1		LAND USE COMMISSION		
2		STATE OF HAWAII		
3		Hearing held on November 29, 2018		
4		Commencing at 9:30 a.m.		
5		Malcolm Center		
6		1305 North Holopono Street, Suite 5		
7	Kihei, Maui 96753			
8				
9	AGENDA			
10	VII	CALL TO RECONVENE		
11	VIII	ADOPTION OF ORDER A05-755 Hale Mua Properties, LLC (Maui)		
12 13 14 15	IX	CONTINUED ACTION A07-773 Emmanuel Lutheran Church of Maui (Maui) - Consider Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Project - Consider Motion for Modification of Original Decision and Order dated March 7, 2008		
16 17 18 19 20 21	X	ACTION A07-773 Emmanuel Lutheran Church of Maui (Waikapu Development Venture, LLC (WDV) (Maui) - Consider WDV Motion to Approve Sale of a Portion of the Petition Area - Consider WDV Motion to Allow for Subdivision of Petition Ara - Consider WDV Motion for Modification to allow for use of portion of the Petition Area acquired for a workforce housing project recently approved by the County of Maui - Consider WDV Motion to Bifurcate		
23	XI	Adjournment		
24				
25				

2

		۷
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	COMMISSIONERS:	
3	JONATHAN SCHEUER, Chairperson NANCY CABRAL, Vice Chair	
4	AARON MAHI, Vice Chair GARY OKUDA	
5	EDMUND ACZON LEE OHIGASHI	
6	ARNOLD WONG	
7	PATRICIA OHARA, ESQ. Deputy Attorney General	
8	STAFF:	
9	DANIEL ORODENKER, Executive Officer RILEY K. HAKODA, Chief Clerk/Planner	
10	SCOTT A.K. DERRICKSON, AICP	
11	RANDAL F. SAKUMOTO, ESQ. McCorriston Miller Mukai MacKinnon	
12	Attorney for Hale Mua Properties	
13	JENNIFER A. LIM, ESQ. Carlsmith Ball	
14	Attorney for Emmanuel Lutheran Church	
15	PETER A. HOROVITZ, ESQ. Merchant Horovitz Tilley	
16	Attorney for Waikapu Development Venture, LLC	
17	Michael Hopper, Esq. Deputy Corporation Counsel	
18	JOSEPH ALUETA, Deputy Planner Director RARA FURUKAWA, Planner	
19	DAWN APUNA, ESQ.	
20	Deputy Attorney General LORENE MAKI, Planner	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Г

			W
1	INDEX		
2	WITNESSES:	PAGE	
	MICHAEL REILEY	1 5	
3	Direct Examination/Petitioner Direct Examination/Petitioner	15 58	
4	Redirect Examination/Petitioner	78	
5	TOM BLACKBURN RODRIGUEZ		
6	Direct Examination/Public	4 6	
	Leif Sjostrand		
7	Direct Examination/Petitioner Redirect Examination/Petitioner	79 89	
8			
9	LISA ROTUNNO-HAZUKA Direct Examination/Intervenor	92	
	Cross-Examination/OP	96	
10	KIMOKEO KAPAHULEHUA		
11	Direct Examination/Intervenor Cross-Examination/OP	109 119	
12	CIOSS-Examinación/OP	119	
13	WILLIAM CHARLES FRAMPTON		
	Direct Examination/Intervenor	158	
14	Cross-Examination/Petitioner Cross-Examination/County of Maui	169 172	
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha, good morning.

This is the November 29th, 2018 portion of the November 28th through 29, 2018 Land Use Commission meeting.

First, our Commission will consider the adoption of the form of the order for Docket A05-755 Hale Mua Properties, LLC an Order to Show Cause as to why approximately 240.087 acres of land at Waiehu, County of Maui, Hawai'i, should not revert to its former land use designation or be changed to a more appropriate classification.

Will the parties please identify themselves for the record?

MR. SAKUMOTO: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Commissioners, Randall Sakumoto on behalf of Successor Petitioner Southwest 7.

MR. HOPPER: Michael Hopper, Deputy

Corporation Counsel for the Maui County Department of

Planning. With me is Deputy Planning Director Joseph

Alueta and Planner Tara Furukawa.

MS. APUNA: Good morning, Deputy Attorney General, Dawn Apuna on behalf of Office of Planning. Here with me today is Lorene Maki.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me first update the record.

On September 13, 2018, the Commission met on Maui and granted the Order to Show Cause as to why approximately 240.087 acres of land at Waiehu, County of Maui, Hawaii, should not revert to its former land use designation or be changed to a more appropriate classification.

Between October 1st and 3rd of this year, the Commission sent collection correspondence to Sterling Kim/Hale Mua regarding meeting venue use on September 13, 2018, and emails to Southwest 7 and Sterling Kim regarding reimbursement payments for Court Reporter and venue fees.

On November 19th, the Commission mailed the agenda notice for the November 28 through 29 meeting to the Parties and to the Statewide, Maui and Hawai'i mailing lists.

Is there anybody in the audience wishing to give testimony on this matter today?

Excuse me one moment. Just take a 30 second recess.

(Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I apologize. Is there any member of the public wishing to provide testimony on this item today? Seeing none.

Commissioners, are there -- Commissioners,

before you is the form of the order in this Docket 1 2 A05-755 Hale Mua. The form of the order is in the 3 form submitted by the Petitioner with technical, 4 non-substantive changes. 5 I'll entertain a motion to approve the form 6 of the order in this matter. 7 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chairman, I 8 move. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Motion to approve the 10 form of the order in this matter by Commissioner 11 Ohigashi. Is there a second? 12 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'll second that. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The motion has been 14 seconded by Commissioner Cabral. 15 Petitioner, do you have something to --16 MR. SAKUMOTO: Mr. Chair, we actually did 17 not submit the form of the order. I just wanted to be clear on that for the record. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. 20 There is a motion on the floor. Is there 21 any discussion on the motion? Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Orodenker, do we need to do a roll 22 23 call on this? Please do roll call. 24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The motion is to approve the form of the

25

1	order.
2	Commissioner Ohigashi?
3	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Aye.
4	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
5	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Aye.
6	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Mahi?
7	VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aye.
8	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
9	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
10	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
11	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
12	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
13	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Yes.
14	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
16	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17	The motion passes unanimously.
18	MR. SAKUMOTO: Thank you very much.
19	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We will now give a
20	moment to the next group to come up Emmanuel.
21	(Recess taken.)
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The next agenda item
23	is an action meeting on A07-773 Emmanuel Lutheran
24	Church of Maui to consider motions by Emmanuel
25	Lutheran Church of Maui and by Waikapu Development

1 | Venture LLC.

The motions include Motion for Extension of Time to Complete the Project, and Motion for Modification of Original Decision and Order dated March 7th, 2008.

And Motions by WDV to Approve the Sale of a Portion of the Petition Area; Motion to Allow for the Subdivision of the Petition Area; a Motion for Modification to allow for use of a portion of the Petition Area acquired for a workforce housing project recently approved by County of Maui; and Motion to Bifurcate.

Will the parties please identify themselves for the record?

MS. LIM: Good morning, Chair, members of the Commission, Jennifer Lim representing the Petitioner Emmanuel Lutheran Church of Maui. To my right is the President of Emmanuel Lutheran Church of Maui, Dr. Michael Reiley.

MR. HOROVITZ: Good morning, Chair, members of the Commission. My name is Peter Horovitz representing Waikapu Development Ventures.

MR. HOPPER: Michael Hopper, Deputy

Corporation Counsel. With me is Planning Director

Joseph Alueta and Planner Tara Furukawa.

MS. APUNA: Deputy Attorney General, Dawn Apuna, on behalf of State Office of Planning.

2.1

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me update the record.

On May 9, 2018, the Commission met on Maui to consider Waikapu Development Venture LLC's Motion to be a Copetitioner, or in the Alternative to Become a Party, or in the Alternative to Intervene and to Consider Emmanuel Lutheran Church of Maui's Motion to Extend Time to Complete the Project.

The Commission decided to grant WDV's Motion to be Intervenor and issued its order on June 6th of this year.

The Commission decided "to defer or continue action on the Motion to Extend Time to Complete the Project for a period of six months and that the details of the next hearing would be worked out between the Parties and LUC staff.

Petitioner was to provide a detailed timetable of any and all State required, State and County required approvals and actions necessary to bring Petitioner into full compliance with this D&O to the Commission at least 60 days prior to the next hearing.

The Petitioner and Intervenor would also

submit all status reports and motions they wish to have considered at least 60 days prior to the next hearing. The Chair would have discretion to grant no more than an additional six months to defer or continue action on this matter. If a continuance of longer than six months was needed, it would have to be granted by the full Commission.

On October 12th of this year, the

Commission received Emmanuel Lutheran Church's Motion

for Modification and Exhibit 1; and Waikapu

Development Venture LLC's Motion to Approve the Sale;

Motion to Approve the Subdivision; and Motion to

Bifurcate.

On October 15, the Commission received

Emmanuel Lutheran Church's CD containing a digital

file of its Motion filed on October 12.

On October 16th, the Commission Chair mailed correspondence to Intervenor WDV granting a time extension and a limited waiver to accommodate the November hearing date.

On October 19th, the Commission received the Office of Planning's Stipulated Request for Extension of Time for filing responses and the Petitioner's Request for Extension and Waiver.

On October 22nd, the Commission Chair

mailed correspondence to the Parties responding to the Office of Planning's Stipulated Request for an Extension of Time for filing responses and the Petitioner's Request for Extension and Waiver.

On October 26, the Commission received WDV's Motion for Modification along with Exhibits A through F.

