	MR. LIM: We will do that.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
5	Why don't we start with your case, Mr. Lim?
6	MR. LIM: Thank you. We will have two
7	witnesses. One is Mr. Valery Grigoryants, and that's
8	V-A-L-E-R-Y G-R-I-G-O-R-Y-A-N-T-S. We will be
9	utilizing the services of Irina McGriff as the
10	Russian to English and Russian to English translator.
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to swear
12	you in.
13	(Irina McGriff interpreted.)
14	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
15	you are about to give is the truth?
16	THE WITNESS: I do, yes, I do.
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.
18	State his address on the record and please
19	proceed.
20	VALERY GRIGORYANTS
21	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
22	Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
23	and testified as follows:
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. LIM:

1 Q State your full name and address.

A My name is Valery Grigoryants. I reside in

Moscow. And I'm vice president of the company Arch

LLC, Limited. My address is Malaya Gruzinskaya

Street, house number 25, unit one.

MR. LIM: Again, for the record, as I stated at the Commission initial hearing for Motion to Continue Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated would like to reiterate that all pleadings and statements made by Waikoloa Highlands, Inc.'s witnesses and counsel relating to Stefan Martirosan, the former director are allegations that he has not been adjudicated to date, however, we wish stress that Waikoloa -- I'll refer to it as Waikoloa for short -- Waikoloa strongly believes in the strength of the allegations of fraud and other mismanagement against Mr. Martirosian, and that we are taking this precaution to not expose ourselves to any claims by him.

So I will proceed with that caveat now.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: About how long do you think you have with this witness, Mr. Lim?

MR. LIM: Ordinarily without translator probably no more than an hour.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So we will go for

1 about 20-30 minutes and then take breaks.

MR. LIM: See how it goes. Just for the Commission's information, Mr. Grigoryants does understand some English, but because of the severity and seriousness of this proceeding, he wanted to make sure that his words were very clear and precise and thus he engaged the Russian interpreter for testimony today.

I'm commencing with the questions.

## BY MR. LIM:

Q Can you please state your involvement with Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated?

A Yes. I'm the Vice President of the company Arch, and the company Arch is owner of Waikoloa Highlands. Was owned -- was the owner.

So all decisions made by Waikoloa Highlands company, actually were made by me, otherwise

President of Arch, together with my brother who's the president of the company.

But today I would like to affirm all members of the committee that I have the full authority to make any decision in connection with Waikoloa.

At this time the company Arch is no longer the owner of Waikoloa, but this is just different

1 story.

2.4

Q So the does Vitoil Corporation now own Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated?

A Yes.

Q Are you familiar with Mr. Stefan Martirosan?

A Yes.

Q Was he a director for Waikoloa Highlands or Waikoloa Mauka during the period in question?

A Yes. He was not only the director, he was also chief financial officer and secretary at the same time.

Q Does Mr. Martirosian today have any shareholder interest or other management control of any of the Waikoloa companies?

A I would like to confirm with members of the committee, just because there were so many gossips and speculations before. I would like to let you know that Mr. Martirosian was never owner of the company or any other companies I'm involved in United States as well as abroad.

He was just a hired manager. He was not and is not the owner of the companies. And now he's fired from all the positions.

Q Please explain to the Commission who

managed the Waikoloa Highlands project during the years that Mr. Martirosian was the officer of Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated?

THE INTERPRETER: Interpreter ask to repeat the question.

Q Please explain to the Commission who managed the Waikoloa Highlands during the years that Mr. Martirosian was an officer of the company.

A Stefan was the director of the company as well as the manager of the company. He received all the permits. He met with engineers and architects. He conducted all business activity in the United States.

Q Approximately when did you become aware that Mr. Martirosian was not pursuing the best interest of the company to fulfill the conditions imposed by the Land Use Commission?

A It was in summer of 2017. In summer 2017 we started to have concerns about him and we stopped trusting him.

Q The issue of the owner's trust in Mr.

Martirosian has come up from the Commissioners, and
the natural question is, why did you trust him?

A It's a long story, but I will try to be short.

Well, we -- in America we are called

Russians, but we are not Russians we are Armenians.

We attend not Russian church but Armenian church.

So we had a goal to differentiate, diversify risks in business, like if you know, there is a huge Armenian community in Los Angeles. And this is how it happens in life, Jewish people help Jewish people; Armenian people help Armenian people and look for connections. That's how I met Stefan Martirosian.

It was at end of the '90's, beginning of 2000. He seemed to me and my brother as a very intelligent, smart man. But we didn't let him to come too close to us, but he wanted. After all he reassured us to start to do some small investments in the United States. That's what we did.

And over time we developed a trustful relationship, I would say, like brothers relationship.

Our relationship became so close that when his mother passed away, we came to the funeral, flying 13 hours. And when my mother passed away, he flew all the way from Los Angeles to Moscow to funeral. That's it.

Q One of the other issues has been the

suspicion, I suppose, the suspicion that this Russian company came to Hawai'i to buy land with a lot of money, and because of that, they must be Russian gangsters or illegal money.

A I understand. You know, I often hear this, and from on one hand I get angry, on other hand I get -- I start to laugh. Because this is just a typical stereotyping.

You know, I would like to tell you that at the beginning of the '90's, my brother and I started business by selling shoes. Then we started to sell alcoholic drinks. Then we started to sell other things, all different, all different types of things. We started to open stores.

And then it's just we were lucky to have opportunity to be introduced to oil business. And then we started to explore, not immediately, but started to explore oil and oil materials abroad.

We are very hard working people, and we achieved what we achieved through hardship. And I'll tell you that my first vacation was after ten years of hard work, and that was only one week of vacation.

Then my company were manufacturing --

THE INTERPRETER: Interpreter needs clarification from the Petitioner.

I will explain in English. Well, open 1 2 companies, and we produced clean balance sheet for 3 last 20 years. Everything is clear, and if possible 4 to check how we earn money, if possible, if it need. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: A clean balance 6 sheet? 7 THE WITNESS: (No interpreter.) Balance sheet, yes, for each year of Arch 8 9 Company from our auditor in London. We have clean 10 balance sheet and it's not a problem to provide with 11 such documents. That's why I'm smiling. I'm not 12 banded. 13 COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Can I suggest that we not have him speak any English? 14 15 difficult for me to separate that. At the last hearing, the Commission was 16 17 concerned that somehow Mr. Martirosian was somehow 18 still involved with the Waikoloa Highlands project. 19 No, he is not involved in with company. 20 Q Have any of the entities related to 21 Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated taken any legal 22 action against Mr. Martirosian for his fraudulent 23 acts? 24 Yes, filed some claims.

First I would like to explain in short that

in 2017, we discovered some bad acts by Martirosian.

For example -- I'll give you one example.

I not going to even talk about the history with the movies. Without having authority from us, he would apply for money by putting land as a collateral. And he took pocket money. There were many cases like this in California and U.S. Virgin Islands as well. We have some land there too.

Therefore, we filed a lawsuit with Supreme Court in Los Angeles. Also the company Pulham filed a fraud claim against Martirosian in Armenia.

Q What is the status of that proceeding in Armenia?

A So the status is there lawsuit, criminal lawsuit was initiated because of the fraudulent activity by Martirosian. That was in September 2017.

And Armenian court in Armenia heard his case while he was absent, and made decision to sentence him. It was in October 2017.

When Martirosian arrived to Moscow because there was a warrant for extradition, he was arrested at the Moscow airport. Then prosecution office in Russia reviewed all their extradition paperwork and they extradited him to Armenia.

Martirosian appealed the decision made by

- 1 Russia, and Moscow court held the public hearing.
- 2 | Held the hearing with the presence of three attorneys
- 3 and their interpreter. And the court made decision
- 4 that expediting him to Armenia is the right decision.
- 5 He again disagreed and appealed with the
- 6 Supreme Court of Russia. So the Supreme Court of
- 7 Russia considered the complaint. Again the decision
- 8 of Moscow City Court, and made decision that decision
- 9 on detention -- on extradition came enforce. It was
- 10 in July 2018.
- And in August he was extradited until the
- 12 papers became full in force. And now Armenia
- 13 investigator conduct investigation.
- 14 Q Is Mr. Martirosian currently in prison in
- 15 Armenia?
- 16 A Yes, he's in prison.
- 17 Q So turning back --
- 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think this might be
- 19 a good time. We will take a ten-minute break
- 20 reconvene at 11:08 a.m.
- 21 (Recess taken.)
- 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We're back on the
- 23 record.
- Mr. Lim, you can continue your questioning
- of your witness. I want to take a break, a lunch

break for one hour sometime between 12:00 and 12:30.
Please proceed.

manager.

MR. LIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Q Moving to the present, what steps has
Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated taken after removing
Mr. Martirosian from his position in fulfilling the
conditions of the Commission's decision in this
matter?

A We appointed a new director of the company,

Natalia Batichtcheva, N-A-T-A-L-I-A,

B-A-T-I-C-H-T-C-H-E-V-A. And Joe LaPinta as project

Also we made arrangements with bank Armbusinessbank, A-R-M-B-U-S-I-N-E-S-S-B-A-N-K, for financing in the amount of \$45 million to complete the project.

Q Is Waikoloa currently able and willing to see the project through to completion?

A Yes. As already explained, we received the financing to complete the project. Also we don't have office in Hawai'i, that's why we have intention to invite a local developer for mutual cooperation on the project.

And as I mentioned before, I am one of those people who help make all the decisions, and I

- will make sure that their project is completed.
- Q Are you aware of any recent discussions with the County's Office of Housing and Community Development?
  - A Do you mean affordable housing?
  - O That's correct.

- A Yes, and I would like to confirm that we have intention to start negotiation in good faith to transfer three or four acres for affordable housing.
- Q Would this be to the proposed developer of the affordable housing project next to Waikoloa Highlands?
- A Yes. We have some land next to Waikoloa, and we would like to start negotiations with the County. So if the committee will give us a chance to return and refresh and start to go back to negotiate rezoning with the County, so we can take care of that, and then we can come back to talk about zoning.
- Q Do you have anything in the form of a personal statement to make to the Commission?
- A Yes, I would like. Yes, there's something
  I wanted to tell.
  - I actually wanted to tell you at the beginning of the hearing, but just because it's my first time to be in front of such respected

1 | committee, so I was nervous and I forgot.

I would like to apologize for being absent during the first couple hearings, for being absent for the May hearing. I didn't realize the seriousness of this situation, as well as there was a very short notice.

I would like to say that, yes, we are investors, and we invest here in Hawai'i. We would like to ask you committee to protect us the same way as you would protect any other investors from Japan or China. You can consider us as Japanese investors.

I also would like to say that we already lost a lot of money here in Hawai'i. And out of 14,000 acres that we had, now we only have 3,000 acres.

And it's you who will decide if we have to lose everything, or if you give us opportunity to develop the project.

Q I would like to reserve a short time for rebuttal and we will close now.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County, do you have questions for the witness?

MR. KIM: County did not have questions for the witness.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning?

1 MS. APUNA: Yes, Chair, I have a few 2 questions. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. APUNA: 6 Thank you for your testimony. I was wondering, were you involved in the 7 original boundary amendment, the reclassification for 8 the project back in 2008? 9 10 No, the staff of Martirosian was involved. 11 So were you aware of the proposed project 12 for Waikoloa Mauka? 13 I didn't know the details on the project 14 and that was one of the problems with him, that he 15 never informed us, never told us details. 16 And so was it just Mr. Martirosian that was 17 involved in the boundary amendment and the project, or were there other people, part of the company that 18 19 were involved in the boundary amendment? 20 As far as I know, it was only Mr. 2.1 Martirosian. 22 So when did you become aware of the 23 boundary amendment and the proposed project for the 2.4 area?

I found out about that at the end of 2017,

25

A

- but that was too late to do anything. So the only thing I could do was to transfer 11,000 acres for affordable housing -- sorry, 11.7 acres for affordable housing.
  - Q So he was -- you weren't aware of the whole Waikoloa Mauka project until 2017?
  - A I didn't know about subdivision or requirements that we were supposed to fulfill.
  - Q Were you aware of the Decision and Order for this matter that set forth the conditions? And when were you made aware of the conditions that were required?
    - A What decision order do you refer to?
  - Q The Decision and Order that this Commission adopted back in June 10th, 2008, and it provides 20-something conditions, including that the project would be completed by 2018.
  - A As I mentioned before to you, I found out about all this in 2017.
    - Q And when was Mr. Martirosian fired?
- 21 A He was fired from Waikoloa Highlands 2016.
- 22 I think so, let me check.

- Q In 2016. And is there any documentation by Waikoloa that would show that?
- 25 A What documentation?