On November 19th, the Commission mailed

Agenda Notices to the Parties, Statewide, Hawai'i

Island and Maui mailing lists for this November 28 to

29 meeting.

On the same day, the Commission also received OP's Response to Emmanuel Lutheran Church of Maui' Motion for Modification.

Office of Planning's Response to WDV's

Motion for Modification. And also Office of

Planning's Response to WDV's Motion to Approve the

Sale; the Motion to Allow the Subdivision; and the

Motion to Bifurcate.

On November 21st, the Commission received the County of Maui's Response to WDV's Motion for Modification, as well as the County of Maui's Response to WDV's Motion to Approve the Sale; Motion to Allow for Subdivision and the Motion to Bifurcate.

So we have been busy.

For the members of the Public, I want you to be reminded that the Commission today will not be considering the merits of the A07-773 Petition; but rather only the Motions by Emmanuel Lutheran and Waikapu Development Ventures, LLC.

2.1

Let me briefly describe the procedure for today on this docket.

First, I will call for any individuals desiring to provide public testimony to identify themselves. All such individuals will be called in turn to our witness box where they will be sworn in prior to their testimony.

After the completion of any public testimony, the Commission will first address and decide on Petitioner Emmanuel Lutheran Church's Motion to Extend Time to Complete Project.

 $\label{eq:elliptic} {\tt ELC \ will \ first \ make \ its \ presentation \ on \ its }$ motion.

After the completion of this presentation, we will receive any comments from the Intervenor,
Maui County and the State Office of Planning.

After we have received comments from them, we will conduct our deliberations on that motion.

After that motion is considered, Emmanuel Lutheran Church will make its presentation on it's

Motion for Modification.

After we have received the comments of the Intervenor, the County and the State, we will conduct our deliberations on that Motion for Modification.

Once we have addressed those motions, the Commission will then consider Waikapu Development Ventures LLC's Motion beginning with their Motion to approve the sale of a Portion of the Petition Area.

After the completion of their presentation on the Motion to Approve Sale, we will real receive any comments from the Petitioner, Maui County and the State Office of Planning.

There's a lot of motions, so appreciate everybody's patience.

After we receive the comments from the Petitioner, County and State, we will conduct deliberations on that WDV's Motion for Sale of a Portion of the Petition Area.

Then after that motion is considered, WDV will make its presentation on its Motion to allow for Subdivision.

We will receive comments from ELC, the County and State, and then conduct deliberations on that.

After that Motion to Subdivide is

1 considered, WDV will be allowed to make its 2 presentation for Motion for Modification to Allow for 3 Use of the Portion of the Petition Area acquired for 4 workforce housing project recently approved by the 5 County. 6 After Waikapu Development Venture LLC's 7 motion is considered, WDV will make its Motion to 8 Bifurcate. 9 After we have received comments from ELC, 10 County and State, we will conduct our deliberations on that motion. 11 12 I will also note from time to time, 13 including like I'm willing to take a break right now after reading all that, I will be calling for breaks. 14 15 Are there any questions or clarifications 16 needed on our procedures this morning? 17 MS. LIM: No questions. 18 MR. HOROVITZ: No questions. 19 MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair. 20 MS. APUNA: No, no questions. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there anyone in 22 the audience who desires to provide testimony on this 23 matter? Seeing none.

We will now first address Emmanuel

We can now begin with the motions.

24

1 Lutheran's motion.

2 Ms. Lim, can you make your presentation on 3 the Motion to Extend Time to Complete Project?

MS. LIM: Thank you, Chair and members of the Commission.

To provide our presentation, what I would like to do is have Dr. Reiley take a seat in the witness chair, and we will go back and forth a little bit talking about what we actually spoke about when we were together last in May, but there has been some recent developments, very positive developments, from ELC that Dr. Reiley will be talking about.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. I'll swear you in and ask you to state your name and address for the record, then proceed with counsel.

THE WITNESS: Good morning.

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

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

MICHAEL REILEY

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the

Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. LIM:

Q Good morning, Michael.

When we were last here in May we were asking the Commission to give us an extension of ten years to complete the ELC project; is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q And at that time I know we talked a bit about your background, so the Commissioners have heard that, but I would like to very, very briefly run through that to refresh the memory.

What is your current occupation?

A Well, I'm President of Emmanuel Lutheran
Church Maui, an unpaid position. I'm also president
of HNU, a family of companies. It's presently
headquartered on Maui, but it's a diverse group,
construction, renewable energy, optics. We build
optics for NASA, platforms for the International
Space Station, biotech. A number of different
companies.

- Q How long have you been president at ELC?
- 22 A That's a good question. I would say five 23 years.
 - Q So you weren't involved when we went through the reclassification process a little over

1 | ten years ago?

A That's correct. I believe at the time I was Chairman of the Board of Elders. I've been in Emmanuel for nearly 20 years -- 18 years now, but I was not in that capacity as president or involved with the Land Use Committee.

Q How long has ELC been active on Maui?

A Well, we just had our 50-year celebration last year, and so the church is 50 years, it's 51 years now.

The preschool started in '72, so that's 46 years. And the school, we have been offering school since '78, so 40 years now on Maui.

Q Now, I know you weren't involved ten years ago, but are you familiar with the project that ELC was proposing at that time?

A Yes, I am.

Q Can you describe it in just very general terms?

A Sure.

Well, it was to develop a portion of the 25-acre property we had recently acquired. And so we did a lot on the regulatory side, project development. A lot of designs and plans and rezoning and things like that.

We did a round of fundraising, which covered the cost of those. We have been paying down the property. We still have a small debt on it, a little more than \$300,000 I think on the property.

Q If I can, the scope of the property that was originally planned ten years ago was?

A It was larger. Larger than what we envision now. It was a different economy, different situation there.

Our enrollment had been growing and we were kind of bursting at the seams of our one-and-a-quarter acre campus, and we were fortunate to be able to purchase the 25-acre campus. So we had plans to develop a much larger campus then.

Q So there were plans, I understand you weren't involved in formulating those plans, but plans to do a pretty considerable project that ELC came before this Commission to get land use entitlements. You mentioned that then they went to County of Maui to get rezoning. So it seems like there was a lot of momentum.

And then here we are ten years later and the project didn't get built. Can you explain why the delay?

A I think there's been a number of

considerations. A lot was the great recession happened. Our enrollment had been increasing up to that time. And then, like many other schools, it hit a lot of families, hit the economy here, and so enrollment did drop down. We were up at about 175 in our school, and up to about 40 in our preschool.

We dropped at our minimum to about 120, so pretty significant drop, about 30 percent.

We have since come up now in the mid 130s.

So it's back recovering as the economy recovers. And

I think the key thing for us, others may have

struggled even more so, but being around for 40 years

we have a large alumni base. We have a lot of

history and relationship in the community.

So I think we weathered the storm better than others, but still it had an impact on our timeline on development, fundraising.

Q Anything, in addition to the great recession, which we recognize that was a pretty monumental event, were there other changes within ELC that may have also contributed to the delay in developing?

A There certainly has. Our former president passed away. It was unexpected. And we've had some turnover on the members of the Land Use Committee, so

I think those contributed.

There were other affects there, a couple new elementary schools opened right in the vicinity, from makai and was focused on ours. Another one on sciences and so on.

So don't think we really shrunk because of that, but I think it impacted our rate of growth back to where we had been.

Q So there was a reduction in demand, and at the same time the people who were leading the charge on the original entitlements and development, you lost some of the leadership people?

A Correct.

Q So then you said you became president about five years ago. So was it five years ago that ELC started to look at this property again and figure out what the next steps were going to be, or was there still a lag time?

A There was still some lag time. It's been a couple of years. We made a decision as a congregation to -- in order to pay off the debt, one of the things we ran into the first round of approaching some of the foundations is the grants are not accessible if you carry debt on the property. So our goal was to pay off the debt.

One of the ways we were considering was to sell a portion of it. And that's what we -- as a deliberate body ourselves, it took awhile to do. We got full approval. We did that. Put a portion up for sale, and we entered into a sales agreement nearly two years, I think, two years ago with Waikapu Development Venture. So probably three years of the five that the process has been underway.

Q So at this point we're asking the Commission, or you're asking the Commission for an extension of time of ten years?

A That's correct.

Q And what do you envision, if the Commission were to grant that request, what do you think would be happening over the next ten years?

A Well, we would -- in order of things, we would close this transaction. We would payoff the mortgage. We would have a balance of funds to begin that development.

I think one of maybe the key differences between those involved at the church now and those back then is those now involved have more construction and development experience.

In the audience one of our long-term members, Mr. Leif Sjostrand. Identify yourself,

please.

He's been with the church and school for 21 years. Taught Sunday School most of that time. Three of his children, two have gone through the school, one is still there at the school. And he's a senior estimator with Goodfellow Bros., so he's involved, a construction professional.

Myself, I own a construction company as well. If you're driving down Waipoua, look up to the left there's a PGA training facility that we built this year, precast, completely off grid, which it's kind of cool. It's merging of our own battery that we make with our battery company. It's solar, completely off grid for that and it's state-of-the-art training facility for the PGA.

So that's a difference though, people that own construction companies that are senior in the business. He's been with Goodfellow Bros., I think as long as I've known him, couple decades.

So we have people that know what it takes to develop things. And we have in this case, I really feel a good partner, guys like Vince Bagoyo that's with us.

WDV, they have been very helpful through this process, and they're going to be developing the

other half of the property if we're successful with these motions.

And certain things like bringing in water. We won't need to bring in electricity if we develop this as an off-grid campus, one of the visions we have.