1 Any documentation that would show, that 2 would demonstrate or show that he was fired by 3 Waikoloa? Yes. All documents were presented to the 4 committee. 5 6 Among your exhibit there is Exhibit 32, I 7 believe, there is a resignation letter in 2017, 8 Exhibit 32, June 19th, 2017 of Mr. Martirosian 9 resigning his position. But you say that he was 10 fired rather than that he resigned; is that correct? 11 Α What company, because we have several 12 companies? 13 0 I'm sorry, from Waikoloa. 14 I'm sorry, let me clarify. 15 It was the oil company, not Waikoloa. Α 16 So he resigned from Vitoil 2017, but he was 17 fired from Waikoloa Highlands from the project also 18 in 2017? 19 No, in 2016. Yes, the committee has the 20 documents. 21 He resigned, he wasn't fired, is that 22 correct, from Waikoloa? 23 As far as I remember, he was fired. 24 And from 2008 when the boundary amendment Q

was approved until 2017 when you said that you

1 started to learn of his bad acts, what type of 2 oversight was there by you or others over Mr. 3 Martirosian and the Waikoloa project? 4 THE INTERPRETER: Interpreter needs 5 clarification. Can you restate your question? From 2008 when the Decision and Order --6 7 when the boundary amendment was made, and 2017 when 8 you became aware of the bad acts of Mr. Martirosian, 9 what type of oversight did you have, or anyone else 10 in this Vitoil Company over Mr. Martirosian and the 11 Waikoloa project? 12 So the problem, me and my brother 13 14 15

communicated to him almost every day. And so when we communicated, he never told us details on actually what was going on with the project. He would tell us that everything is good. That he worked with Sidney Fuke, that everything was good.

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

And then in 2010 that things happened, why he is in prison now. That he sought to be involved in movies and completely forgot about the project.

Okay, thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I just need some simple clarification. Thank you very much, Mr.

Grigoryants for coming all the way down here to join 1 2 us. 3 THE WITNESS: (No interpreter). My 4 pleasure. 5 COMMISSIONER ACZON: You mentioned you have 6 100 percent to make decisions for this project. 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. When I was leaving to come here, we agreed with my brother that I would 8 have 100 percent authority to make decision. 9 10 COMMISSIONER ACZON: You also mentioned 11 that Waikoloa Highlands is owned by Arch, Limited, 12 which you are the vice president. 13 THE WITNESS: I just want to just clarify 14 that Arch Company was their owner of Waikoloa 15 Highlands. Now Vitoil is owner. COMMISSIONER ACZON: I'm coming to THAT. 16 17 Later on you mentioned that now Vitoil is the owner of Waikoloa Highlands? 18 19 THE WITNESS: Yes, 100 percent. 20 COMMISSIONER ACZON: What is your 21 relationship with Vitoil? What is your position with 22 Vitoil? 23 THE WITNESS: I don't have any position 24 with Vitoil. I'm owner of Arch Company, which is the

25

owner of Vitoil Company.

```
COMMISSIONER ACZON: So you still have 100
1
2
     percent authority for this project?
 3
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
 4
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So I kind of noticed
     that there's several change of plans on this project.
5
                Was the Commission notified of these
 6
7
      changes in a timely manner?
                THE WITNESS: What changes do you refer to?
8
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: All the changes of
9
10
     ownership.
11
                THE WITNESS: We produced all the documents
12
     of ownership, and the committee should have those
13
     documents.
14
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: What about in a timely
15
     manner?
16
                THE WITNESS: I think, yes.
17
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: That's all, Mr. Chair.
18
     Thank you.
19
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
20
     Commissioners? Commissioner Cabral.
21
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'm suffering from some
22
     confusion, and I would like to know if, as the
23
      100 percent owner of this project, if you have a way
24
     that you can provide us written verification and
25
     backup of that ownership, and of all of the
```

principals involved with the company that is going to 1 2 be involved companies involved with Waikoloa 3 Highlands? 4 THE INTERPRETER: It's very simple. 5 produced before a diagram who is who and who owns 6 what. So the company Arch is the owner of the 7 company Vitoil, 100 percent owner of company with 8 Vitoil. And Vitoil company is 100 percent owner of 9 Waikoloa Highlands company. 10 So Arch Company is owned my brother as 11 well, me and my brother, we both decision-makers. 12 And the director of Waikoloa Highlands 13 company is present here. Her name is Natalia. And 14 we have complete understanding with each other, and 15 she fulfills all the tasks we ask her to do. 16 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? Commissioner Okuda, then Commissioner Chang. 18 19 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. 20 Mr. Grigoryants, thank you so much for coming so far from Moscow. 2.1 22 THE WITNESS: (No interpreter). Pleasure

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Let me assure you about how the Commission makes its decisions. We do

23

24

25

is mine.

1 | not have any preconceptions about anyone's

2 | background, ethnicity or what country they come from.

3 I personally do not view you or anyone connected with

this project as being connected with any type of

5 criminal activity or anything like that.

I'm not an expert in Eastern European history, but I do know the Armenian people have suffered at the hands of many people who have oppressed, and in fact attempted to exterminate Armenian people.

That is the reason why our Commission follows American legal principles, which is basically that cases should be decided based on the law and the facts, and not on anyone's background or ethnicity. We neither favor nor disfavor people whether they come from Europe, Eastern Europe or Asia.

In fact, let me assure you that I
personally, as a lawyer, am very aware of the
infamous United States Supreme Court case called
Korematsu versus United States, which allows
Japanese-Americans to be in prison even though they
did no wrong during World War II.

So let me again assure you, we are just looking at the facts and the application of the law here, and nothing else.

1 There were questions that were asked about 2 the organizational structure and chain of command 3 involved here. 4 May I ask your attorney to possibly assist us by showing you what was submitted as Exhibit 28 of 5 6 your submittal? Do you have Exhibit 28 in front of 7 vou? THE WITNESS: Yes. 8 9 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Have you seen 10 Exhibit 28 before today? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, I saw. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Exhibit 28, in the box 12 13 at the top indicates that you are the ultimate 14 beneficial owner. Is that -- is what I'm saying 15 correct? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, correct. 17 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Are you in fact the ultimate beneficial owner, or is your brother also an 18 19 additional ultimate beneficial owner with you? 20 THE WITNESS: The owner is, as you can see, 2.1 is my brother. We have a separate agreements where 22 we make all decisions together. 23 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm just trying to 24 determine the accuracy of Exhibit 28.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Is the first block at 1 2 the top, which indicates Vitaly Grigoryants as the 3 ultimate beneficial owner. Is that first block 4 completely accurate or is there additional 5 information that needs to be added to that block? 6 THE WITNESS: No, everything is correct. 7 No additional information needed to be added. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And is all the 8 information in Exhibit 28 a 100 percent accurate? 9 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. 11 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Did you and your 12 brother know back in 2008, or around that time, when 13 the property was purchased that you and your brother 14 intended to develop the property? 15 THE WITNESS: First I would like to clarify that the project was purchased in 2005 not 2008. And 16 17 when we were purchasing, we had intention to develop 18 the project. 19 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And you mentioned the 20 name of Mr. Sidney Fuke, F-U-K-E, correct? 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Did you know that one 23 of the companies that you were either owning or 24 controlling had hired Mr. Fuke? 25 THE WITNESS: Yes, Stefan told me about it.

1 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And you knew that Mr. 2 Fuke had expertise or knowledge in dealing with 3 government here in Hawai'i, correct? 4 THE WITNESS: I didn't know. Не 5 communicated with Stefan Martirosian always. 6 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: What did you 7 understand Mr. Fuke's role to be? THE WITNESS: I understood that Mr. 8 9 Martirosian was not a specialist and he needed 10 someone who could assist him and give him guidance what to do. 11 12 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And what type of 13 guidance did you understand Mr. Fuke was to provide? THE WITNESS: I don't know. I can only 14 15 quess. And if quessing is sufficient for the 16 committee, I can tell you. 17 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm just trying to 18 find out your understanding. So let me ask a few 19 more questions. 20 At the time that Mr. Fuke was hired, did 21 you understand, or was it your intention that you 22 intended to have some type of development of the 23 property? 24 THE WITNESS: Well, how I would say? I 25 would say that we had intention to develop, but we

didn't know where to start, how to start at that time just because we didn't have any experience of development in the United States.

So the role of Fuke was to guide us, to explain -- Fuke was supposed to tell, advise Stefan on what stages to go through, and then Stefan was supposed to inform us.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: But in any event, you understood that certain approvals and certain things would have to be done with respect to government entities regarding the development, correct?

THE WITNESS: Well, everybody knows about, it's common knowledge.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And you do agree that if people working for your company have made promises to any of the government entities here in Hawai'i, that your company is supposed to live up to those promises, correct?

THE WITNESS: I do not waive any responsibility. I except full responsibility. I just regret that we discovered things too late.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And right now, as of today, what is the property being used for?

THE WITNESS: As far as I know, as of today, it's not being used.

1 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. I have no 2 further questions. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 4 Commissioner Chang. 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good morning, Mr. 6 Grigoryants. Thank you again for being here this 7 morning. I'm going to follow up on some of the 8 questions that Commissioner Okuda asked. 9 10 When you bought the property, you said in 2005, what was your intention? 11 12 THE WITNESS: My intention was simple, just 13 like anyone else has just to make some money, develop 14 a project. 15 COMMISSIONER CHANG: When you say develop the project, what was your intention? How did you 16 17 propose to develop the project? THE WITNESS: Well, my understanding was 18 19 that this is a huge part of the land that might be 20 not enough my life to completely develop. So I understood that we needed to talk to specialist and 2.1 22 get some information on how to start. 23 My intention was to start with a small park 24 and talking to the specialist, getting their advices.

That's why my understanding that was Sidney Fuke was

- supposed to do. And as far as I know, he supposed to be a very good specialist.
- 3 COMMISSIONER CHANG: And you trusted Mr.
- 4 Martirosian to provide you information based upon his
- 5 discussions with Mr. Fuke?

- THE WITNESS: Yes, we trusted him completely. But the problem that -- the questions what he told us, and how sufficient that information was. At this time now I understand that he didn't have any intention to develop the project, he just wanted to make money to pocket them.
- now to ensuring -- because you're saying that you have the authority to make decisions. So what are you doing different now to ensure that the development proceeds that you didn't do when Mr.

  Martirosian was in charge?
  - THE WITNESS: As I mentioned earlier, first of all, we hired a new director, Natalia.
  - Second, we hired a new project manager,

    LaPinta.
- We secured financing in the amount of \$45 million.
- We are planning, since we are not local, we are planning to invite a local developer for mutual

1 cooperation.

2.1

\$45 million. Did you secure any money for development during -- when Mr. Martirosian was involved, did you secure any financing to do the development at that time?

THE WITNESS: Yes. We received several financing from several banks. But because of the crisis of 2008 in the United States, we were not able to return money to the banks, so we lost a lot of land that was sold by the bank.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So how much financing did you secure for the initial development that you got approvals in 2008?

THE WITNESS: In 2008 we didn't know about the subdivision and that we had to make the project.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Did you secure any financing in 2008?

THE WITNESS: Well, at the time in 2010 we had money for financing, and we invested \$19 million in movie industry. If we knew, we could have invest those money into this project.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So how much money did you invest in this project?

THE WITNESS: It's hard for me to tell the

exact numbers right now, but based on the documents 1 2 in this, as far as I can tell, so we purchased the 3 property for \$60 million and invested 1.2. 4 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So was it ever your intention to build the development after the 2008 5 6 approval? 7 THE WITNESS: We always had intention, but at the beginning we just didn't know about 8 9 requirements that supposed to be met in 2008. 10 COMMISSIONER CHANG: What is your 11 understanding now as far as the requirements that 12 need to be met? 13 THE WITNESS: Well, one of them we already 14 fulfilled, that was with affordable housing. And 15 then also as I mentioned before, we are willing to consider additional three or four acres for 16 17 affordable housing. And I think that this question you should 18 19 ask our specialist LaPinta who will testify. 20 COMMISSIONER CHANG: One of the conditions 21 is that you're supposed to have completed the 22 build-out by 2018. Were you aware of that condition? THE WITNESS: I learn about that at the end

25 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So, Mr. Grigoryants,

23

2.4

of 2017.

you have told the Commission that you have 1 2 100 percent authority to make decisions. 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER CHANG: What assurances do we 4 5 have that you're going to complete the project in a 6 timely fashion when it's not clear that you 7 understand what all the conditions are? THE WITNESS: I know the requirements. 8 9 It's not that I don't know. I just mention that it 10 would be more appropriate to ask the specialist about 11 the requirements. 12 I know that one of the requirements is 13 about road, water, park. Well, as far as assurance, I'm not the bank 14 15 to give you a reassurance, but because we already 16 transferred some part of the land, it should show 17 that we do have intention. COMMISSIONER CHANG: If for some reason the 18 land gets -- and as Mr. Okuda said, no decision has 19 20 been made -- but if for some reason the land gets 21 reverted, will you take the land back? The acres 22 that you gave to the County, will that be taken back? 23 THE WITNESS: You mean 11 or 8?

COMMISSIONER CHANG: How much acres were

24

25

given to the County?

1 THE WITNESS: 11. 2 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So 11 for affordable 3 housing? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, 11. COMMISSIONER CHANG: So if -- because 5 6 today's hearing is whether to revert the land, if the 7 land gets reverted back to agriculture, will you withdraw or take the land back, the 11 acres that you 8 9 gave to the County? 10 THE WITNESS: Well, that's a very difficult question. And it's better if it will never happen. 11 12 It's better let's just work together. Let us go back 13 to the County, talk to them and make it work. COMMISSIONER CHANG: I appreciate that, but 14 15 I quess it's important for me as a commissioner to understand. Your intention is that was this 16 17 conveyance to the County of the 11 acres that if you don't get, if the land gets reverted back to 18 19 agriculture, that you'll take that land back from the 20 County? 21 THE WITNESS: It's hard for me to tell you. 22 I think it will be -- it is difficult to say, maybe

COMMISSIONER CHANG: This is my last

yes, maybe not. I would just suggest, let's just

23

24

25

move forward.

question.

As the owner, what do you understand is your responsibility as the owner of this property to proceed with the development? What is your responsibility as the owner?

THE WITNESS: Well, I understand my responsibility is to complete the project, and it will be good for everyone. It will be good for County, and hopefully it will help us to recover some losses.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It is 12:11. How's our court reporter? You're okay. We can do one more. Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm looking at Exhibit No. 5, and in that exhibit it was exhibit that said that Natalia, whatever her last name is, she would become -- working for the company, Waikoloa Highlands, Inc., and dismiss Stefan Martirosian.

MR. LIM: Try Exhibit 31, there may be duplicate exhibits. I think the most recent one -THE WITNESS: We are talking about retail company?

1 2016. 2 THE WITNESS: I did not find, but I'll try 3 to understand. 4 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just asking, since that time, has Natalia been the person making 5 6 the signing and binding Waikoloa Highlands, Inc? 7 THE WITNESS: I did not understand the question. Purchase of what? 8 9 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm asking, since 10 that date, May 9, 2016, has Natalia been the person 11 in charge or signing on behalf of Waikoloa Highlands, 12 Inc? 13 THE WITNESS: She was authorized to sign. 14 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And on that same 15 exhibit it says that Arch Corporation owns 80 percent of Waikoloa, and I believe it was Vitoil owned 16 17 20 percent. 18 THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: When did Vitoil 19 20 become 100 percent owner? 2.1 THE WITNESS: I think it was in 2017, but I 22 don't remember exact date. 23 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was that about the

same time that -- I'm have a hard time with these

names -- Stefan was dismissed from Vitoil?

24

```
1
                THE WITNESS: Maybe, maybe. I just can't
2
      find the document to compare the dates, but it's
     possible.
3
 4
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: But in 2016 he
5
      represented Vitoil Corporation in the signing of that
 6
     document?
7
                THE WITNESS: Who?
8
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Stefan.
9
                THE WITNESS: Yes, because he was fired
10
      from Vitoil Company 2017.
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Vitoil Corporation,
11
12
     was he able to sign documents on behalf of Vitoil?
13
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
14
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Until he was
15
     dismissed?
16
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
17
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And the reason you
18
      said the dismissal from Waikoloa, the reason for that
19
     dismissal May 9th of 2016 was because you discovered
20
      that there were problems with the development and his
21
     use of money from that development?
22
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
23
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And my last
24
     question.
25
                I just wanted to be clear. At that time,
```

```
1
     May 9th, 2016, did Arch Corporation own all of
2
     Vitoil?
 3
                THE WITNESS: Yes, it owned -- Arch owned
 4
     Vitoil from the beginning.
5
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: My next set of
 6
     questions, I'm kind of curious.
7
                Is it correct that Natalia signed the
     housing agreement between the County and the
8
9
     Petitioner in this case?
10
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And if I remember
11
12
     correctly, that was about November 30th of 2016
13
     after --
14
                THE WITNESS: December.
15
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: December of 2016.
                And you met -- and we were talking about
16
17
     11 acres and 8 acres. What was the acres that was
     transferred to Paradise -- I forgot, Paradise. What
18
19
     was the acreage of that?
20
                MR. LIM: Perhaps we can have Mr. LaPinta
21
     cover that.
22
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just wanted to
23
     know.
24
                THE WITNESS: I don't know.
25
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: No further
```

1 questions. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think it is time to 3 break for lunch, and we will continue with the witness after lunch. I want to start in exactly one 4 5 hour at 1:20 p.m. Thank you. 6 (Noon recess taken.) 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We're back on the 8 record. I'll remind the witness that you're still 9 under oath. 10 Commissioners, we're continuing with questioning of the first witness. I have a series --11 12 Commissioner Aczon. Please, go ahead. 13 COMMISSIONER ACZON: I just want to follow 14 up, clarification. 15 You mentioned your new management thing is composed of Mr. LaPinta and Natalia Batichtcheva? 16 17 THE WITNESS: Yes, and LaPinta. COMMISSIONER ACZON: When was Mr. LaPinta 18 19 brought into the project? 20 THE WITNESS: I think the end of 2017, 2.1 maybe beginning of 2018. 22 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So was he involved 23 during Martirosian time? 2.4 THE WITNESS: No.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: What about

Batichtcheva, Natalie, when did her involvement 1 2 begin? 3 THE WITNESS: As I mentioned before, she 4 became a director of Waikoloa in 2016. 5 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So she wasn't involved 6 during Martirosian time? 7 THE WITNESS: She was, I think, a chief financial officer, but she was not involved in the 8 development of the project. 9 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So what was her role 10 11 exactly besides the financial? Does she report to 12 Mr. Martirosian or she report to Mr. -- to the 13 owners? 14 THE WITNESS: What period of time? What 15 period of time are you asking? 16 COMMISSIONER ACZON: From the time she got 17 involved in the project. THE WITNESS: From the time when she became 18 19 involved in the project, she reports directly to me. 20 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So Ms. Batichtcheva didn't tell you what's going on in the project? 21 22 THE WITNESS: I feel like we misunderstood 23 each other. Are we talking about the time when she 24 became a director?

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I'm talking at the

time from she got involved with the project while Mr. 1 2 Martirosian was, I believe, in charge. 3 THE WITNESS: She was not involved in the 4 project. COMMISSIONER ACZON: When Mr. Martirosian 5 6 was there? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes, when Martirosian was the 8 director. 9 COMMISSIONER ACZON: I thought what I read 10 was she was there during Mr. Martirosian. 11 THE WITNESS: No, no. 12 MR. LIM: Just to clarify. I think there's 13 maybe a misunderstanding, because I get what you're 14 asking. I believe you're asking was Natalia 15 Batichtcheva ever involved in developing the project while Stefan Martirosian was running the project. 16 17 COMMISSIONER ACZON: That's correct. 18 MR. LIM: And you're centering only on when 19 she became the director, but she was working for the 20 company before that. 21 THE WITNESS: Before. Before she worked in 22 the company. So she was accountant of the company. 23 COMMISSIONER ACZON: During Martirosian's 24 time? 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So, again, does she 2 report to Martirosian or --3 THE WITNESS: At that time she reported 4 only to Martirosian. 5 COMMISSIONER ACZON: And by any other time 6 that Ms. Batichtcheva mentioned anything about the 7 project to you directly? 8 INTERPRETER: Interpreter ask for 9 repetition. 10 COMMISSIONER ACZON: During any of the time that she was accountant or Ms. Batichtcheva didn't 11 12 mention anything to you directly about what's going 13 on in the project? 14 THE WITNESS: No. 15 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Okay. 16 During your earlier testimony you mentioned 17 about trying to involve local developers to help on 18 this project. 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 COMMISSIONER ACZON: What was the outcome? 21 Is there any solid discussions or agreement with a 22 local developer? 23 THE WITNESS: Not yet, but I will take full 24 responsibility to control of the project to make sure 25 that the project is complete.

1 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So there's no 2 potential help from local developers? Are you still 3 pursuing that? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, we continue to look for 5 local developer, but I can't tell you right now 6 anything concrete. 7 COMMISSIONER ACZON: One last question, Mr. 8 Chair. 9 Regarding the 11 acres that you said was 10 dedicated to affordable housing, who owns the 11 acres now? 11 12 THE WITNESS: I don't know. We fulfilled 13 our only obligation and we transferred the land for 14 affordable housing. There were different newspaper 15 publications, but I can't say. MR. LIM: Mr. LaPinta can answer the 16 17 question about the 11.7 that were conveyed for 18 housing. 19 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Maybe I can ask the 20 next question to Mr. -- thank you, Mr. Chair. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 22 I have an a few questions. 23 First, and I share thanks with the rest of 24 the parties for your being here. 25 I want to make sure I heard you correctly

1 earlier. You testified that Mr. Martirosian has no 2 ownership interest in any of the entities involved in 3 this development. Did I understand that correctly? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So I'm trying to 6 understand, it's an exhibit that Commissioner 7 Ohigashi referenced before, Exhibit 5, which is the May 9th, 2016 Resolution signed by Mr. Ovasafyan 8 9 Aykz, as well as Stefan Martirosian appointing 10 Natalia Batichtcheva as the Director for Waikoloa 11 Highlands, Inc?

THE WITNESS: (No interpreter) I can't I see what you mean.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So this Exhibit 5, aid couple questions about it. Can you explain who Mr. Ovasafyan Aykz -- and excuse me for mispronouncing.

THE WITNESS: No problem. Ovasafyan is a director for of Arch Company. And also is nominal owner of Arch, but actual beneficial owner of Arch is Vitaly.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can you please further clarify the difference you're making between the nominal and beneficial ownership of the companies?

1 THE WITNESS: There is a trust agreement 2 between Vitaly Grigoryants and Ovasafyan where 3 Ovasafyan, he is nominal owner where he keeps his 4 shares in the trust for the benefit of Vitaly. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 6 Has that trust agreement been entered into 7 the record? 8 THE WITNESS: No, but we can send to you. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I would like to have 10 that trust agreement entered into the record, Mr. Lim. 11 12 So a number of my questions really get to 13 -- well, to a vocal part of your early testimony when 14 you talked about how you met Mr. Martirosian, that 15 you shared community ties and cultural ties and there 16 was a trust. 17 Fundamentally, a lot of what this 18 Commission has to grapple with is trust that a 19 developer is going to follow through on what they've 20 promised to do. So my questions are motivated by 21 that. 22 On that Exhibit 5, I read Exhibit 5 as 23 listing Stefan Martirosian as owning 20 percent of

the property through Vitoil; is that incorrect?

THE WITNESS: Incorrect, by mistake,

24

1 | happened by mistake only.

That was a mistake, you can check, review the files and records of the company Vitoil, and you can see that Arch was always the only owner.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And does Mr.

Martirosian have any interest in Vitoil? Any
ownership?

THE WITNESS: He never had any interest before, and he still -- and now he doesn't have any interest as well.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So immediately regarding Exhibit 5, it was given to us as an exhibit by the Petitioner, by you, as a basis for our decision-making, but you're stating now that it's erroneous in regards to Mr. Martirosian's ownership and role?

THE WITNESS: Yes, and I can explain.

Well, we give you what we had. There was a mistake on this document but this is the only document we had. So you asked us for document, we gave it to you. We didn't make any changes on that document.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Is there any written documentation otherwise provided to us that explains the error in

this record that you've just described? 1 2 THE WITNESS: As far as I know, no. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 4 It was a pleasure to meet you today. 5 Are you listed in any of the documents that 6 have been provided to us? There were 30-plus 7 exhibits. I see your brother's signature and name but not yours. Are you pointed to anywhere in these 8 documents? 9 THE WITNESS: There is a document that 10 11 verifies that I'm the vice president of the company, 12 document signed by Ovasafyan, the director of the 13 company. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you know the 15 exhibit number of that, either or your counsel? 16 THE WITNESS: Maybe our attorney will help 17 me. 18 MR. LIM: I don't have the immediate 19 reference. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: When you can. 21 Does that document make it clear in writing 22 that you have the ability to bind the company before 23 this Commission as to your commitment? 24 THE INTERPRETER: Interpreter needs 25 repetitious.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Does the document 2 referenced just now naming our witness as the vice 3 president clarify that he has the legal authority to 4 bind Waikoloa Highlands, Inc., in any commitment made 5 to this Commission? 6 THE WITNESS: This letter states that I'm 7 holding the position of vice president, and my 8 brother holds the position of the president. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Which document or 9 10 exhibit are you referring to, please? 11 THE WITNESS: I'm looking at Exhibit 33, 12 but I think we have different numbers on the 13 exhibits. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No, this is 15 Exhibit 33. Thank you. 16 So do you have any documentation that would 17 be normally accepted in a court in the State of 18 Hawaii showing that you have an authority to bind the 19 company? 20 THE WITNESS: I don't have such document 21 with me today, but I do have, so it's not a problem 22 to show. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 24 Did I understand your testimony earlier 25 correctly to say part of the problem beyond fraud was

that Mr. Martirosian was not qualified to be running
the business to develop this property?

THE WITNESS: Not exactly. What I was trying to say that he was a director of the project, and he ran business with the help of specialist Fuke.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Can you explain to me what the qualification of Ms. Batichtcheva are for helping this project to proceed?

THE WITNESS: First, the most important we have the trust. And second, she has education in accountant finances that is very important, so she understand.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So her training is as an accountant?

THE WITNESS: Her main training and experience is accounting, but she does any task I ask her to do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

And I want to talk just a little bit about another thing that I heard you say. And correct me if I misunderstood you.

I believe I understood you to say that you believe that we have a duty or responsibility to look out for the -- protect the interest of investors.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I said that. But I meant that any committee have interest in protecting investors.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you familiar with any of the other duties of this Land Use Commission?

THE WITNESS: I know that the committee can

make any decision in connection with the land use.

Can change zoning or can keep it the same.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you familiar with any of our duties regarding the protection of environment or Native Hawaiian rights or water resources?

THE WITNESS: Yes, absolutely. It's a duty of any committee.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So you're similarly familiar with our duties to look out for affordable housing, traffic concerns as well?