So I think that's going to play in very nicely with what differentiates you among other schools that are trying to tract. If you have a tract like you're off-grid and technology, it's green energy.

I think that's going to attract a lot of schools and families, as well as the economic benefits of not having your large Maui Electric bills.

We're pretty excited about it. I think we have a really good shot this time with the right people to make it happen.

Q Just a point of clarification. You mentioned a really good partner with Vince Bagoyo.

Just to clarify, they're a joint development or some kind of a business, joint development between WDV and --

A There is not a joint venture, it's just they are -- they're the economy of -- when you're

mobilizing things to a site. There have been discussions about how we can make sure the entire project is successful.

Q Something cooperative rather than actual business?

A They're great partners. They're here supporting these things. We completely support 100 percent affordable housing, what they're doing. They've been very supportive.

A long history here. Our original pastor,
Pastor Fricke, 50 years he's been out here. And Bill
Frampton, his whole family, he's the reason they're
here. Big brothers/Big Sisters at the time they came
out, and everybody knows the impact they have had on
that community. But that's how the church and the
school have touched many lives through the years.

Q So ten or so years ago before you were in this position, and the church was coming before the Commission, ELC was proposing a \$20 million project, and said it would be done within ten years.

Now, we are at the Commission a little over ten years later, and the \$20 million project hasn't been built.

In our second motion is when we will talk about the nature of the project we're proposing

really, but it's a much more modest scale project, but the Commission is going to, I think, have concerns that an extension of time may not actually result in anything getting built.

When we were altogether in May we acknowledged that there was going to be fundraising and grants that could maybe be sought once the property was no longer encumbered by a mortgage, but those ideas hadn't really jelled very well.

Can you please update the Commission on your vision, or new developments in terms of raising the funds necessary to pursue the project?

A Sure.

So fundraising is a key element of that.

There are some very positive developments. The first time ten years ago we did use the services of Mr.

Macklemore from Oahu, and he did helped us raise some funds.

This time around we actually have some very positive things that we are excited about. One of the people we have been in contact with, we have met with her, her name is Jocelyn Demirbag, and she was the Head Mistress at Haleakala Waldorf School for a number of years. Head Mistress of the Waldorf School on Oahu for the last three-and-a-half years. And

she's recently joined the college there with grants and development and so on.

I just met with her on Monday for a couple reasons. This was one, and another one she actually reached out to me separately. I'm on the Chancellor's Council at the college on how to guide the college, which happens to be right across the street from Emmanuel Lutheran Church and Schools.

So I don't know why I'm telling you this.

Too much free thought here.

But the point is we met with her. She was recommended to us by Bill Frampton who had that connection also, and has done this type of thing. So that's local fundraising, grant writing connections.

The other one we are really excited about is our denomination has a long history of Lutheran Christian education all along, and they're very supportive of this. And one of -- so we have a whole gift planning office.

And the head of that office back in California is a gentleman named Michael Fisher. He actually used to be affiliated with one of the churches on Oahu. And he has gotten approved through the denomination that for the next 18 months at no cost to the church he will be leading an entire

visioning gift planning development, which is a perfect timeline for what we need here to put these things in place, the fundraising.

This is what he does for a living at the national scale. Again, no cost. He's going to be here for six different sessions during that period. The first one is on December 20th. Flying in special, meeting with all the church leaders, and we're going to be developing this in earnest.

So I think between the local help with Jocelyn, then at the national level somebody that does that for our entire denomination, Lutheran Church Synog, we are very excited about this time. We will not be in this kind of situation ten years from now. We are very confident of that.

Q I guess there's a couple of barriers to engaging in that fundraising, and one is the mortgage; and the second is right now we are out of compliance with the Commission's original order.

- A That's correct.
- Q So how will the mortgage be taken care of?
- A Out of proceeds of the sale.
- Q And then -- and that will clear --
- 24 A Yes.

Q No debt on the property whatsoever?

- A Correct, no debt on our current property, and no debt on the new property either.
- Q And then will there be excess funds to begin to sort of kick-off the fundraising efforts?
 - A There will.

- Q If the Commission were to grant a time extension, is it your representation that ELC will begin its fundraising efforts in earnest and pursue the development of this -- describe it again. That's a matter for the second motion, but it's relevant to the time extension.
- A Definitely. We already have begun that in engaging these parties, and again this process we will formally be kicking off in about three weeks.
- Q Assuming the Commission approves the time extension?
 - A I am assuming that.
 - Q I think this will be my last question.
- In our motion we requested a ten-year time extension. And what I want to know from you is, is ten years absolutely the bare minimum that you think ELC needs, or if maybe in this Commission's discretion, in light of the history and the facts that through no fault of ELC, but there just wasn't really progress on development, if in the

Commission's discretion they think a shorter timeframe is more appropriate so they know the property isn't languishing. I would like the Commissioners to hear your thoughts.

A Sure, yeah.

We actually have laid it out this time as a phased project. There's development, fundraising.

There's multipurpose building and buildout of the campus further. So there is certainly progress along there.

while we are requesting a ten-year extension, which I am confident is sufficient for what we need, a shorter extension I think would be fine to show the progress if that gave better confidence to the Commission.

Q I don't have any further questions. Thank you, Dr. Reiley.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Lim, is this the entirety of your work on this motion for the time extension?

MS. LIM: It is, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there questions for the witness from County of Maui?

MR. HOPPER: For the initial matter I'm not sure if we would go next or --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sorry, I think you're correct.

MR. HOPPER: If that's --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I apologize. I really should ask you guys to switch seats. Mr. Horovitz.

MR. HOROVITZ: Thank you, I will sit wherever I'm told. No questions, but we obviously support the motion of Emmanuel Lutheran.

MR. HOPPER: Did you want us to direct our questions to the witness, as well as our position on the motion? We don't have any questions to the witness.

The County of Maui, I think, sort of in conjunction with the modification motion, because that deals with breaking the project into phases as well as amending a condition to specify the new timeframe. We don't object to the time extension. We're supportive of it, based on also the change in conditions in the modification motion.

The County believes that there can be an opportunity given here, and that that would be preferable to reverting the property or some other method.

So at this time the County does support the

Motion for Extension. Understanding that it does go hand and in hand with the next motion that we're going to discuss as that outlines the conditions under which the extension would be granted.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Office of Planning?

MS. APUNA: We don't have any questions for the witness. Like the County, we addressed most of the concerns in the second motion. And we would also just note that we do have concerns as far as whether the property, or whether the Ka Pa'akai analysis has been fulfilled for the property, that we just leave that as a concern.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe that issue will come up in the second motion.

MS. APUNA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are there questions for the witness or for the Petitioner? Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If the Ka Pa'akai issue is going to be raised on the second motion, I'll reserve my questions to that point.

I would just like to -- I don't think this is required disclosure, but I'll state it anyway just

1 for full transparency.

Even though I was raised in a Buddhist household, our children went to a Lutheran school in Kaneohe, and I do not find the witness' testimony inconsistent with my own personal experiences of a community-based Lutheran education.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon, questions for the witness or Petitioner?

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Good morning, Mr.

Reiley. Just addressing the first motion. Because of what we went through yesterday, kind of compelled -- for the past ten years any improvements on the Petition Area? Or what is the use of the Petition Area for the past ten years? You mentioned some, but just to clarify.

THE WITNESS: That's a great question. I would say we have not done any improvements on there. There was a period of time that we were holding monthly services on the property, but the property, there is a lot of growth and it became a problem for the more elderly members of the church to access that property.

We did do that for a number of years, but we haven't done it for the last couple of years. So

- the property is old canefield. So, no, there has not
 been any development.

 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So you are not holding
 any services right now?
- 5 THE WITNESS: We are not.
- 6 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Thank you.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
- 8 Commissioner Ohigashi.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I really have a question of procedure. The two motions appear to have the same issue with regard to an extension of time. So my question would be -- is that, would we be able to consolidate that issue and start hearing on the other motion?
- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm going to -there's numerous motions presented. We had to spend
 a bunch of time thinking about how to properly
 agendize.
- I'm going to ask for sharing a little bit of thoughts from the Executive Officer, and why we structured the discussion this way.
- EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 Nice punt.
- This was set up this way in part because
 there are some slightly different issues between the

two motions. The extension of time is one that's a little bit more of a pro forma motion, extension — although there is a request for extension of time with regard to — with regard to Condition No. 2, it's also a more encompassing motion, because it's asking for modification of the project.

Theoretically, these could have all been done in a block. But given that some of them -- the issues are different than the other ones, that's why we separated them.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So if we rule on the extension, and hypothetically, if we say no extension, then does that affect the considerations of the second motion?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Yes, it does. They're designed to go in sequence. If you deny any one of the motions along the way, the other ones fall out.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just -- thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: This is -- I don't know if this is proper, but would the Petitioner consider withdrawing one of the motions, the first

motion in favor of the next motion?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: This is a question from the Commissioner to the Petitioner Emmanuel.

MS. LIM: The Petitioner wants to do whatever is going to facilitate a successful outcome today. Analytically, to me -- so that is my answer, if that would facilitate the Commission's deliberation, then that's probably an acceptable thing for us to do. But analytically, the time extension goes to all 25 acres, and that just brings us current.

That doesn't mean that on our request for modification, or on WDV's request for modification, that doesn't in any way prevent the Commission from making, what we consider an unfortunate decision, you know, should they choose to deny it, what we want to do is try to get to a clean slate.

And the other reason why we filed the time extension motion when we did, and this may ring some memory bells, is the original plan was to file everything all at one time, I mean both parties, but it's sort of a big omnibus package of motions, and have that done when the County had already approved the 201H resolution for the WDV project, thinking that the Commission would want to know that there

were two real projects going before it.

But due to some time constraints on the County side, that 201H resolution did not get approved within the time frame that we had originally hoped. So that's why when we filed in April, it was really an effort. This, as I said, the original plan was, let's make the County make the decision on the 201H, then ELC come in and request for motion for time extension, request modification, et cetera.

But because of delays on the County side in approving the 201H, and it wasn't due to issues with the 201H, it really was just a scheduling thing.

On the ELC side, we started to get very concerned that the Commission would think these guys have just run out of their ten-year timeframe, they're not even requesting an extension, they're not adhering to the Commission's rules.

And, frankly, there had a been a history for reasons that Dr. Reiley explained where there was a change in leadership, where ELC hadn't been timely with annual reports.

So we were very concerned that the Commission would think the ELC was just thumbing its nose at the Commission and not trying to adhere to timeframes, not trying to be respectful of the

process.

So that's why we filed that motion. It could almost be perceived as premature because, again, the ideal track was that everything be done all at once.

I just wanted to give that background discussion we had in May, and many things have happened between now and then. So now if the request is that we withdraw the motion for time extension, that means that then the subsequent decisions are decisions that are being made on a docket that's out of compliance. And that seems to raise a concern to Petitioner, and possibly to the Intervenor.

I'm giving you a very wishy-washy answer,
because on the one hand we don't want to overly -CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: This has been very
helpful, Ms. Lim. I think -- do you have anything to
wrap up?

MS. LIM: No, I'm happy to stop there. I don't know if maybe the Intervenor --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I would say to my fellow Commissioners, there is a lot of different motions, a lot of complexities presented to us because of the particular history of this project.

We have set out the agenda in this way

really to take a methodical series of steps, and frankly, I think they're probably close to ready to report on this first motion, and if we do that successfully, that would render the discussion of whether we should combine them with the second motion. Are we good to move forward? I'm looking toward the Maui Commissioner.

So are there further questions for either the witness, who's still on the stand patiently, or for the Petitioner on the motion to extend time?

I would ask the witness if -- you mentioned a number of plans for fundraising and other things.

Are those substantiated in written financial documents yet?

THE WITNESS: That's a great question. Not with Jocelyn Demirbag, but we do have a signed and counter-signed fully executed Memorandum of Understanding with Michael Fisher. I signed it and he signed it, so that could be provided.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioners, if there are no further questions for the witness, you're excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And no further

```
questions. I would entertain a motion on the Motion
1
2
     to Extend.
 3
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chair, I'm
 4
     going to move to grant extension. However, I would
 5
     want to place the ten-year as a placeholder in there,
     because we are taking up a second motion on that
 6
7
      issue. We may be able to determine a different time
8
     at that time, but I don't want -- in other words, I
9
     move to extend for ten years.
10
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You're making a
11
     motion to grant the request for a full ten-year
12
     extension?
13
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's right.
14
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there a second to
15
     that motion from Commissioner Ohigashi?
16
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Second.
17
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There is a second
     from Commissioner Wong.
18
19
                Discussion on the motion to grant the full
20
     ten-year?
21
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The part that I
22
     raised was --
23
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Discussion on the
2.4
     motion first.
25
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I guess I put my
```

discussion, expressed my thoughts in my previous statement. But because we are issuing this, we are considering a second motion to which includes a motion, because we are considering a Motion to Modify, and included in the modification is the request for Extension of Time. I think that there is basis at that time to address the length of time, whether or not the ten years is appropriate or whether it should be shorter or longer. And that's the purpose of my motion.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to speak in favor of the motion. This is the reason why.

Under Bridge Aina Le'a, even though there is no substantial commencement or use of the property, that element in Bridge Aina Le'a only goes, in my view, to determining what is the process or procedure the Commission needs to follow in determining what the remedy should be.

I believe the record in this case, not only the testimony of the witness in observing his demeanor, which gives us an idea of judging his credibility, but not only witness demeanor, but the document supported in the record shows good cause to

grant the motion.

I do agree with Commissioner Ohigashi that the ten years should be a placeholder, but on the issue of extension, I would urge a vote in favor of the motion. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further discussion?

Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I kind of reluctant to go along with the motion without hearing the second motion. I think the two motions kind of intersected.

The first motion locks us in at ten years without hearing the second motion. There might be some leeway on that. That's why I asked -- so that's my feeling.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, I have a question for the Petitioner. Since there is some deliberation among the Commissioners right now over whether essentially if we pass the motion right now, grant the ten-year extension, can we, based on the next discussion on your subsequent motion where there's been arguments put before us that it should be perhaps only six years, and your witness has discussed willingness to accept a smaller amount of time, would you be objecting during our next deliberation to say, oh, no, you can't do that? You

already passed the ten-year motion, you can't change it.

MS. LIM: We absolutely would not be objecting to that. The Commission has the authority to set whatever timeframe they think is appropriate. So, no.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon, does that address --

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Satisfies my concern.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I share in those concerns. It's been ten years, and we're finding that there is -- again, I won't be here, but I don't want any of my fellow future Commissioners sitting here ten years from now and nothing has happened.

We want to make sure we push along, and maybe our tighter timeline might help push the Petitioner and community to come together in order to be successful at this wonderful endeavor and a faster timeframe.

So I too would support a little tighter timeframe, or some kind of condition, or some kind of something to not have anyone sitting here from now in ten years in the same position.

I don't know how to formulate that, but I

1 | would be in favor of working that out.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

3 | Commissioner Cabral. Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The only reason why
I asked for ten years, that's the only thing before
us at this point in time. I believe OP's memorandum
addressed the modification. And the timeframe
outlined in that memorandum seemed to address the
modification where there was substantive steps being
considered for the purposes of determining whether or
not we should modify some of the terms.

So I'm only making a motion, because I don't think we can leave it without a date, and the only date before us in this particular motion is the ten years.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Understood.

Because of the nature of this, can I ask
the Intervenor whether you would have any concerns
with the manner in which we appear to be proceeding
of a ten-year motion for now, with the understanding
when we take up the next motion, the actual timeframe
might be reconsidered?

MR. HOROVITZ: We have no issue with that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Mahi.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: I'm simple. You know,

1 half now, half later; give five years. After five 2 years, see what happens. I'm for the project. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So there is a motion 4 before us right now from Commissioner Ohigashi, 5 seconded by Commissioner Wong, to grant the 6 Petitioner's motion for ten-year time extension, and 7 discussion has reflected that we might, in the substantive next motion, reconsider that amount of 8 9 time. 10 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Is that part of the 11 motion? 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's not part of 13 the motion, it's part of the discussion and 14 understanding. The motion in front of us is for a 15 ten-year time extension. Is there further discussion on the motion? 16 17 If not, Mr. Orodenker, please do roll call of the 18 Commission. 19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 20 The motion is to grant the Motion to Extend Time for 21 a period of ten years. 22 Commissioner Ohigashi? 23 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Aye. 24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?

COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.

1	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
2	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Aye.
3	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
4	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
5	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Mahi?
6	VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aye.
7	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
8	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: No.
9	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
11	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Mr. Chair, the motion
12	passes six to one.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
14	It is 10:25. We will take a ten-minute
15	break, then resume.
16	(Recess taken.)
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We're back on the
18	record.
19	For the parties and my fellow
20	Commissioners, before we move on to the next motion,
21	I was approached during the break by a member of the
22	public who just narrowly missed the opportunity when
23	I closed public testimony. He drove here and came to
24	offer, I am assured, one minute of testimony.
25	If there is no objection from the

1 Petitioner, the Intervenor and County, Office of 2 Planning or any of my fellow Commissioners, I would 3 like to reopen testimony for that expressed purpose. 4 Hearing none, would you please quickly 5 approach the witness stand. I will swear you in, 6 followed by your name and address for the record, and 7 your testimony. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 8 9 you're about to you give is the truth? 10 THE WITNESS: I do. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: State your name and 12 address. 13 THE WITNESS: My name if Tom Blackburn 14 Rodriguez. I live at 85 Manino Circle, apartment 15 202, Kihei 96753. 16 TOM BLACKBURN RODRIGUEZ 17 Was called as a public witness, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 18 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION THE WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, thank very 20

much. I appreciate your indulgence of yourself and the other Commissioners.

21

22

23

24

25

I will limit myself to one minute.

I am representing Go Maui, Incorporated, which is a nonprofit community-based organization

1 focusing on housing, jobs and a healthy environment.

We are testifying officially in support in of the Waikapu Development Venture. We appreciate it's 100 percent affordable 201H with 80 units between 70 and 140 percent of median income will be available to local residents.

Mr. Chairman, the forecast for additional housing needs by 2025 is more than we will probably be able to meet according to DBED, it is 13,949 units, housing units are needed for Maui by 2025.

So in conclusion, we think this is an excellent project. We appreciate it coming forward, and we believe increasingly that affordable housing, workforce housing, and housing for our local people is no longer just a housing issue, it is an issue of justice itself.

We urge you to act positively on the motion. And, again, thank you very much for your consideration.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Are there questions for the witness from the Petitioner?

MS. LIM: No questions.

MR. HOROVITZ: No.

MR. HOPPER: No.

1 MS. APUNA: No. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 3 Commissioner Okuda. 4 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much 5 for coming here to testify. 6 Can you tell us approximately how many 7 members are involved in your organization? 8 THE WITNESS: We are not a membership 9 organization. It is organized as a nonprofit with 10 board of directors that are all volunteers. And then 11 we try and receive funding from the community to do 12 fundraising events, that kind of thing. But if 13 you're thinking about like are you a member of? 14 there's no membership. 15 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Let me make it more 16 clear. 17 When your organization gets together, 18 generally how many people get together? 19 THE WITNESS: At our last board meeting, we 20 had 15 people. A bunch of folks ranging from 21 environmentalists to developers to health 22 practitioners. A pretty diverse people. 23 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any other 25 Commissioner questions? Thank you very much.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you again.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So I'm closing the public testimony portion, moving back to the second motion of the day.