THE WITNESS: I know that Batichtcheva does take care of such concern as you mentioned, but that's why I feel like we fulfilled our obligation with affordable housing, and we do intend to negotiate for extra three or four acres for affordable housing.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Since you mentioned affordable housing, are you aware in the letter that

was not accepted into the record, at least yet from 1 2 the County, that they do not believe you have 3 fulfilled your obligation as to affordable housing? 4 THE WITNESS: I heard, but on other side, 5 it's kind of strange. We do have agreement of 6 release signed by the County of fulfillment of all 7 obligations. It looks strange we have such document. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Have you 8 9 been to the property? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Have you been all 12 across the property? 13 THE WITNESS: Practically, yes. We even 14 went to their area where they had the cows. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Has there been 16 physical improvements to the property since the time 17 that the Decision and Order was passed ten years ago? 18 THE WITNESS: I did not notice any changes, 19 but what I would like to add is that I do not take 20 off responsibility for myself. I am completely 21 responsible, and otherwise I wouldn't be here today. 22 And what else I can say? 23 I was betrayed by Mr. Martirosian. 24 betrayed by my brother because I trusted him, and he

just did not do what he promised.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. I just 2 have one more question about your testimony regarding 3 how much has been invested in the property. 4 When you testified that the acquisition 5 price of the land was \$60 million, that was for a much larger property of which this is a part, 6 7 correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, that was for the 14,000 8 9 acres. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And how many of the 11 \$1.5 million that you said was invested was spent 12 after the point at which the Decision and Order was 13 passed, but before the point to which this Order to 14 Show Cause hearing began? 15 THE INTERPRETER: Sorry, can you rephrase 16 for the interpreter? 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes. I can break it 18 up. 19 The witness testified that \$1.5 million had 20 been invested in the property. How much of that was 21 spent after the Decision and Order but before these 22 Order to Show Cause proceedings began? 23 THE WITNESS: I do not really understand 24 the question. To what time? 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Don't have exact

1 dates in front of me.

2.1

MR. LIM: The majority of the money was spent previous to -- Petitioner will stipulate that the majority of the money was spent prior to the 2008 reclassification by the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I will still have the question, but we cannot address it now. I will still have the question of how much was spent during that particular period of time. And I said that was my last question. I forgot one.

Armbusinessbank is also owned by your brother?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So the commitment of additional funding is not from an outside entity who necessarily did their own due diligence on this transaction, correct?

THE WITNESS: I wouldn't put question this way. But I would say that it was a very important decision for us to invest this money. That was the duty diligence, that decision was made through due diligence.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Commissioners, any further questions for this witness? Commissioner Chang.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you. I would like to thank you very much. I would like to just follow up on some of the questions by Chair Scheuer.

2.1

Mr. Grigoryants, you seem to be a business person that is involved in many different business ventures, oil, movies and development. Is that true?

THE WITNESS: I try.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And is your brother also involved with you in many of those business opportunities?

THE WITNESS: Yes, he also tries.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So this \$45 million that has been set aside or committed by your brother's bank, if you have different opportunities other than this Waikoloa development, will you withdraw that money for this project?

THE WITNESS: First of all I wouldn't do that, because this 45 million planned for ten years. And the rest of other opportunities for financial, if we have other opportunities for investments and we have our own money.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Because I think your previous testimony was when Mr. Martirosian was managing, he used the \$19 million for the movies that was supposed to be for this project; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I said. But I meant if 1 2 we knew that in 2008 there would be an act, at that 3 time we had money for development in 2009/2010, so 4 instead of movie business. 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So what assurances do we have now that you have the \$45 million, your 6 7 brother has committed to this project, that something else won't come up? 8 9 THE WITNESS: It's no brother, it's a bank, 10 two different things. 11 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Would you put that 12 money in an escrow account to assure that it's dedicated to this project? 13 14 THE WITNESS: Well, it's not a business 15 approach, nobody would put 45 million in their escrow 16 for ten years. But we don't need 45 million every 17 year. So if we breakdown 45 million by ten years, it comes to we need about 4.5 million each year. 18 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Is that based upon the 19 20 full build-out, that the \$4.5 million, that's the 21 cost every year to build out the project? 22 THE WITNESS: It's very approximate. One

year may be less, one year can be more.

23

24

How much money have you actually spent? 1 2 You said 1.5 million, and I know I heard your counsel 3 that most of that money was spent prior to 2008. 4 So could you tell us approximately how much money has actually been spent on this development 5 6 since 2008? 7 THE WITNESS: So the only work we managed to do since 2008 was transferring 11 acres for the 8 affordable housing. And then since 2017, just 9 10 because only in 2017 that's when we learned that 11 nothing were happening. 12 COMMISSIONER CHANG: I appreciate the 13 honest answer. I want to ask you one final question. 14 Did you work with your lawyer in preparing 15 the documents that were filed? THE WITNESS: I was in contact with the 16 17 attorney and was getting advice. 18 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So your papers, the 19 statement that was filed, it says Mr. Martirosian 20 committed fraud, misrepresentation and breach of 21 duty. Is that true? 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER CHANG: What was the fraud? 24 THE WITNESS: A lot. If I start to talk

about it, I can talk till morning.

1 COMMISSIONER CHANG: I only ask because 2 your papers say there's more than enough evidence for 3 the Commission to find that these things were 4 committed. 5 I don't see that in the record, so I'm just 6 asking. 7 THE WITNESS: Okay, I can give you couple examples if you want. 8 9 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Yes, I would like. 10 THE WITNESS: We have land on U.S. Virgin 11 Island. We purchased 3,000 acres for 25 million. 12 And Stefan was the director and he ran the entire 13 project. 14 And in 2017 when we received title report, 15 we sold that. The entire land was put as collateral for the amount of 7,900 -- interpreter ask 16 17 permission -- 7 million, 900. We were very 18 surprised. COMMISSIONER CHANG: Are there any 19 20 fraudulent acts for this project? 21 THE WITNESS: Also the same Waikoloa 22 project, there was put collateral for the amount 1 23 million, 200. Maybe because of the title report --

you can see that on the title report. Yeah, the

title report shows that there's a collector for 1

24

```
million, 200, and another one for 1 million, and we
1
2
     didn't give him the authority.
 3
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Have you filed any
 4
     action against Mr. Martirosian for these acts?
5
                THE WITNESS: We plan, but so far we only
 6
     filed for the Malibu. Now, when I come back, I will
7
     be take care of this.
                In 2005 he announced that land is for sale.
8
9
     We paid 1 million, 625,000. Vitoil got 35 acres.
10
     But then in 2017 we found out that for that price,
     two lots were sold, 35 acres and 17, and apparently
11
12
     he put title for 17 acres into his name.
13
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you.
14
                But you have taken no action at this time.
15
                THE WITNESS: So this is the Malibu case,
     that's what I mentioned earlier. This is the one we
16
17
     already filed.
18
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: So it's not the
19
     Hawai'i?
20
                THE WITNESS: The other cases are still
21
     pending.
22
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: But nothing in
23
     Hawai'i?
24
                THE WITNESS: Soon.
25
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Are any of your
```

companies registered to do business in Hawai'i? 1 2 THE WITNESS: Waikoloa Highlands is 3 registered. 4 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, any 6 further questions of this witness? Hearing none, I 7 think we're at a good time for a break. Then after 8 the break you can bring your second witness, Mr. Lim. MR. LIM: Maybe a short wrap up rebuttal. 9 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. LIM: 12 Mr. Grigoryants, you testified that there are discrepancies in the corporate documents that you 13 14 submitted, correct? 15 Α Yes. Can you tell the Commission who makes the 16 17 final decisions and who owns the companies that you've been talking about today? 18 19 I just want to reconfirm that my brother Vitaly is the owner of the company, and we together 20 2.1 run the business. And it's only two of us make all the decision in connection with all American 22 23 companies, and all the companies in other countries. 24 We understand our responsibilities for

decisions we make. And I would like to say one more

- me, and because I am here, and because also trusted
  Mr. Martirosian, and he betrayed us.
  - Q Last question. Can you personally commit to the Commission that you will be taking charge of development of the project along with Ms.
- Batichtcheva and Mr. LaPinta?

- A I promise that I will be personal control this project, and if committee makes a favorable decision, I promise that we will complete the project.
- Q Do you have any more statements for the Commission before you leave?
- A I would like to thank all the members of the committee for your patience, for your excellent questions, and I hope that now you have more clarity on this issue. And, again, I apologize for not being here in May.
- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No further questions?
- MR. LIM: No further questions.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry, Mr. Okuda
- 22 indicated he might have one last question.
- COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Counsel can answer this question also just to speed things up.
- Since in response to your question, Mr.

1 Lim, about discrepancies in the documents, can you 2 identify by specific exhibit number documents which 3 contain discrepancies or erroneous information? 4 MR. LIM: The ones I'm aware of are 5 Exhibit 5, our last filing which was May 9th, 2016, 6 where I think Mr. Grigoryants already testified that 7 that was in error by identifying Mr. Martirosian as a 8 shareholder. 9 And I don't know if it's in error or not, 10 but the other issue was the organizational chart which showed his brother as being the ultimate 11 12 decisionmaker, and I think he's clarified today that 13 they have an agreement to share both control and 14 ownership. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, Mr. Okuda. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: If I can ask a 16 17 follow-up question. 18 Were there any -- or can you tell us --19 strike that. 20 First question is: Are there any documents in the record correcting these erroneous documents? 21 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I asked that question 23 earlier. 24 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I forgot the answer.

MR. LIM: There's no documents, but I think

Mr. Grigoryants's testimony today has corrected 1 2 errors in the documents. 3 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Chair. I 4 have no further questions. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are now going to 6 take a ten-minute recess. 7 (Recess taken.) CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha. We're back on 8 the record. 9 10 Before we proceed, Mr. Lim, I have received 11 by us today a submission of a copy of a Irina Frances 12 McGriff, Certificate of Service. Did you want to make this an exhibit? 13 14 MR. LIM: That's correct. This would be 15 Petitioner's Exhibit No. 38. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any 17 objections from the County or Office of Planning or 18 the Commissioners for the inclusion of this as 19 Exhibit 38? Hearing none it's included in the 20 record. Thank you. 21 (Petitioner's Exhibit 38 was received into 22 evidence.) 23 Now you may proceed with your second and 24 final witness.

MR. LIM: Petitioner will call Joel

1 LaPinta. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. LaPinta, good 3 afternoon. 4 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 5 you're about to give is the truth? 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Please state your name and address for the record and then 8 9 Mr. Lim can proceed. 10 THE WITNESS: Joel LaPinta, and my address is 255 Puia Road, Hilo, Hawai'i. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You don't have to go 13 that close to the mic. You can be slightly back. 14 Normally people are too far away, including your 15 counsel. 16 MR. LIM: I was trying to correct my. 17 Prior --18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 19 MR. LIM: At this time the Petitioner would like to offer Joel LaPinta as an expert witness in 20 2.1 the area of real estate development and sales. His 22 curriculum vitae is attached as Petitioner's Exhibit

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please go ahead.

question, if the Commission would like.

No. 23. And I can ask him some more qualifying

23

24

-000-1 2 JOEL LaPINTA. 3 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 4 Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined 5 and testified as follows: 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. LIM: 8 Mr. LaPinta, how long have you been 9 employed -- let me back up. 10 What is your line of business at this time? 11 Α Currently I'm doing development land 12 consultant with a number of developers. I'm doing 13 development modeling so that their projects can 14 financed with debt and equity sources, and a number 15 of projects. 16 And also I worked for Kennedy Wilson for 17 seven years. We acquired a project in Kaua'i. I 18 was -- and I was in charge of the development in 19 completing the development of that project that was 20 partly finished and did not have all of its 21 subdivision infrastructure done. 22 I also was one with -- when the CEO did the 23 investment for Kennedy Wilson. MR. LIM: This is Petitioner's Exhibit 6. 24 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I don't know why

we're getting a lot of static, whether the mic is too 1 2 high --3 THE WITNESS: How's that? 4 So I'm involved in the working with 5 developers and people and plans that are suited for 6 development. And myself, I have a project in Kaua'i, 7 I bought out the interest in a project in Kaua'i. (By Mr. Lim): I'll be following some of 8 9 the information that's on Petitioner's Exhibit 6. 10 What is your education as it relates to 11 this particular subject? 12 My background in undergraduate was science. 13 I was premed student. I studied history, science. 14 COURT REPORTER: I can hear you. 15 THE WITNESS: My background was in science 16 and math. And when I got into real estate, I 17 immediately went through a program which a Commercial Investment Real Estate Institute has which provides 18 19 educational opportunities.

And also I have a background in course work in doing development review, project review, projects for analyzing high-rise, multi-family development, that type of thing.

Q Can you please identify some of your professional training with regard to the subject

20

21

22

23

24

1 matter?

A My professional training with regard to this subject matter?

Q Yes. Regard to real estate, what kind of training did you have in real estate?

A I was describing the Commercial Investment
Real Estate Institute training. Also, I don't have
it in front of me, but I've taken a number of courses
over the years in, like I said, multi-family
development, and taken courses in land acquisition
and development analysis.

And I'm a fairly -- I also actually developed real estate and subdivision here in County of Hawaii.

Q For how many years has that been that you've been developing real property in the County of Hawaii?

A First subdivision I did was in 1986.

Q Have you done any projects that are similar to the Waikoloa Highlands project?