The Commission will now address the Emmanuel Lutheran's Motion for Modification of the Original Decision and Order dated March 7th, 2008.

Ms. Lim, how are you going to present?

MS. LIM: Thank you, Chair. Initially I'll give a brief overview of the motion and ask

Dr. Reiley to come back onto the witness stand to describe his understanding of what the modified updated ELC project consists of.

We will then ask that Mr. Leif Sjostrand to come up to discuss the construction cost estimates for the updated project. And then -- this is a little bit of an unusual procedure -- but based upon both the filings of the Office of Planning, and also frankly, some of the questions that were coming from the Commission during the deliberations on the first motion, I would ask the Commission's indulgence that we allow the Intervenor's counsel to present a couple of the witnesses to address some of the concerns about Ka Pa'akai o ka aina and cultural assessments, because although certainly the ELC witness, meaning

Dr. Reiley, is competent to describe about what he knows about going on the property, when it comes to actually getting into the more detailed nuances, it's really more appropriate that the Intervenor's counsel do that in light of the fact that they have been working with the professionals who have assessed the property most recently.

Is the Commission willing to allow that?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Just to clarify for myself and the Commission, your plan is to briefly review the motion, then call two witnesses. And your desire is that the Intervenor then be allowed to call witnesses who are going to address issues that are germane to your case as well?

MS. LIM: Correct, limited to questions about the cultural assessments of the property.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: May I ask counsel for Intervenor to comment on this?

MR. HOROVITZ: We will be happy to put those witnesses on if the Commission will allow.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Who are those witnesses?

MR. HOROVITZ: Two witnesses. First is
Lisa Rotunno-Hazuka. She prepared, or her firm
prepared the archaeological study for entire property

back in '04, updated 2016. They also, the firm prepared the exhibit that was attached to our errata filing, which analyzed the cultural assessments, impact assessment, first round of the properties.

Then the second witness was going to be

Kimokeo Kapahulehua, who is a local cultural

practitioner and has prepared a cultural impact

assessment and can testify more fully to practices in
this area and on this property.

We were also intending to call Randy Peltz.

He contacted us this morning and was unable to

attend, he had some personal issues. Those would be

the two witnesses on the cultural side.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And those witnesses may still be available when we consider later in our proceedings your Motion to Modify?

MR. HOROVITZ: Yes, if the Commission requires they stay around, we will ask them to be available.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any concerns with following this procedure from the County and Office of Planning or my fellow Commissioners in that order?

MR. HOPPER: We don't object, Mr. Chair.

MS. APUNA: No objection.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 2 Commissioner Okuda. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. Maybe 3 4 counsel can comment on this. 5 Is a determination whether or not the Ka Pa'akai standards have been met or not a condition 6 7 precedent to move forward with these motions, number 8 one? 9 And number two, even if it's not strictly a 10 condition precedent, is it more useful for the 11 Commission to consider the Ka Pa'akai analysis first, 12 because if the Ka Pa'akai standards are not met, does 13 it mean that we cannot really proceed with the 14 remainder of what is on the calendar today? 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: This is a question 16 for the Petitioner. 17 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Or anyone else who can 18 answer it. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'll limit it right 20 now to the Petitioner. MS. LIM: So from the Petitioner's 21 22 perspective, it's not essential that the Commission 23 reconsider the Ka Pa'akai o ka aina analysis, because

ten years ago the Commission made a Conclusion of

Law, the Conclusion of Law on Page 39 of the original

24

Decision & Order. Conclusion of Law No. 4, the base of the cultural impact analysis, which included consideration of the history of the Petition Area, which has been in agricultural operations for the past century, research on nearby parcels in the vicinity of the Petition Area, and review of informant interviews and archival research conducted for several projects in the vicinity of the Petition Area, there appear to be no special amenities to the Petition Area for Native Hawaiians or any other ethnic group in the use of the Petition Area for customary and traditional subsistence, cultural or religious activity.

So that was an unchallenged Conclusion of
Law from ten years ago. And I believe as an
unchallenged Conclusion of Law, it is unnecessary for
the Commission to revisit that in response to
particularly ELC's request to modify their project.

That was a Conclusion of Law that was made at that time. Nevertheless -- so that is my response to the question.

I don't believe that the Commission needs to engage in a full Ka Pa'akai o ka aina analysis before taking another step forward.

Nevertheless, we fully understand the

Commission's mandate and interest in understanding, and these Commissioners, particularly who weren't present ten years ago, more about cultural activities on the property of which there are none.

2.1

So that is why I suggested, or I requested to have the opportunity to allow Intervenor to -- counsel bring up the two cultural witnesses who they have identified.

But I do not believe that the Commission needs to make, as an initial decision, a determination on whether or not the Ka Pa'akai analysis needs to be completed.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: As a follow-up question, Mr. Chair, to Petitioner's counsel.

How do you respond to the footnote that was in the Office of Planning's filing which seems to indicate that the witness' testimony was that there was no specific assessment made with respect to the specific parcel?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may,

Commissioner Okuda, I'm trying to understand.

So we are trying to get into the second motion, and you're really raising a procedural issue, would we dive in rather than as proposed by the

Petitioner to first hear presentation to the motion, 1 followed by two witnesses, and then followed by the 3 experts?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that way?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'll withdraw the question.

Maybe I can just follow-up this way. Does it make more sense to, just for a clear record, to determine whether or not Ka Pa'akai and the record of this proceeding -- when I say the record, the record going back to the very beginning, requires -- whether it's better to make a determination whether the Ka Pa'akai standards have to be met first before proceeding to the rest of the calendar today? Does it make more practical sense to do it

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe, Commissioner Okuda, that we are going to address the Ka Pa'akai issues and deliberate them in the context of this motion.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Okay, that's fine.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are we clear on where we are procedurally? We are on the second motion of the day, and the procedure that we are going to follow is that Ms. Lim will first give an oral review of the motion, followed by her bringing two witnesses 1 forward, one of whom we have already sworn in.

Followed by that, the Intervenor will bring forward two witnesses.

Understood? Let's proceed.

MS. LIM: Thank you, Chair and Commissioners. Jennifer Lim representing the Petitioner.

As a brief overview, what I wanted to give is to mention what the original ELC project was all about, because the request that we are presenting to you right now is that this Commission authorize us to modify that ELC project, what was originally approved ten years ago, we are now requesting a modification.

And in many respects it's not -- although it's extremely important to us -- not a significant modification in that what was approved ten years ago was a church and school for Emmanuel Lutheran Church.

And what we are now presenting as the -- what we call in our motion, the updated ELC project, is really the same thing but shrunk down. A much more modest project.

Just with that context, the original project was going to be a preschool building upwards of 18 classrooms for grades K through 8, multipurpose complex, other accessory buildings, and a 450-seat

sanctuary for religious and school-related functions intended to accommodate 450 students, and the development cost at that time were estimated at about \$20 million.

So it was a big substantial project.

Physically, the footprint of that project, as you know from the exhibits, our exhibits I believe A and D of our motion, which -- our first motion, which are also attached to the second motion, although that was a substantial project, the actual footprint was only going to be on about half of the Petition Area.

So with that as background, I would now like to ask Dr. Reiley to come back to the stand to describe what we call the updated ELC project, which could also be seen as the reduced or more modest ELC project.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I said earlier on the record that you were dismissed. Can we consider that you are still under oath to tell the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. I did not realize you were coming back.

THE WITNESS: Nor did I.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Apparently you weren't telling the truth.

MS. LIM: We won't review Dr. Reiley's background because that is all part of the record already.

MICHAEL REILEY

Was recalled to the witness stand by and on behalf of the Petitioner, was previously sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. LIM:

Q Really I just want you right now to be able to explain to the Commission, in your own words -- they have read the motion -- explain in your own words what is the updated ELC project. What does it consist of? What are the plans?

A We already discussed that. It was a much more modest phased approach. But, again, we will start with the development of fundraising, but the first phase, which we have laid out we believe reasonably for completion by 2024. Maybe six years from now would be this multipurpose building to be able to house preschool, worship services and so on. That would be sort of the hub of any further development on there.

Q Now, that multipurpose building, it will also have how many classrooms? Is it three

classrooms?

- A I believe it's three classrooms.
- 3 Q For --
 - A That would be the upper grades 6th, 7th and 8th, currently.
 - Q Middle school grades. And then also would be office space?
 - A Correct.
 - Q And for the Pastor Schneider?
 - A Yes. He's our senior pastor. Pastor

 Schneider is also a military chaplain. He was here

 at the hearing in May, but unfortunately he's on

 military training this weekend, starting today.
 - Q So the multipurpose building, I know we spoke about fundraising during the first motion, so I don't want to have you repeat a lot of that, although, of course, the Commissioners are free to ask you questions about it.

But for the multipurpose building construction, assuming that the fundraising -- it sounds like it's already off to a great start -- goes forward, when would you anticipate beginning work on doing the plans for the multipurpose building, and then actually break ground on that?

A We have slotted about two years for

- development of fundraising and so on to get going, so
 we are anticipating 2021 moving forward in earnest.
 - Q Start doing the site plans, and actually doing the construction, infrastructure kind of plans?
 - A (Witness nods head up and down.)
 - Q You're familiar that one of the conditions that's on -- that this Commission imposed on the property ten years ago was a requirement to do an archaeological monitoring plan?