A Yes. In the '90's I acquired a piece of land, went through the zoning change, did everything from having the subdivision approved, engineering done, to in process of dedicating the streets to the County of Hawai'i and provided 28 gap-housing

1 residential sites. 2 Q So currently your primary job now is to act 3 as budget consultant, project manager? 4 Α Yes. 5 That would be what you've been retained to 6 do for Waikoloa Highlands? 7 Α Correct. MR. LIM: I would offer Mr. LaPinta as 8 9 expert witness in the area of real estate development 10 and sales. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there questions 12 on this matter from the County of Hawai'i? 13 MR. KIM: No questions. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 14 15 MS. APUNA: No questions. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 16 17 I just want to know, Mr. LaPinta, you 18 mentioned one project that you took through 19 entitlements? 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What was the size of 22 that project? 23 THE WITNESS: 28 lot residential 24 subdivision.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Where was that.

1 THE WITNESS: Pepeekeo. I bought land from 2 C. Brewer Company, who also I did consulting work 3 for. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That was solely under County zoning? 5 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, it had already been 7 urbanized, correct. 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Does anybody object to Mr. LaPinta being qualified as proposed? Hearing 9 10 none. 11 Please proceed. 12 MR. LIM: Thank you. 13 Can you give the Commission a brief 14 background of your work on the Waikoloa Highlands 15 project and when it was that you started work on this project? 16 17 I started --18 Q Approximately. 19 Approximately I started in June on this 20 project. 21 Of this year? 22 Yeah, June of this year. But I had been 23 talking to the ownership for sometime before that. I 24 don't know exactly how long.

Q From June of this year, what have you done

with respect to development of the project.

A To begin with I reviewed the engineering.

And I at my insistence I told the client that we first need to proceed with reviewing the project and see if it's viable as a project economically.

And so I reviewed the engineering. That was done so far by RM Towill on the project. And quite a bit of engineering was done.

In fact, to date, the roundabout plans were completed to the point that they were first submitted to the County, and the County had actually done its first review of the roundabout plans.

The drainage study, topographic surveys were done on the first phase. They had completed civil engineering plans with grading plans, and erosion control plans as well. We reviewed those.

At my insistence, the client, there were some outstanding bills. And to get cooperation and to work with RM Towill, those had to be paid. It was about \$43,000.

I had numerous meet -- I had a three-and-a-half, four-hour meeting going over the plans alternative ways in which we can develop the project, and what was work was done.

I've come up with -- I have an estimate of

how much the remaining engineering will cost. And I confirmed with RM Towill that the work they have done so far, it can be used, and they will work from where they are now with the grading plan that they have, with the flood control plans that they have with street design. So that was good to know.

And we can also work from the roundabout plans as well.

Hawaii Water Company and discussed the issues concerning the service. The area is within the service area of West Hawaii Water Company talking to Stephen Green. We went over the tariffs and cost and discussed the issues concerning this specific project because the contribution and aid of a construction, if you're familiar with that, to get water, the developer needs to contribute to the capital cost of the system.

So the acronym CIAC fees were discussed and how are they based because they're based on a formula about the amount of water each lot would use.

So in Waikoloa, a residential lot, they consider residential lot will use 600 gallons a day, that's their measure; 400 gallons for potable use and 200 gallons a day for landscaping.

Because of these proposed to be one-acre lots, they want an additional agreement and additional fees to be paid for the anticipation that people with one acre lots would use more water.

So we come to an estimate of about what they will cost, and a procedure for getting our commitment.

And also investigated the cost and calculated whether County fair share, what contributions will be on the project.

Also reviewed and discussed it with -- you know, did a market analysis of what I think the price points will be. And I built the business model and estimated what the cash flows would be to model what the cash flows will be from a project to be developed at that site.

I've also a reviewed the affordable housing, and you may have questions about affordable housing. I can go over that with you as well.

Q Can you please give the Commission an overview of the project itself and how many lots, et cetera? Then go into a description of the subdivision process that will be necessary to get to final subdivision approval and sales of the lots.

A What this stage -- the project would be

developed in increments and the increments would be sized based on market and demand. I'm looking at doing somewhere between 50 to 80 lots in the first increment.

In order to proceed at this point, assuming we can go back and get rezoning and extension on the conditions from the County. We would go forward and get the tentative approval on a preliminary plat map.

And I would work with RM Towill to finalize the engineering for the streets. And we are also looking at ways to reengineer to make them more cost effective. Looking at doing, rather than County dedicated streets, doing private streets using -- and I've also discussed using native plants that use very little water for the landscaping on the shoulders of those streets.

One of our concerns if the project would need to be fenced to keep out goats and feral donkeys, because that's a major problem if we were to landscape our streets. So I've looked at the possibility of doing that and the cost.

I met with and toured the Waikoloa drive force initiative and did a write-up on that. And I think it's possible we can use a lot of their knowledge towards coming up with the program for

landscaping along the shoulders of the project.

So we would have a very nice project that would reduce the amount of water. And if you haven't seen the Waikoloa dryland initiative, it's quite a beautiful environment when you look at the ground cover that is generated by promoting the native plants.

So to meet those criteria, at that point prior to construction, we would register the project under Uniform Land Sales Practices Act, and we would register under the Uniform Lands Sales Practices Act and we would do pre-sales on a preconstruction basis after bonding for completion on the first phase of subdivision improvements.

Q So the project already has some level of construction drawings for the subdivision infrastructure and water system and roundabout?

A Yes, it's quite far along.

Q Do you have an estimated percentage of how complete those are at this point?

A I guess we could do it by the numbers.

It's about, I estimate that we have \$670,000

additional work to do with the engineering. And to date there was close to maybe 900,000 spent on the engineering for this particular space of the first

1 phase of the project.

A How long, if you were given the go-ahead, how long would it take the engineers to -- I know that you are not in charge of that -- but your estimated time frame for getting the project plans up to snuff so that they could pass muster with the County's Department of Public Works and Department of Water Supply?

A After one year going through the County rezoning, after the one-year County rezoning, we would be there in about 14 months.

Q And that's to final construction drawings?

A Yeah, really, 26 months with the County rezoning.

Q Once you have the final construction drawings approved by the County, what happens next in terms of going towards --

A To get the construction drawings we go out, get competitive bids from a number of contractors who are qualified contractors. We enter into a subdivision agreement with the County, and as part of that agreement they will have to post a bond to bond for the bid price of the improvements. And then we can register under the Uniform Land Sales Practices Act with Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs,

and we can proceed to take actual binding contracts prior to starting construction.

- Q So at that point in time you're selling the lots essentially and there's no construction on the ground?
- A That's correct. And I will say that I did that in the subdivision in Pepeekeo 6789.

In fact, in order to close the loan with First Hawaiian Bank and Isimoto (phonetic) as my partner, I had to do that, because the pink wouldn't finance until we had preconstruction sales in place.

This is not -- this is how we have been doing this in the state for 40, 50 years, so it's not new.

- Q When you say "we" --
- A General real estate, yeah, land developers.

This has been the process of doing land subdivision and development for decades.

- Q In during consulting work, do you have occasion to speak with various developers, purchasers, sellers in terms of feasibility of projects as they are looking at them?
- A Yes. I'm in contact with many developers, engineers and contractors in the industry, and have been for -- I started selling and developing land

back in the '90's, so I've known a lot of them and I'm in contact with them today. I'm in contact -- actually I am talking to one contractor about the project, working with a contractor as partner on development has its advantages.

- Q Based on your experience on evaluating projects, do you think that the Waikoloa Highlands project is a feasible development?
- A Yeah. That was the first step that I analyzed it and believe it's feasible.
- Q One of the concerns that has been raised by the Commissioners is that the fear is that having had the District Boundary Amendment to Rural for the last ten years will lead to private land speculation.
- Is that a concern for the Waikoloa Highlands project?
- A Okay, should I mention -- okay.
  - You know, that thinking, the land uses or the law that was passed that created -- what the Land Use Commission does is what's called conditional zoning, right?
  - Conditional zoning, there's nowhere in the literature that I can find where the statement of the legislative committee that reclassifying land to Urban results in land speculation.

In fact, all the research that I've seen in urban -- in urban economics is basically saying a land speculator is a farmer. You do not hold -- it's a very bad business of model to hold lands as speculation. The industry has changed. Since the '90's the industry of funding real estate development to private equity markets don't award anyone for doing a land speculation business. There's just no money in it, and it's been proven to be a way to lose money.

In fact, what I have find, and if you want to know in urban economics, is peer-reviewed studies showing that land regulations is positively correlated. Levels of land regulation is positively correlated, positively correlated with high housing prices and with homelessness.

I have a study here from the Journal of
Urban Economics. It's peer-reviewed. It's published
by University of California Los Angeles and
University of California Berkeley and University of
Netherlands, comes to the conclusion that higher
levels of approval on land use results in high
housing cost.

And I can also give you another study that Homeless Advocacy Organization located in the bay

area. This is published in University of California
Berkeley.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Lim, can you please help explain how witness' testimony on this point is relative to this?

THE WITNESS: It's relevant because there is no --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I was addressing counsel.

MR. LIM: The other of proof is that one of the issues here, and maybe one of the biggest issues is the issue of whether the Petitioner here is engaging in speculative land banking.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I understand that point, but I was trying to draw the connection between a discussion of apparently two peer-reviewed articles finding correlation between real estate prices and homelessness.

THE WITNESS: I agree, I went off course there. In fact, what I would go back to is in the industry the capital does not finance speculation.

That's the whole point, cannot finance speculation.

What you can finance is a viable business model. And the underwriting criteria for that business model includes economic analysis, also

includes in-depth market analysis. They are party groups. It includes that you can show -- of course, you have the entitlement. Entitlement comes into the business model as a risk that has to be valued if it's risk, or as an uncertainty.

If it is an uncertainty then it can kill the business model and its ability to be funded.

That's basically what happens.

But they don't fund land speculation.

There's no capital out there. If you guys can find some, give me a call, because it's just an absurdity frankly in the market today to say that there's a capital source to speculate land.

Q So in conclusion, is it your opinion that Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated is or is not engaged in land speculation?

A It appeared from the amount of work done in the engineering, and steps taken to get the archaeological inventory review approved, getting the drainage plan, all the cost put in the engineering, that is not speculation, that's proceeding with the business plan to use the property for the subdivision and lots to be sold to the open market.

Q Moving to another subject.

The Commission has discussed, through other

witnesses, the conveyance of 11.7 acres by the Petitioner for the purpose of satisfying an affordable housing agreement.

Can you please describe for the Commission how that came down, and whether or not there have been any current discussion on the affordable housing issue?

A Well, it's -- to begin with I want to draw your attention to the letter from Paul Sulla. Have you read that letter?

That letter gives an explanation of the transaction. Today I called Sidney Fuke. I asked him about the transaction from Waikoloa Mauka to Plumeria, Plumeria at Waikoloa who's manager is Paul Sulla.

Sidney said he did not know who Plumeria at Waikoloa is. And I asked him -- and he also said that the Office of Housing and Community Development of the County instructed him to have his client deed the property to that entity in order to satisfy the affordable housing requirement. Other than that he doesn't know who the owner of that company is, and he only knows that Paul Sulla is the attorney and manager of that company.

Q Did Waikoloa Highlands, Inc., subsequently

get a release of the Affordable Housing Agreement?

A Yes. They received a release, which basically ratifies that they completed their requirement for affordable housing per the agreement with the Office of Housing and Community Development.

And they followed the instructions of that office and fulfilled that obligation.

MR. KIM: If I may object to the witness' testimony. It's a legal effect of a document. He was qualified as real estate and investment expert, not as legal expert.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to sustain that.$ 

Q (By Mr. Lim): You're aware that the release of the Affordable Housing Agreement was filed -- excuse me -- dated July 20th, 2017?

A Yes.

Q And signed by the Housing Administrator of the Office of Housing and Community Development by Natalia Batichtcheva, the Director of Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated, approved as to formal legality by Amy Self, Deputy Corporation Counsel and signed by County of Hawaii Managing Director?

MR. KIM: Again, I need to object. If the witness has any direction knowledge of this document

1 other than looking at it.

that.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have. I saw the document that's recorded and it was part of my due diligence.

MR. LIM: The document we are talking about, for the Commission's benefit, is the Petitioner's Exhibit 11 on that last filing.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: This document has been included as an exhibit, correct?

MR. LIM: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Moving along.

MR. LIM: I wanted to set the basis for

Q In talking to Mr. Grigoryants about the project, and about the affordable housing issue, are you of the opinion that the Petitioner believes that their affordable housing requirements for the Waikoloa Highlands project has been fully satisfied?

A Yes.

Q Moving on to more current days. Were you part of a meeting, recent meeting with these County's Office of Housing and Community Development regarding assistance by Waikoloa Highlands, Incorporated, with County of Hawaii sponsored Affordable Housing Project?

1 A Yes.

2.1

- 2 Q When was that?
  - A Well, I have notes from the meeting. It was on the 19th, Friday, October 19th at the Office of Housing and Community Development with Neil Gyotoku, Alan Rudo, Duane Hosaka, Malia Hall.
  - Q And Malia, and the first three where Office of Housing and Community Development. And the last was who? Who was Ms. Hall?
    - A Their legal counsel.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm getting a little uncomfortable, but you can clarify. We're talking about a meeting that nobody else in this room was a party to. Where you are going?

MR. LIM: Offer of proof is the Petitioner was requested just last week by the County Office of Housing and Community Development to assist their project developer who is developing the project on that 11.7 acres that we're talking about.