Have you done an archaeological monitoring plan for this half of the property?

- A Have I?
 - Q Well, has one been done?
- A Not to my knowledge.
- Q So do you recognize though that archaeological monitoring will be required before you can actually break ground?
- A Yes.

2.1

Q Another condition that the Commission put on the Petitioner Area was to prepare soil analysis in consultation with the State Department of Health.

That's Commission's Condition No. 10.

Do you recognize that that's a requirement that will need to be satisfied?

A Yes, I do.

Q Now, the schedule that we submitted, which I believe is Exhibit 1 to our Motion for Modification, anticipates that infrastructure and site work plans would be submitted to the County around 2022/2023; and the completion of that work, the infrastructure and related site work, we have projected between 2023 and 2024.

A Yes.

Q So then once the infrastructure is done, is that when the multipurpose building, the construction on that would start going forward?

A Well, hoping to accelerate beyond that, but, yes. It would be in that timeframe, material progress, yes. That would roll right into, as quickly as we could complete that, would roll right into construction of --

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{CHEUER: Please speak into the } \\ \mbox{microphone.}$

THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm sorry. Do you need me to repeat any of that?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The last sentence.

THE WITNESS: We would roll -- the plan would be as soon as the regulatory portion and site work was completed, we would roll into construction of that building.

- Q (By Ms. Lim): So, again, that's in the 2 2023/2024 timeframe?

 A That's correct.
- Q So that's about six years from now, give or take?
- 6 A Yes.

8

9

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Now, we also talked about a Phase 3 for the updated ELC project, which is three middle school classrooms and the office space.
- When do you anticipate when that work would start?
 - A I quess in year seven.
- 13 Q About 2025?
- 14 A Yes.
 - Q And just continue to move forward with a similar timeframe?
 - approach, but ultimately our goal would not be to continue to have two campuses. The campus that we have now, the one-quarter acre, does have value.

 It's paid for, and the goal would be how to transition into that.
 - So it does not benefit us to have an extended period of time where we have split up our good church family community into two different

- campuses, even though they're only a couple miles 1 2 apart. There would definitely be a lot of incentive 3 to expedite that, once we are under construction, to move through to buildout.
 - Again, what we provided as Exhibit 1 to the Motion for Modification describes four phases. Phase 1 is fundraising?
 - Α Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Phase 2 is construction of a multipurpose Q building.
- Now, Phase 3 is the three middle school classrooms and office space?
- Α Yes.
 - And then there is a Phase 4.
- 15 Can you describe to the Commission what 16 Phase 4 is?
 - It's grander than the other three, but much less so than the original plan. It would be building out the remainder of the campus there, the rest of the elementary school, fields and facilities.
 - Is it your representation that ELC is Q certain to go forward with Phase 4, or might Phase 1, 2 and 3 really be the sum total of the development?
- 24 Well, I don't have a crystal ball. A
- 25 Obviously, things do change, economies, but that's

- part of the phased approach that Phase 4 wouldn't be absolutely necessary if we're not achieving the growth expectations and plans. So, yes, that is possible.
 - Q Is that Phase 4 -- we have it marked in our exhibit as a tentative phase.
 - A That's correct.

2.1

- Q And one of the fundamental starting points for Phase 4 is that it would involve looking at marketing the existing Kahului campus?
 - A That's right.
- I think a lesson we learned last go-round is don't be too ambitious. Be more realistic. And that's what this phased approach is meant to convey. It's a different set of expectations of what makes sense for the community and the timeline.
- Q So, again, your projection is definitely the fundraising phase; definitely the second phase, which is actual construction phase. Very likely the third phase.
- But as far as the fourth phase, which is the sanctuary and construction of elementary school classrooms, that may or may not go forward.
- We want to make clear to the Commission what the Petitioner's representations are so there is

no confusion as the years go by whether or not the development has really been performed consistent with representations.

A Yes.

Q Who is going to be leading the charge -- if that's the appropriate way to phrase it -- on pursuing the actual construction?

And I don't mean who is your contractor.

Who within the ELC organization is going to be making the decisions, looking at the plans, pursuing that kind of work?

A There will be a committee for that. There is a committee at this stage. It has been the principal of the school, the senior pastor and myself, and then church members like Mr. Sjostrand and so on.

The construction time, or the estimation what will be needed here for this development, we pull in the resources of church members, school families. A number of them are in construction as well. So we have a pretty broad-reaching community, and that's how it's going to be done.

A lot of people have expressed a lot of interest in being involved in this, and bringing their gifts and talents and expertise to the process.

Q Now, you had mentioned earlier too that there are people who have construction background experience who will be working on this development.

A That's correct.

2.1

Q The estimated cost, and I know Mr.

Sjostrand will help us on this too, but I just wanted to make sure that you're familiar with the estimated cost that we have.

So for the Phase 2, which is the multipurpose building, the total estimated cost including the infrastructure, as well as vertical construction, is just shy of \$4 million, 3,850,000, and to that, of course, we would have to add the cost for the archaeological monitoring and whatever soil analysis the Department of Health requires.

Do you feel that ELC has a reasonable expectation of being able to raise the funds necessary an almost \$4 million Phase 2?

A I do. We will have a goodly percentage of that just from the proceeds of the sale afterwards.

We will probably have between three-quarter and a quarter-million clear beyond that, the sale.

We did the first phase successfully raise a million dollars there for development. So we have a track record of being able to do that.

There's just -- in meeting with Jocelyn

Demirbag, there's an expectation that we may be able

to get on the order of half-a-million dollars of

grant foundation money for a project like this.

Again, the denomination has a strong history of supporting these kind of projects. Our first mortgage was from them for the property to do it, so there are programs.

Again, Mr. Fisher would be very in-tune with what those are to be able to have the capital to do a project like this.

- Q And, again, Mr. Fisher is basically a professional fundraiser for ELC nationally?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q With a track record of how many years?
 - A In that role, I'm not certain.
- 17 Q Excuse me.

- I recall that you indicated he had been doing that work for several years. Strike that, excuse me.
- Another source of funding would come possibly from an increase in enrollment, is that correct?
- A Yes, that is true. And that's a very good point.

To date we are not an accredited school.

Not that that's actually fairly common, but we have been under the process of gaining accreditation during the last couple years and making very good progress this spring is the major visit from the

accreditors.

So that's going to open up things like the Kamehameha funding that they make scholarships available to other Hawai'i-based private schools, but accreditation is a requirement for that.

Our preschool just recently was notified we are qualified for Kamehameha preschool help. So that's terrific news. That just helps grow the enrollment. More families can afford it. And there is an economy of scale. So, yes, the tuition, all of that is going to help.

Q So provides tuition assistance, as well as increasing the church and student community for possible additional fundraising?

A Yes. A lot of our church membership growth comes from school families that start attending the church.

Q And I just want to go over the cost estimates for Phase 3, which is the three middle school classrooms and office space. Again, in our

- Exhibit 1, the total estimate for Phase 3 is \$2,200,000.
 - A That's correct.
 - Q So we're looking at about \$6 million project, compared to the \$20 million project that was originally proposed?
 - A Yes.

- Q And how much money did you say the church had raised just to pursue that original project?
 - A I believe it was about 1 million.
- Q And that was really used for entitlements and planning at that time?
 - A A good portion of it was for that. We also had an account for making mortgage payments on the property, which we have done through those ten years. Those were the two primary uses of the funds we raised.
 - Q And how much debt is on the property right now, approximately?
 - A A little more than 300,000, between 3 and 400,000. I don't know the exact amount.
- Q So should the sale go forward, the church will receive a significant cash injection?
- A Yes. I would expect three-quarter to a million dollars net proceeds from the transaction.

Q Do you have any concerns about having this modified project on 12-and-a-half or a little more than 12-and-a-half acres of the property?

Right now you own 25 acres of the property, and that was planned for the ELC project. Now we're scaling it down to half that size.

A If you look at even for the \$20 million project, the footprint of the developed area we were looking at was still less than the 12-and-a-half acres that we would now be confined to.

Q So even with the original project, putting 450 students on about 12-and-a-half acres was something that had been assessed and approved of internally?

A Yes.

Q And now we are looking at a much more modest project?

A Yes.

Q That would be maybe 120 students, 170 students?

A Yes. Certainly more than 120, hopefully growing up to 200 or more.

O To 200 or more?

A Our peak has been 175. And with the new campus and all of the things we have been discussing,

1 that would be our target. 2 Do you have any concerns about having the 3 church and school immediately adjacent to the 4 affordable housing project that Waikapu Development 5 Ventures has proposed? 6 Concerns, no. That would be wonderful. 7 Probably a number of our teachers there could qualify and that would be great for them. 8 9 Q I don't have any further questions for you, 10 Dr. Reiley. 11 Α Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Intervenor. 13 MR. HOROVITZ: No questions. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County of Maui. 15 MR. HOPPER: No questions, Mr. Chair. 16 MS. APUNA: No questions. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No questions from OP. Commissioners? Commissioner Wong. 18 COMMISSIONER WONG: Just one question on 19 20 the affordable housing. So if the Intervenor does build affordable 21 22

housing next to your property, was there any contract to say that they must provide affordable housing to your teachers?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

23

```
1
                COMMISSIONER WONG: That's all. I just
2
     wanted to know. Thank you.
3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon.
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: You're doing
 4
5
      fundraising right now?
 6
                THE WITNESS: We have begun that process by
7
     engaging a fundraiser and the other meetings I've
8
     described.
9
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So the next phase of
10
     the construction, do you have enough money to fund
11
     the first phase of the second phase of construction?
12
                THE WITNESS: On hand, or after the
13
     proceeds of the sale and first fundraising round.
14
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: My question also,
15
     where the proceeds going to go for the sale, is it
      for construction or for operation?
16
17
                THE WITNESS: For construction. We do not
18
     need those funds for operation.
19
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So in other words,
20
     after the sale, you have enough funds to do the
21
     construction, 4 million?
22
                THE WITNESS: We do not have that amount
23
     funds currently.
24
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: No, no, after the
25
      sale?
```

THE WITNESS: No, we still would not have the funds to do a \$4 million construction. We would need fundraising.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: When do you expect to start those construction? Are you going to be waiting for the fundraising to finish, or concurrently?