The developer apparently needs more land area because there's a mauka-makai drainage channel that runs through the property, so he doesn't have enough land area to develop his affordable housing units. And I'm trying to -- the reason why we're talking about this for this proceeding, is we're

trying to show the Commission that the Petitioner in good faith on a voluntary basis is trying to assist the County in developing its Affordable Housing Project.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Please proceed.

Q (By Mr. Lim): Can you -- who called the meeting? Was it the Petitioner or you or who called the meeting?

A The Office of Housing called the meeting, asked us to come and meet with them to discuss them acquiring more land in order to accommodate 80 affordable apartments on the site.

Q Can you detail for the Commission the substance of that meeting?

A Basically the substance was that they had been -- that the owner of Pua Melia did not have enough space to put his True Value Hardware store and commercial use, plus 80 affordable apartments unless they go high, like three stories, and do stacked plats, and they prefer not to do that.

They prefer to do a two-story town home design. So the footprint would be much larger than the parcel would allow.

And the parcel is inefficiently shaped,

being very triangular and shaped at one point because

of other landowners.

So we talked about the reconfiguring the parcel with lands owned by my client in order to accommodate 80 apartments.

- Q When you spoke of Pua Melia, is this the -I'll ask you to explain the chain of conveyances from
  Waikoloa Highlands, 11.7 acres?
  - A The conveyance?

- Q Who was the land conveyed to?
- A I got to pull up the chart. It was conveyed from Waikoloa Highlands to Plumeria at Waikoloa. And then there was a warranty deed to Pua Melia, which is owned by Danny Joseph Julikowski of Cook, Minnesota.
- Q Pua Melia, LLC is the current owner of the parcel?
- A Pua Melia, LLC is the current owner. And through using 201H approval through the County's Office of Housing and Community Development, he plans to do a mixed use project on the site.
- Q What was the ultimate outcome of the meeting?
- A That we would like to accommodate them. We would like to talk with -- they're talking about

working with a nonprofit. I don't know the name.

They're talking to a nonprofit. The executive director I think is Delene Osorio. And they would like to do the 80 town homes there as affordable rentals. And they need a better configuration site to have a footprint for that project.

And we talked about working with them, their architects and engineers coming up with a better footprint, and after that, us doing a boundary adjustment in order to accommodate that. And we ended it with we're willing to work with them.

Q What were the drivers that were represented to you during the meeting in terms of why it's a good time to do the affordable housing project right now?

A The available affordable tax credits from the state, they would like to be able to take advantage of those at this time. I don't know exactly what the quantity is, but, yeah.

Q Was there also discussion of why the County's nearby Kamakoa Nui workforce housing project was stalled, and why the Waikoloa Highlands land was better suited for conclusion in this particular --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: One moment.

Commissioner Chang.

respect, I'm a little confused and I'm trying to understand. Is this transaction related to the affordable housing condition in the matter before us? Or is this a separate private transaction between Waikoloa and the County for a project?

I guess I'm a little confused. Maybe you can clarify.

MR. LIM: We think it's a separate transaction, but I don't know what the County thinks. For the first time yesterday they filed a document saying that they although we conveyed the 11.7 acre irrevocably to a third-party per their instruction, and got an release of agreement, they're now telling us that maybe that wasn't good. And frankly that surprised us.

That's why we're discussing the fact that we feel like we have satisfied the Affordable Housing Agreement by conveyance of this land which we can't get back, I don't think. We will have to file litigation or something to get it back.

But it relates in part to the current effort by the County Housing and Community

Development. Because if the County is going to end up taking the final position that we haven't fully

satisfied the agreement, then this will become very relevant.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry, just at this point, about how long do you think you have with this witness?

MR. LIM: Not very much longer.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm assuming there will be some questions for the witness. Please proceed.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner

12 Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Are you going to ask the same question again, because I didn't hear an answer?

THE WITNESS: Could I finish answering the question of why they want to do the affordable housing there and not on the County land? I can answer that.

What we were told is that the County land hasn't been cleared of unexploded ordinance to the level that's required under HUD rules. So they can't do the affordable housing until they do go to a second clearance done. The Army Corps of Engineering has done the clearance, but now they need a

```
clearance -- a report done to the Department of
1
2
     Health. I believe that's the case, right?
 3
                So they don't have clearance to build
 4
     housing on that. It involves tax credits and federal
5
     money, they can't do it.
 6
               So our site that we're talking about is
7
     cleared, so we can clear that and be done. And then
     they can use the tax credits, and they can develop
8
     housing on this site. That's the reason. Is that
9
10
     clear? Anybody have a question?
11
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Respectfully, you
12
     need to not ask us questions. I only mention it
     because you asked us before whether we had read a
13
14
     document in this case or not.
15
                I ask you to reserve that urge to ask us
16
     questions. I understand the urge, believe me.
17
                THE WITNESS: I apologize.
18
               MR. LIM: I would like to reserve time for
19
     rebuttal.
20
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. County of
21
     Hawaii.
22
               MR. KIM: County has no questions for this
```

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. State Office of Planning.

23

24

25

witness.

1 MS. APUNA: Thank you, Chair. I do have a 2 few questions. 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 BY MS. APUNA: Q So basically you're kind of stepping in the 5 6 shoes of Mr. Martirosian with respect to the project 7 manager at this point? A With respect to that, yes. But I will be 8 9 capable of doing more, because I know more about what 10 to do than he did apparently. I have seen the 11 correspondence. He was relying heavily on Sidney 12 Fuke's work. 13 And so you're familiar with the Petition 14 Area at this point in time? 15 Α Yes. 16 Are there any roads for infrastructure or 17 utilities built on the Petition Area at this time? 18 A There's quite a bit of utility infrastructure on the property, and there roads on 19 20 the property as well. 21 Q But were they built by the Petitioner since 22 the Decision and Order? 23 A Maybe you should ask your question again. 24 It's not a clear question. Your question should be 25 clearer.

The road infrastructure and utilities that 1 2 you claim are on the Petition Area at this time, were 3 they placed there by the Petitioner since the Decision and Order was made? 4 5 Α No. 6 Are there any other structures on the 7 property that were built by the Petitioner since the 8 Decision and Order? Not that I'm aware of. 9 10 And to confirm the backbone infrastructure has not been built out on the Petition Area, is that 11 12 correct? 13 Α The definition of "backbone infrastructure" 14 is ambiguous. But there is no infrastructure that I 15 see that was built since the 2008 Petition. 16 Has an agreement been reached with DOT with 17 regard to Condition No. 6 highway improvements? Condition No. 6 satisfied by the 18 19 intersection improvement that was done down at the 20 Queen Kaahumanu intersection I understand. 21 0 That wasn't my question. 22 Was there agreement between the Petitioner 23 and DOT with regard to the improvement required under

Condition No. 6? Is there a document that says that

DOT and Petitioner agree?

2.4

I don't know of a mutual document, no. 1 Α 2 A unilateral agreement? I mean unilateral 3 document? No agreement, is that correct? Steve Lim's office reviewed that and 4 cleared it. I, right now, can't hold out a document 5 6 or what the basis of that was, but they cleared that 7 it had been satisfied by the improvements at the 8 intersection. 9 Q But you can't point to a written agreement? 10 Α No. 11 With regard to archaeological Site No. 22, 12 has Petitioner consulted with SHPD, State Historic 13 Preservation Division on Site 22 directly? 14 May I consult with counsel, because it was 15 ordered and it's in process. Did we receive that? 16 Yeah, we're in compliance. I think we have 17 one last report that has to be approved, right? CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Counsel can answer 18 that, if you have the information. 19 20 MR. LIM: We made application for SHPD site 21 number, and we are awaiting for their reply. 22 THE WITNESS: That's the answer. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You can continue. 24 (By Ms. Apuna): Was a timeline for Q

development by major task and phases prepared?

- 1 A Are you talking about construction?
  - Q For development, for construction, for anything as far as --
- 4 A Yes.

- Q And was it submitted to the Land Use Commission?
- 7 A No.
  - Q When is the full project expected to be fully complete?
    - A I did a ten-year projection.
    - Q And isn't it true that earnest efforts to pursue development occurred only after the Land Use Commission decided to issue an Order to Show Cause?
      - A No. I don't think so, because Sidney Fuke was working on the affordable housing condition prior to my being involved in the project.
      - Q With regard to affordable housing condition, what is your understanding -- is that affordable housing condition the same as the requirement under Chapter 11, Article 1 of the Hawaii County Code?
        - A I believe so.
- 23 Q And do you know --
- A I believe that's the right citation. I am familiar with that.

- 1 Q That's the affordable housing chapter?
- 2 A Right.

Q Do you know what the requirement is for residential lots as far as what the affordable housing requirement is?

A 2020 -- it's like 20 points for the number of units. It's a point system, not a number of units exactly. So depending on how those units are priced, and to what income levels, you get different points.

So let's say we have 400 units, we need 80 points.

- Q Right. And so --
- A But the points can be accomplished by
  40 units. They're priced or designed for like a
  60 percent, I think, income level, yes.
- Q So generally it's 20 percent, there's a 20 percent requirement. So for this project, we have --

A Well, that's not accurate. It's 20 points, not 20 percent of the project. 20 of the percent of the unit in account, is 20 points based on the point table.

- Q Well --
- 24 A Well, what?
- Q Well, according to the housing code --

1 A Well --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Excuse me. I would encourage both of you not to interrupt each other, and encourage the witness to use a respectful tone in this meeting room.

Please continue with the Office of Planning and then you can respond.

Q (By Ms. Apuna): As I read -- well, so there's a 20 percent of total number of units proposed at the project.

So this is a 398 lot that are proposed, so 20 percent of 398 would be the 80-unit that you had, so 80 would be the affordable housing requirement for this project?

- A 80 points.
- 16 Q 80 points, 80 units.

And you said that for -- the developer has put in 201H application for 32 units for the 11.7-acre lot?

- A Which developer?
- Q I think it's Plumeria -- Pua Melia.

A This is what I'm told by -- this is what I was told by the Office of Housing and Community

Development and the County and their officials. But we're not really involved in that. Our meeting was

- 1 to discuss them acquiring more land to complete their
  2 project.
  - Q But as far as you know, the 11.7 or .8-acre lot that was transferred from Petitioner to Plumeria and then was sold to Pua Melia, on that lot it is proposed to have 32 units of affordable housing; is that correct?
    - A Where did you get that information? I don't have that information.
    - Q Well, I think one of our exhibits from the Hawai'i Housing and Finance Department said there is an application.
    - A I can't really -- I'm not -- that's not part of something I need to work on, because that's their project.
      - Q Thank you.

- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It is 3:28 p.m. What I would like to propose doing is taking a break, ten minutes. We will then go for one further hour and then call it a day for the day.
- I suspect we might have a full hour of questions for Mr. LaPinta, I don't know. If not, we can begin with the County.
- Is that acceptable to the parties and my fellow Commissioners? Let's take ten minutes. Thank

```
1
     you.
2
                (Recess taken.)
 3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay, we're back.
 4
      Thank you for your patience.
5
                Commissioners? OP, you were done?
                MS. APUNA: Yes.
 6
7
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
8
     Commissioner Aczon and then Commissioner Chang.
9
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Like my fellow
10
      Commissioner Wong always says, we're just laymen,
11
      just simple questions.
12
                Mr. LaPinta, who do you report to?
13
                THE WITNESS: I report to Natalia
14
     Batichtcheva and to Valery Grigoryants.
15
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So your immediate
16
      supervisor is Natalia?
17
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
18
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: She has the power
19
     to --
20
                THE WITNESS: But I'm an independent
21
     contractor. But anything that I do, I get clearance
22
      from them. They don't want to have me appear to be
23
     an agent or a person who has rights to enter into
2.4
      contracts or contractually bind them.
```

So everything I run by them before I have

```
1
     meetings or interactions with the utility company,
2
      for example, or with RM Towill, engineering
3
     companies.
 4
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So you cannot do
5
     anything without --
 6
                THE WITNESS: Without authority from the
7
     owner, correct.
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Natalia's permission;
8
9
     and Natalia can't do anything without the owners --
10
                THE WITNESS: The owners, yes.
11
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: -- permission?
12
                THE WITNESS: Correct.
13
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Maybe I'm kind of
14
      losing it. I'm still not -- not fully understand
15
     what is your core responsibility for this project?
16
                THE WITNESS: My core responsibility for
17
     the project is to manage the development, to
18
      initially to do a feasibility study to see if
19
     developing these lots, and given the potential market
20
      for them and the price points that we could sell them
21
     at, and giving the anticipated cost and steps and the
22
      time to develop that it would be a profitable
23
     enterprise rather than lose money.
24
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So from start to
25
      finish?
```

1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, correct.

2 COMMISSIONER ACZON: What would you do

differently from the previous management?

THE WITNESS: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER ACZON: What would you do differently from the previous management for the ten years that went by?

THE WITNESS: What would I do differently? Move quicker, one.

 $\label{eq:work with designing a product that the} % \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{$ 

Three, work in finding ways to do cost engineering with the engineers. And that's what my discussions with them and meetings have been, and they believe there's ways in which we can do that.

We don't believe this is a high-end luxury development. It's going to be pretty much, you know, modestly priced in line with Waikoloa Village residential, but with a larger lot. And actually pricing similar to one-acre lots, maybe a bit higher, but in a price range that we think we can move the lots. And we're looking at the price range for places around Kailua-Kona, Hilo and in Waimea.

And in this area of the island there are very few to no one acre or even half to one-acre

1 lots, little larger lots that people want a bigger
2 site.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Maybe you answered this before, but do you have an overall financial plan for the project, or is that your responsibility or Natalia's responsibility?

THE WITNESS: My responsibility.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: And my question is --

THE WITNESS: I do the financial modeling for the project.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: So you have an overall financial planning for what the whole project is going to cost?

THE WITNESS: Yes, correct.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Do you think that the 45 million that is borrowed is enough to finish the project?

THE WITNESS: Actually it's way more than we need. Like for my model in here -- let me look at the spreadsheet.

What happens is this is done in increments, the project is done in increments. And as the increments go forward, we sell lots and that reduces the capital cost.

So based on -- I have this particular model

here. It's for the 398 lots. The peak, we call peak
capital during the entire sellout of the project
towards the development cost, comes to 15 million,

790. 15,800,000 would be peak capital.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Just give me a minimum dollar amount from minimum to maximum.

THE WITNESS: This is a model using strictly equity capital, so there's no enhancement using dead capital, because if you have a project like this, you have assets that banks would lend on, especially finished lots. You have an inventory finished lots, or if you have future increments that are finaceable, and bank knows they're good collateral. You can get some enhancement by borrowing money.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I'm not going to hold you to it.

THE WITNESS: We're talking about cost that, you know, in the early stage, you want up-front cost because of infrastructure up-front, so those numbers get to be high. So in the early stage we get a high --

COMMISSIONER ACZON: So --

THE WITNESS: What I said, I told you -- I'm sorry.

```
What I mean by -- if you're going along,
1
2
     the max, in this model, the maximum amount of capital
3
     the developer will have out is 15 million, 800,000?
 4
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Does that answer your
5
     question?
 6
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: That's the maximum?
7
                THE WITNESS: That's the maximum amount,
8
     yes.
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: What is the minimum?
9
10
                THE WITNESS: Well, it starts out in the
11
      first month that -- the first months they're putting
12
      in a million one to million six every month to do.
     But as that goes along, they will be selling lots and
13
14
      lots will help pay.
15
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: I understand.
16
                Just to follow up with Ms. Apuna's question
17
     about the time.
18
                So you have a overall timeline for the
19
     project, correct?
20
                THE WITNESS: Correct, yeah.
21
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: When do you think is
22
     the project's shovel ready?
23
                THE WITNESS: My timeline has us out 26
24
     months, which would be at a point to --
25
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Talking about ten
```

months for the whole project -- ten years for the whole project?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, but in 26 months we will be at a point where we can start pre-sales, because we have to go through a zoning, 12 months with the County zoning, get that in place. Then get our civil plans done, approved, reviewed. And we have a number of other agreements that need to be finalized with the utility companies.

So at that point I think we would be ready to register the project and then go to preconstruction sales.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: So when do you think
Mr. Grigoryants can come down over here to break the
ground; looking forward to it?

THE WITNESS: Well, if the market's right, it would be about 30 months. Because you've got to -- it might be earlier than that, because once you start the preconstruction -- preconstruction sales have to be cash sales, and once you start that, you want to complete your streets and deliver lots, because then you can sell to people who can build houses right away.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: So after all the infrastructure is finished, the model for this

```
project is to sell individual lots?

THE WITNESS: Right. During
```

preconstruction -- during preconstruction sales

pretty much will have to be cash sales because banks

will not finance unless you can build the house. And

you need to complete the streets to be able to get a

loan to build the house.

So we'd start out with the preconstruction sales. Probably be a lower price, give people incentive to buy preconstruction. And then once construction --

COMMISSIONER ACZON: You're not answering my question. My question is the model for this project is to sell the lots individually?

THE WITNESS: Right. Sell lots individually, correct.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: So it's going to be all owner builder?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Yeah, in the beginning, that's our plan is to sell lots.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: The 11 acres, going back to the 11 acres that I asked earlier. I understand it was conveyed to Plumeria, correct? Was Plumeria, they understand the conditions by the Commission for affordable, how many affordable

1 housing do they have to supply?

THE WITNESS: Ask the question again. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: So does the -- did the Petitioner gave Plumeria instruction on how to comply with our condition?

THE WITNESS: No.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: My point is just barely giving 11 acres to this one entity, it doesn't -- for me it doesn't -- the Petitioner doesn't necessarily comply with the Petition. It has to be, you know, ultimately the Petitioner is responsible to make sure the conditions are met, not when they turn over the land.

THE WITNESS: That's a legal question beyond my expertise. That's beyond my expertise technically how the condition -- you're asking about the State's condition and how it works with the County's condition and management of affordable housing, and I'm not qualified to answer that question.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry, you were qualified as a development expert before this Commission. It's kind of a core part of doing development before this Commission. So if you could

1 | at least try and answer the question.

2.1

THE WITNESS: My understanding is that the conditions are on the land, on the order, the boundary amendment, conclusions of law that these then are, at least authority, actually is with the County and the County agencies in charge from that point on to work with the developer, so the developer is in compliance. That's how I understand it's being done.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Well, I beg to differ, but let's move on.

MR. LIM: Perhaps I can -- the Decision and Order for this project has Condition No. 9 on affordable housing, basically requires that the Petition shall provide affordable housing opportunities for residents of the State of Hawaii in accordance with applicable affordable housing requirements of the County.

Location and distribution of affordable housing, or other provisions for affordable housing shall be under such terms as may be mutually agreeable between Petitioner and the County.

THE WITNESS: Correct. That's my understanding.

MR. LIM: Goes onto say that we would

```
provide the Commission (indecipherable) copy of the
1
2
     affordable housing agreement within 30 days.
 3
                I do not know whether that happened or not.
 4
                THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I could have
      looked it up, but I was trying to go by memory.
5
 6
      Probably a bad idea.
7
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So let me understand.
      So still the Petitioner's responsibility to meet the
8
9
      compliance?
10
                MR. LIM: Of the County.
11
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: One last question, Mr.
12
     Chair.
13
                Condition No. 6. In your opinion, who has
14
     the final say that the condition has been met, the
15
     Petitioner or Department of Transportation, or the
16
     Commission? That's the Department of Transportation?
17
                THE WITNESS: What is your question?
18
      just reviewed --
19
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Condition 6.
20
                THE WITNESS: Yes, my understanding.
21
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: The Petitioner is
22
      claiming that they complied with Condition 6 by --
23
                THE WITNESS: Yeah.
24
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So who has the final
25
            DOT is saying that Petitioner didn't comply.
      say?
```

So my question is, who has the final say to say, yes, 1 2 the Petitioner complied or did not comply? 3 Petitioner, DOT or Commission? 4 MR. LIM: Petitioner will stipulate that 5 Condition 6 on the DOT intersection requires that 6 Petitioner shall reach an agreement with the State 7 Department of Transportation. I'll represent to you that no agreement was 8 9 made, although the improvement did get built. 10 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 12 Commissioner Aczon. Commissioner Chang. 13 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you. 14 Good afternoon, Mr. LaPinta, I just have a 15 couple questions. 16 First one, I just wanted to make sure I 17 heard you correctly. Was it your testimony that this 18 project to build approximately 398 rural lots and all 19 of the infrastructure would cost \$15 million? Did I 20 hear that correctly? 21 THE WITNESS: No, that's not my testimony. 22 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Make sure I 23 understand.

THE WITNESS: I'm describing that during the process of developing the project, you would

24

develop it in increments, so you wouldn't subdivide and put streets in for 398 lots and have them sit empty. You do it in increments. So each increment would be done as sales occur. And the proceeds from the sales would then come back to help fund the project.

And at that point -- so when I describe that number, that's based on a model of certain rate of sales per month and per year, certain rate of doing the development incrementally. So that would be called the peak -- in the model it's the peak capital that the owner has to put in to fund the project. So that's the maximum amount he would get to.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And a lot of that is based upon presumption?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I wish I could project the future, you know. There's major risks in real estate development, and not just entitlement risks, obtaining entitlement. Also the risk of market. There's macroeconomics that as we know 2008 great recession. There's all kinds of risk involved.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Currently the condition is you have to build within ten years.

Can you give me, based upon your expert

opinion as a real estate developer, what is the total estimated cost to build this project, not in phases, not based upon certain assumptions, but what is the total cost?

number. That's where that came from. And my client put up that letter, because he said, well, if you were to fund the whole thing all at once, but no one does that. That's not how you would do it.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So I'm going to take this in phases. So I'm going to look at what the current proceeding before us is an Order to Show Cause why the property should not be reverted because there has been substantial noncompliance.

So based upon your expert opinion to do this project that was approved in 2008 to have been completed by 2018, it would have cost \$45 million; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That's an estimate, yeah, that's an estimate. It's an estimate.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And my understanding is you have -- your testimony has also been today that approximately \$900,000 has been spent on -- I think you called it first phase of the project, pre-engineering. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I wouldn't call it 1 2 pre-engineering. It's engineering that's been done, 3 and a lot of work was done. And topographic surveys, drainage studies, a drainage plan was done. And the civil engineering on the first phase. And the civil engineer meaning design of the road. These are plans 7 that can be construction plans bid by a contractor for the roundabout.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: You said that was about 60 percent, so 40 percent more would need to be done.

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So up-to-date, \$900,000 in your opinion has been spent to date?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. That's based on detail analysis of the billings from RM Towill in my meetings with them, and discussion -- and then my goal there was not to come up with this figure for this purpose. Actually my goal was to come up with a figure what we anticipate the future cost will be. That's why I did that.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Well, our goal is from LUC is to determine whether there has been substantial compliance.

So the estimated cost to build this

1 development is approximately \$45 million. To date, 2 approximately \$900,000 has been spent. 3 In your opinion -- and I take you've 4 actually gone out on the site -- has there been any -- what kind of use of the land has been done on the 5 6 acreage, actual land use? What kind of improvements 7 to the land have been done other than engineering? THE WITNESS: The engineering work has been 8 9 done. And the conveyance of the parcel for 10 affordable housing. 11 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So in your opinion 12 there has been no land use on the property? 13 THE WITNESS: No, not the land. 14 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Okay, no land use. 15 In your expert opinion as a real estate 16 developer, looking back, this was approved in 2008. 17 Do you believe that the environmental work, 18 the environmental studies that were completed, are 19 they still viable or are they stale? 20 THE WITNESS: I believe they're still 21 viable. 22 COMMISSIONER CHANG: In your opinion, are

the archaeological work still viable or are they

THE WITNESS: Viable.

23

24

stale?

1 COMMISSIONER CHANG: And so that, in your 2 opinion, you feel confident that you could proceed 3 based upon the existing environmental studies that 4 were completed prior to 2008, prior to the approval 5 of the boundary amendment, you feel confident that 6 those studies are still relevant and pertinent to 7 today? 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You can take a break 10 for other Commissioners, and come back to you. 11 Commissioner Ohigashi. 12 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Yes, thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Can you tell me the 14 difference between the rural designation that they 15 have now, and state ag land, can both be subdivided? THE WITNESS: Both could be subdivided into 16 17 one-acre lots. And there's zoning for family agriculture in the County of Hawaii zoning ordinance 18 19 allows zoning of one-acre lots in the State 20 Agricultural District. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So if this matter 21

is reverted, would they still be able to develop the one-acre lots?

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: The property -- because in order for this property to be classified Rural, the

```
1
      owners went through a process with their consultant
2
     and --
 3
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand that.
 4
     My question is different. My question is, State
5
     ag --
 6
                THE WITNESS: I'm sorry --
7
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Can still be
8
     divided into one-acre lots?
9
                THE WITNESS: In ag you can sub -- no,
10
     because the general -- we would have to change the
11
     General Plan. The General Plan of the County of
12
     Hawaii supports Rural classification for this site.
13
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: But in each case,
14
     whether it's a Rural designation or State Land Use
15
      Designation, it would be ag? It would be one-acre
16
      lots, right?
17
                THE WITNESS: Under Rural it's possible to
     do half acre lots.
18
19
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Maybe even denser.
20
                THE WITNESS: You could do smaller lot
21
      size. But we wouldn't be able to increase the number
22
     of lots. So by density, if you mean number of lots,
23
      I don't believe that's possible because the County
24
     will not allow that.
25
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The 11 acres, they
```

```
were originally part of the 730 some-odd acres that
1
2
     were designated from Agriculture to Urban, right?
 3
                THE WITNESS: Right, right, correct.
 4
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And it was
5
      subdivided to a three lot subdivision --
 6
                THE WITNESS: Yeah.
7
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: -- sometime in
8
      2016?
9
                THE WITNESS: Correct.
10
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And then the
11
     Petitioner transferred 11 acres, approximately, a
12
      little bit over 11 acres, to the Plumeria?
13
                THE WITNESS: Plumeria Waikoloa is the name
14
     of the LLC.
15
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: If it reverts back
16
     to Agricultural designation, how many homes would be
17
     built on that property, on that 11-acres? How many
18
     units can be built on that property for low-cost
19
     housing?
20
                THE WITNESS: None.
21
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: None?
22
                THE WITNESS: Right.
23
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And if it reverts
24
     back, you can still have the one-acre ag lots, but
25
      you don't get any low cost housing, correct?
```

```
1
                THE WITNESS: That's correct, yeah.
2
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So if we decide to
 3
      revert it back, we wouldn't get any low cost housing;
 4
      is that right?
5
                THE WITNESS: Right.
 6
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Now, the three-acre
7
      -- you know, I'm not -- my concern is not necessarily
8
      these people are bad people or good people or
9
      wonderful people. I'm just trying to look at what
10
     the practical effects of what we are trying to do
11
     today.
12
                THE WITNESS: I appreciate that.
13
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's all I'm
14
     trying to do.
15
                So the other question I have is that
     because the subdivision was done to meet a County
16
17
     requirement, if you revert it back to Agriculture,
18
     wouldn't that negate, or be a basis to try to negate
19
     the subdivision itself?
20
                THE WITNESS: I don't know how to answer
21
     that question.
22
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: You don't have to.
23
      That was a query that I had. I'm sure the County --
24
                THE WITNESS: If reverting it from
25
     Agriculture to Rural --
```

1 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: From Rural to Ag.

and that's a problem.