THE WITNESS: We would be doing the development phase of the project as funds are available. The initial funds, then we would engage that phase of the project to get it teed up. And we would be doing the construction and development timeline as the funds are available.

So I think your question is would we wait until we have \$4 million in hand before we started any of that? No.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Do you have a timeline on when the construction is going to start, finish?

Just approximate timelines.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's one of the exhibits in what we have submitted.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: And can you answer (indecipherable) --

THE WITNESS: I can, but, again, I've been recognized as being a very credible witness, and I

would prefer if I can defer that to the estimator from Goodfellow Bros., I don't know if I can answer that, not my area of expertise as much. I can tell you the information --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's fine. He's deferred to the subsequent witness.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, any further questions for this witness? Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Clarification on the housing, and this may be, again, a more credible witness may be available.

I recall reading that you were looking at affordable housing being in what they call a workforce level of requirements as opposed to -- there are multiple levels of low-income housing that you can get funding for. And I thought I read that there was something about workforce level of limits.

MS. LIM: If I may, Commissioner, I know you directed the question to Dr. Reiley, but your question actually is more appropriately directed to the developer of the affordable housing project, which is Waikapu Development Ventures.

I just know Dr. Reiley wouldn't be in a

position to answer about affordable housing. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay, thank you. 3 Are there further questions for this 4 witness? Commissioner Wong. 5 COMMISSIONER WONG: So I already heard 6 about the funding stream. If the sale of property 7 goes through, you'll have some funds. Also you are doing some fundraising. 8 9 Do you already have a construction loan 10 committed by the funder, such as bank or --THE WITNESS: No, we do not. We have not 11 12 approached the banks or the denomination, which also 13 extends loans. We are not at that phase. We need to 14 execute this transaction, get those funds, and then 15 that would be part of the development. COMMISSIONER WONG: For your property? 16 17 THE WITNESS: Correct. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner 19 Ohigashi. 20 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Just want 2.1 clarification. 22 Your timeline indicated a Phase 1, Phase 2. 23 Phase 1 appears to be the fundraising. Phase 2 would be the actual construction? 24 25 THE WITNESS: Phase 2 and 3 are

1 construction. 2 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Phase 2 would be 3 the construction, completion of the multipurpose --4 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other questions for 6 this witness from my fellow Commissioners? 7 If I may ask you a couple questions. To be very, very clear, I understand that 8 9 you're amenable to a six-year extension of time as 10 opposed to a ten-year extension of time. 11 THE WITNESS: Not preferred, but amenable, 12 yes. I think that's fair. Six years is what we are 13 showing as a point where the Commission certainly could make a reevaluation. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you just -- I 16 want to understand your sort of understanding of our 17 process. 18 Do you understand why the Commission sets 19 timeframes for projects? 20 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What is your 22 understanding of that?

THE WITNESS: Land in Hawai'i is very

important, and it needs to be developed responsibly,

and there is oversight for this, all the different

23

24

cultural issues and concerns. So that's -- it is,
for Maui it's a fairly large parcel of land. That's
my understanding of why timelines are important,
because if it is not developed along the lines of how
it was represented, or not developed at all, then
that's not -- we need to look at what the use of that
land is, especially as things change.

2.1

Ten years ago that was almost all agriculture. Now, it is built-out all around there. It is definitely much more urban for the use of that area.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And my second question, forgive me if this has already been discussed, or you can point me to -- how much revenue are you going to receive as result of the sale, should this process move forward successfully? How much money will you receive for that?

THE WITNESS: I believe the gross sale is on the order of 1.3 million. So after the -- that's why we owe about 300,000 in gross revenue, might be a million in revenue after the other cost would be, say somewhere between three-quarter and a million.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: But the mortgage pertains to the entire property?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further? 2 Are you done with the witness for the day? 3 MS. LIM: Just a quick redirect. 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. LIM: I want to make sure everybody is familiar 6 7 with the timeline, especially in light of the fact of 8 the ten-year time extension, and then the 9 Commission's very fair deliberations on whether ten 10 years should actually be modified. 11 So that we are very clear, Phase 1 is the 12 fundraising phase; correct? 13 Α Yes. 14 And Phase 2 is the multipurpose building 15 that is anticipated to be completed by 2024, which is six years, give or take, from here? 16 17 Yes. Α But does ELC also intend to do Phase 3, 18 19 which is the three middle school classrooms and 20 office space? 21 Α Yes. 22 Would that be done within six years? Q 23 That would be my hope. Α 24 That's not what is on the development Q 25 schedule though?

1 That's right. Is that a problem if we 2 develop that faster than --3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I would appreciate 4 everything about this, a hearing moving faster. 5 THE WITNESS: It's also our intent to 6 develop Phase 4. I know I'm not supposed to say 7 that, but that is our intent. We are just not 8 representing that that is a certainty at this point. 9 MS. LIM: I have no further questions. 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Lim, are you done 12 with this witness for the day? 13 MS. LIM: I am. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. You may 14 15 call your second witness. How long do you think? MS. LIM: Five minutes at the most. Mr. 16 17 Leif Sjostrand. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 19 affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the 20 truth? 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 23 LEIF SJOSTRAND 24 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 25 Petitioner, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined

1 and testified as follows: 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION 3 BY MS. LIM: 4 Would you please state your name for the 5 record? 6 A My name is Leif Sjostrand. 7 What is it that you do for a living? I work for Goodfellow Bros. I've worked 8 9 there 24 years. I'm a senior estimator. I try to 10 find work for our guys. As senior estimator, what does that mean? 11 12 I've never been in construction. 13 Α We do heavy civil construction. So whether 14 it's public bids or private request for proposal type 15 of thing. Meet with clients. Try to figure out what 16 they're looking for, trying to get done. 17 And I put together from budgets to actual 18 cost estimates, and just try to gather up work for 19 our guys. You know, we got a large crew, and we just 20 got to keep everyone working. So I'm on the 2.1 front-end trying to get projects for our guys. 22 And cost estimates? 23 Absolutely, yes. Α

Lutheran Church of Maui?

What is your relationship with Emmanuel

24

25

Q

A Like your children, I'm a product of
Lutheran education. I went to kindergarten through
high school, Lutheran School in Denver. And gone to
Lutheran Church my entire life.

Anyway, so I came to Hawai'i 24 years ago and attended Emmanuel Lutheran for 21 years. I've been on Maui 21 years. Taught Sunday school there for 21 years. My wife is a first grade teacher. Our three children went through the school. My daughters through 8th grade, my son through 6th grade.

So we have been pretty involved. I was on the Board of Education quite a long time.

And so since this property has been acquired, they have asked me for estimates on, you know, construction cost. So that's kind of my involvement.

The one other thing I get to do frequently, because I'm in the construction profession, is when things come up on campus and they have got to get things done, I'm kind of the middle man to make things happen there.

Q Now, this -- I don't believe you've ever seen this Petitioner's Exhibit 1, which is attached to ELC's Motion for Modification. However, I do believe that you're familiar with the cost estimates

that are provided in this.

- A I provided them. Yes, I'm familiar.
- Q So if you would please -- I've got

 Petitioner's Exhibit 1 in front of you. So you've

 got the numbers in front of you. But for the

 multipurpose building, as we just heard, the

 estimated construction cost total, including

 planning, doing the infrastructure, and doing the

 actual vertical construction was about 3.8, 3.85.

Can you very briefly explain to the Commission what you think those costs are comprised of, so they can know that these are costs that are genuine and reflect a fair estimation.

A I'm familiar with the property, so there are certain things we have to do. We have to bring a waterline to the site. There is sewer close by, so that's relatively inexpensive.

We have to do some frontage treatments, so that's part of the civil construction cost. And then the building is basically a large gymnasium-type of structure, so put together an estimate on that.

I came up with these estimates, and I did come across Peter's needs with Maui Architectural Group. Shortly after I put them together and kind of ran them by them. They had done the multipurpose

- facility recently at Maui Preparatory Academy, and he was like, that's right in line with what we did that project for.
 - Q How recently did you come up with these estimates? Was it within the last six months or are these five years old?
 - A No, less than six months.
 - Q So would you have done the same analysis for the estimated construction cost for Phase 3, which is 2.2 for the three middle school classrooms and the office space?
 - A Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

21

22

23

- Q Thank you. I don't have any further questions for this witness.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Intervenor.
- MR. HOROVITZ: No questions.
- MR. HOPPER: No questions.
- MS. APUNA: No questions.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
- 20 Commissioner Wong.
 - COMMISSIONER WONG: So since you're in construction, as you know sometimes there's things that goes off schedule, so you need some sort of bridge loan or something just to carry the cost.
- Do you foresee how they're going to pay, or

1 | how they're going to get that type of loan?

THE WITNESS: You know, I'm not an expert, but the Lutheran Church has Lutheran Church Extension Funds, so Lutheran Church kind of governing body also has a financial side. And I'm sure any kind of financing we do would come through that. It's super favorable terms.