THE WITNESS: From Rural to Ag creates a lot of cascading contingent problems. One is that the General Plan of the County supports Rural classification, not Agriculture. So in order to do the Agriculture zoning, we would have to go back and change the General Plan to support the Agriculture,

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not worried about that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's totally impossible for our court reporter to transcribe to people speaking simultaneously.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I apologize. I'm trying to ask a simple question so my simple mind can get ahold of this thing.

Now, if it was reverted back to

Agriculture, what requirements, besides changing the

General Plan or amending of the General Plan, would

be -- would the County get to require upon this

particular subdivision?

THE WITNESS: It would be the same thing.

There would be pretty much the same list of requirements and conditions can be put there. We really don't need the Land Use Commission's

1 conditions at all, because the County can impose the
2 same conditions, like putting one hat on top of
3 another.

2.1

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And the only missing part would be affordable housing, which they can fight among themselves?

THE WITNESS: Right, we'd have to deal.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Frankly, any of the parties can answer this question. What in the record shows or can assure the Commission that if we do not revert the property and rely on representations ten years from now, whoever is on the Commission then, might find itself in the very same position as this Commission finds itself today.

And I don't mean to be blunt about it, but it's like we're being told, hey, take our word for it.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda, I think it's a good question to perhaps ask during closing arguments, rather than necessarily directly in front of this witness.

reserved for closing arguments, if I can give a heads-up for closing argument, I would ask all parties to tell us whether or not the following is an accurate statement of the law.

In other words, quote, "where the LUC issues an OSC and seeks to revert property based on a Petitioner's failure to substantially commence use of the land in accordance with its representation. The LUC is not required to follow the procedures otherwise applicable to boundary changes under HRS Chapter 205. And that's from Bridge Aina Le'a 339 Pacific 3rd at 710.

The other question is, whether that's an accurate statement of the law. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? I'm ready to go if no one else is.

THE WITNESS: Is that a question to me?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe it was

stated by Commissioner Okuda as something that he wanted the parties to address in closing arguments.

THE WITNESS: Can you give me the reference in the Aina Le'a case?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: It's found at volume 339 of Pacific 3rd at page 710. I don't have the

1 Hawai'i report citation in front of me.

THE WITNESS: It doesn't refer to just 205,

it refers to specific clauses in 205.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Again --

THE WITNESS: I don't know if your quote is correct.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, I do thank my fellow Commissioners. You've asked all my questions I think so far except for one. And I apologize. I don't think I've heard it and we've had some intermittent ability to not hear in my old age.

You're looking at approximately 398, 400 lots, vacant lots at the initial onset of this with a possibility of later maybe building out some as life goes on, but initially they will be probably an acre or half acre to an acre.

And you said you referenced doing some market analysis in order to do your cost analysis. I don't recall if you've given us any numbers as to what you feel like you were able to be able to sell those.

If you have those ready today, have you analyzed what they might sell for at a half acre to an acre in general?

THE WITNESS: Around 200, 225. 1 2 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. 4 LaPinta. 5 THE WITNESS: The spreadsheet requires a 6 number, so that's the --7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I have a set of questions for you that are sort of widely dispersed 8 on different subjects. 9 10 One is referring to your resume. It states that in 2003 you were the exclusive -- from 2003 to 11 12 2004 you were the exclusive broker for Waikoloa 13 Heights. 14 Can you explain the relationship between 15 that project and the history of these many 16 interlocking projects? 17 THE WITNESS: Okay, I can do that. Waikoloa Heights is the half of Waikoloa 18 19 that is to the north. I think it was 898 acres zoned 20 Residential Urban. Its original Urban

I represented Oak Tree Capital who acquired the property in a settlement with a dispute with Bill

classification, so there is no Sunset, no annual

zoned by the County for residential.

reports, no conditions, it's just Urban, and it was

21

22

23

24

- 1 Mills. And then I sold the property for them.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So it had nothing to
- do with Mr. Martirosian or any of the other corporate
- 4 entities --
- 5 THE WITNESS: Are you are familiar with the
- 6 | company Oak Tree Management?
- 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I am familiar but
- 8 | that's not question that I asked you.
- 9 THE WITNESS: That was the client. It had
- 10 | nothing to do with Martirosian.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have any
- 12 previous dealings with Mr. Martirosian regarding this
- 13 | project at all?
- 14 THE WITNESS: No, not at all.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
- 16 You testified in relationship to
- 17 | questioning from Commissioner Chang about you believe
- 18 | your ability that we could rely on the existing
- 19 | archaeological studies as a sufficient analysis at
- 20 this point in time that they remained fresh.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I've seen the study, and it's
- being handled by Steve Lim's staff, and to be
- 23 finalized. And SHPD has reviewed it apparently
- does -- the archaeological site has been identified,
- 25 I know where it is.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What is the basis of 1 2 your concluding that from a real estate development 3 perspective that that's a sufficient analysis? 4 THE WITNESS: It's a very open site, so the 5 archeologist would have had opportunity to go through 6 all the property and see. 7 But, you know, there will be a need if there's an incidental find during construction to 8 stop construction and, of course, have those 9 10 incidental finds to be analyzed and determined. 11 So we would have an archeologist working 12 for that purpose during construction. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What year was the 14 original archaeological study competed? 15 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you know when SHPD 17 revised its rules for archaeological surveys? 18 THE WITNESS: No. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you aware that 20 they revised their rules since that study was done? 21 THE WITNESS: No, I wasn't aware of that. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You testified that 23 you have spoken to water companies for providing 2.4 water to this development. 25 What's the aggregate amount of water that

1 | would be needed for full buildout?

THE WITNESS: I would just inquire for the first phase, which is what I'm focusing on.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So you did no inquiry
as to the amount of water needed for the entirety of
the development?

THE WITNESS: No. We would have to negotiate an extension agreement to improve the system and build storage tanks and pumps, was my understanding. And I don't have -- I would rely on an engineer when the time comes for doing that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you know what aquifer this development is in?

14 THE WITNESS: I don't know the name of it,
15 but I know it's in a specific aquifer.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you know whether the water source is in the same aquifer?

THE WITNESS: I'm relying on the West

Hawaii Water Company. That's their business. That's

not within the purview of my work.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry, I had understood as an expert in development that you would be able to testify as to the availability of water for the entirety of the project.

THE WITNESS: For the entirety of the

1 project. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That is what is 3 before us. 4 THE WITNESS: Well, I started working on 5 this a few months ago, and I believe my 6 communications with the West Hawaii Water Company, 7 they believe they can supply water to the project. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: For the first phase 8 9 alone is all that you spoke to them about? 10 THE WITNESS: Talking about the first 11 phase, yeah. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You have not spoken about water availability for the entirety of the 13 14 project? 15 THE WITNESS: I have not discussed that 16 with them. But they are aware how many units are 17 there, and they didn't say there was no red flag. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You are not aware of 19 the aquifer, you're not aware of what the sustainable 20 yields are for this aquifer? 21 THE WITNESS: No, I'm not.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you aware of the fact the Water Commission is about to go out with revised sustainable yields for the two aquifers in

22

23

24

25

this area?

1 THE WITNESS: No. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you know that 3 those numbers are going to be reduced? 4 THE WITNESS: No. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you aware the 6 Water Commission is preparing to revise downward 7 sustainable yields for two aquifers in this area? THE WITNESS: No, I'm not. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you aware that 10 revision downward of sustainable yields in this area 11 could result in proceedings to designate these areas 12 as groundwater management areas? 13 THE WITNESS: I'm familiar with the 14 process, but I'm not aware of the specific instance. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you aware that 16 that could slow the development of water sources for 17 this project? 18 THE WITNESS: I could infer that it could. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So are you familiar 20 with -- and this is going again to your testimony in 21 response to Commissioner Chang about the freshness of 22 documents -- are you familiar with the Hawai'i 23 Supreme Court case Unite Here versus City and County 2.4 of Honolulu?

THE WITNESS:

No.

```
1
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That court case dealt
2
      specifically with for how long an EIS is actually an
 3
      adequate basis for decisionmaking, but you're not
 4
      familiar with that case?
5
                THE WITNESS: No.
 6
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So that actually does
7
     provide a standard by which documents and analysis
8
      can be considered to be fresh.
9
                Do you know how old the transportation
10
      impact analysis study was?
11
                THE WITNESS: No, but that we know we need
12
     to redo that.
13
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So you acknowledge
14
     that that --
15
                THE WITNESS: That that component needs to
16
     be redone, I know that.
17
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's usually part
     of an EIS, correct?
18
19
                THE WITNESS: Right.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You testified earlier
20
21
     about -- I'm sorry, I'm jumping around a lot of
22
      subjects you testified on.
23
                You testified earlier about your very
24
      recent last week conversations with the County of
25
      Hawaii Housing Department, I believe.
```

Are you aware of what period of time this Commission is legally obligated to look at in terms of whether or not substantial commencement has occurred?

Can we look at things that happened last week, or do we look at it from the period of time before we issued an Order to Show Cause?

THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Finally, I want to talk to you about articles that were referenced both orally by Mr. Lim, as well as in the briefings from Environment Hawai'i.

And I think you actually started at one point in your testimony to talk about some -- one of the transactions for transferring land to the various affordable housing entity.

Did you want to respond to that a little bit more?

THE WITNESS: Well, I want to say, I appreciate your volunteering and taking the time to go through the details to get the true story about this project and about the owners involved in it this morning.

Because the Environment Hawai'i articles were full of a lot of false statements that were

1 prejudicial to our client, my client.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Could you identify 3 those false statements on the record?

4 THE WITNESS: I will identify one

5 particular right now.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You said pleural, so if you can do more than one that would be great.

THE WITNESS: Well, to begin with, the statement that Steve Lim was working for Stefan Martirosian in one of the articles. She could have called Steve and gotten -- and ask Steve if he was actually working for Stefan Martirosian. He was not.

Here's a specific statement from the

July 2018 Environmental Hawai'i, page 9 through 10.

It says under the heading, belated filings. It says,
in other words, thanks to the County affordable
housing agreement, the last obstacle to Martirosian
holding clear title to more than 2,800 acres of Waiko
land was are cleared away.

This statement is based on her analysis that the sale from Plumeria to Plumeria Waikoloa for \$1.5 million, the money was used to pay off a loan that Stefan Martirosian had taken out and mortgaged the property for. This is not what happened. This is a false statement. It's a false inference. And

you have a copy of Paul Sullu's affidavit stating what the events were.

I had also contacted the person who made the loans. The loans were paid before. It was simply a matter of clearing title by recording the leases of mortgages.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You said there were other --

THE WITNESS: There is a -- in that same section of related filings, it says: Nearly nine months past the required deadline, insinuating that the owner was in default of the subdivision agreement because it went beyond 180 days.

And she's referring to the date that the deeds were recorded. That's not the same as the date the conveyance -- you do not have to record a deed to have a conveyance.

So that I would say is not a strictly false statement, but it's misleading. I think that's enough. The articles were so full of -- I mean, the level of away from the truth and the salacious connections made were easy to see.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I've never personally used the word "salacious" in reference to Environmental Hawai'i. It's not my kind of salacious

literature. 1 2 THE WITNESS: Those articles were. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I have nothing 4 further. Commissioners? 5 So I would just like to notice, since they 6 have already been referenced, at least one reference, 7 one article was specifically cited in Mr. Lim's testimony as well as -- or Mr. Lim's pleadings, as 8 9 well as orally referenced to Environmental Hawai'i. 10 I would just like to note these articles 11 for the record, as part of the record. 12 So I'm done. Anything more from the Commissioners? Okay. 13 Do you want to redirect, Mr. Lim, before we 14 15 leave for the day? 16 MR. LIM: No. I just reserve rebuttal 17 either by two witnesses depending on what's said in 18 the coming witnesses. Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay. I'm looking 20 for my cheat sheet, but what we are going to do is go into recess until I believe 8:00 a.m. 2.1 22 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: (Indecipherable). 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi 24 needs to be here by 7:30. 25 My apologies.

1	We are recessed for the day and we will
2	reconvene these hearings here tomorrow at 8:00 a.m.
3	(The proceedings recessed at 4:39 p.m.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE STATE OF HAWAII )
2	) SS. COUNTY OF HONOLULU )
3	COUNTY OF HONOLULU )
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on October 24, 2018, at 10:00 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 24th day of October, 2018, in
16	Honolulu, Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	/s/ Jean Marie McManus
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	