Working for Goodfellow, I mean, there's alternate delivery methods. To get a fancy set of plans drawn, and then go ask contractors, hey, build this. It's pretty old school.

I mean, I think we signed Goodfellow up to do a design build; we want a school. We want this many classrooms. And that handles what you're talking about, because Goodfellow can wait six months if our money isn't on hand right now for a payment type of thing.

So when the time comes, I fully believe we will just be doing a design build-type of project with Goodfellow.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So you don't see them selling any other properties or anything else to assess any gap for this project?

THE WITNESS: I think the long-term plan at Emmanuel is when we get over there to sell the

existing property on Kaahumanu, and that would -- you know, that is an asset that I think at some date

Emmanuel sees selling.

But, yeah, I mean, I think the financing for the project would be Lutheran Church Extension Funds, and I think the kind of short-term interval financing would be, hey, we sign up like a design-build contract with Goodfellow, they could take the -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER WONG: The other question I have is in terms of just, you know, the grubbing portion, going to get permit for the grubbing portion, then the construction itself. So it should be all smoothed out, just keep on going, you foresee that?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, right.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Permits and all that, because you need usually get two permits for that.

THE WITNESS: We definitely have a grading permit. And we have a right-of-way permit, because we got to do frontage. We have a building permit -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just following up on what Commissioner Wong

asked. Just so we can see the structure. ELC is

affiliated with -- is that the Missouri Synog?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: What is the Missouri

Synog?

THE WITNESS: So you're going to test my knowledge. Back in the day, the Lutheran Church has synog instead of, you know. So they broke away 500 years ago from the Catholic Church. And the Catholic Church has a world governing body. The Lutheran Church said, we're not doing that. There were reasons why we are not going to. So they have synog.

You know, when people from Europe were immigrating in the early -- in the 1800's, whatever, synog were formed. Missouri Synog was kind of the German Lutheran Church, where like the Wisconsin was kind of more the Scandinavian --

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I don't mean to be interrupting you. I apologize for not focusing my question.

The Missouri Synog is, for lack of a better term, it's not a manini or small organization,

1 correct? 2 THE WITNESS: It's not. It's a governing 3 body. So their one mission that sets them apart from 4 other Lutheran Churches is education. 5 So how, like, the Jesuits, the Catholics have a lot of schools, Lutheran Church Missouri Synog 6 7 has a lot of schools. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And they provide 8 9 funding and financing as part of their mission, or 10 it's not unusual for them to provide funding and financing as part of their mission? 11 12 THE WITNESS: Yes, for projects, 13 absolutely. For building churches, building schools, 14 yes. 15 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Based on your personal knowledge, they are not a small or insubstantial or 16 17 manini group when it comes to assets, correct? 18 THE WITNESS: Based on my understanding, 19 no. 20 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Not asking you to 21 testify about net worth or anything like that, but a 22 pretty substantial group, to use a common term,

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. No further

THE WITNESS: Yes.

23

24

correct?

1 questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are there further questions? Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Good morning. Just followup on Commissioner Wong's question.

Let's focus just the multipurpose. When you estimate this project, or a project, besides doing the material takeoff, you come up with a timeline to come out with your cost, right, how long is it going to take you for certain phase.

So can you give us just a rough estimate on how long it's going to take for the design, permitting and construction itself?

THE WITNESS: Construction should be a year maximum. The permitting could be $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Depends on the County.

THE WITNESS: Well, permitting, four to six months, I would say. Design should be relatively quick. Again, I would propose -- and this would be the governing body of Emmanuel Lutheran, would have to agree to just making a design build delivery with Goodfellow so that Goodfellow handles all of that.

And Goodfellow has a development side and a construction side. So they can take on permitting and design. And we would just say, this is what we

```
1
     want, and let them handle all that.
2
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Take say, two years,
 3
      three years?
 4
                THE WITNESS: Two years.
 5
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: From design to
 6
      completion of construction?
7
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Two years?
8
9
                THE WITNESS: Two years.
10
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there any further
      questions for this witness? Ms. Lim, anything on
11
12
      redirect?
13
                       REDIRECT EXAMINATION
     BY MS. LIM:
14
15
                Before you provided these construction cost
16
      estimates, had you been on the property?
17
                I've been on the property.
          Α
               More than once?
18
           Q
19
                Many times.
          Α
20
           Q
                So the estimates were based on your
2.1
      knowledge of the property, as well as your experience
22
      in the construction industry?
23
          Α
                Yeah.
24
                As an aside, are you familiar with anybody
25
      ever seeking to access the property for any reason
```

whatsoever?

A O

3

4

5

6

13

22

23

24

- A Other than dumping rubbish, no. Nobody goes there.
- Q Nobody's ever approached the church to access the property?
- A No.
- 7 Q Thank you. No further questions.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
- I'm going to do a time check. We are going
 to lose Commissioner Ohigashi at 12:15. We can still
 proceed with business, but I would like to cut
 through as much as possible while Commissioner
- How long -- Jennifer, you're done?
- MS. LIM: That's correct.

Ohigashi is still here.

- 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: How long do you
 17 expect you need for your two witnesses?
- MR. HOROVITZ: My questions to them will be relatively brief. I would say five to ten minutes a piece. How many questions the Commissioners have for them.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Even I as Chair cannot estimate that reliably. And I'm very, very fond of my fellow Commissioners.
- 25 We need to take a five-minute break. We

will resume and try to get through as much at we can before 12:15.

(Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are back on the record. We will go until 12:15 when we lose Commissioner Ohigashi. We will see how much we get through. At 12:15 we will take a lunch break for 45 minutes and resume.

Mr. Horovitz.

MR. HOROVITZ: During the break we handed out an exhibit, which is another view of maps that were already in evidence. So if there is no objection, I would like you to be able to consider them.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sure. Where in the already submitted documents?

MR. HOROVITZ: It was attached or within the body of the Exhibit A to our errata that was filed, which is the report prepared by our next witness.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So it will be understood for anybody reading the transcript, if there's references to these diagrams, they're in Exhibit A to your errata.

MR. HOROVITZ: This is another view, easier

1 to read. I thought it would be a better overview of 2 the project. And where the four cultural impact 3 assessments that were analyzed in the report are 4 located. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. MR. HOROVITZ: I would like to ask Lisa 6 7 Rotunno-Hazuka to come up, and I'll keep my questions 8 brief to get to your questions. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Good 10 morning. 11 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 12 you're about to give is the truth? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. 14 LISA ROTUNNO-HAZUKA 15 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 16 Intervenor, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 17 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. HOROVITZ: 20 Q Can you state your name? 21 Lisa Rotunno-Hazuka. Α 22 Where do you work? Q 23 Archaeological Services Hawai'i. Α 24 About how long have you been there? Q 25 28 -- 25 years.Α

- What kind of services does your firm 1 Q 2 provide? 3 We provided archaeological services, so 4 inventory surveys, monitoring, basically relates to 5 archaeological issues. 6 And you and your firm have specialized 7 expertise and training in this? 8 Α Yes. Can you describe that a little bit for us? 9 Q 10 Well, for inventory surveys we go out to Α the property, walk out on the property to see if 11 12 there is any historic properties. And then we assess document historic 13 14 properties, put that into a report. 15 During monitoring we would watch construction to see if any historic properties are 16 17 unearthed. O You're familiar with the broader Petition 18 19 Area? By that, I mean the 25 acres, the subject of 20 this Petition?
 - A Yes.

21

22

- Q What kind of services has your firm provided for this particular property?
- A On the 25 acres we did the initial inventory survey in 2004. And it was updated again

- in 2016. And then we've also submitted a monitoring plan for the affordable component.
 - Q Your firm would be doing the monitoring for Waikapu Development Ventures development?
 - A Yes.

- Q And then more recently you were asked to review existing cultural impact assessments for surrounding properties, is that correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q On what was handed out, there is a map.

 The second page identifies -- could you tell me what the property in blue is?
- A Yes. The property in blue is the ELC and Waikapu Development. And the properties in orange are the properties that contain the CIAs that we reviewed.
- Q So the report that was submitted as Exhibit
 A to our errata for cultural impact assessment that
 your firm and you assisted in reviewing are the ones
 represented in orange?
 - A Correct.
- Q What did you find in reviewing those cultural impact assessments?
- A Basically of the three that are in close proximity to the Project Area, there was no

traditional cultural practices occurring on the Project Area.

For the Waikapu Country Town, they did show up in the valley, closer to the valley, that there was a cultural practice for agricultural activities that was ongoing, and as well as most of the CIAs mentioned.

Waikapu Stream is a natural resource and a cultural resource and it should be considered.

Q So in your experience and expertise, where would you typically find cultural practices to be occurring?

A Along the stream, as well as if the area had not been so radically modified, you know,

150 years ago from agriculture, a lot of the CIAs also came to the same conclusion that there could have been traditional practices in this area, but due to all the disturbances there were none.

Q Waikapu Stream, just for reference, is about how far away?

A I think it's about a half a mile. Right close to Waiko Road on the second page of that exhibit.

Q So in your work on the archaeological survey for the property that you did: One, did you

find anything of concern from an archaeological 1 2 standpoint? 3 And also, did you hear of any stories or 4 get any evidence of any cultural practices on the 5 property? No. During the survey we did not find any 6 7 historic properties. We did document again much of 8 the disturbances that had been across the parcel, and 9 we did not hear of any traditional or customary 10 rights of access for the property. 11 For the record, the archaeological survey 12 is attached as an addendum to our 201H Application, 13 which is in the record already. I have no further questions at this point, 14 15 and I would defer to the Commission or parties. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Petitioner? 16 17 MS. LIM: No questions. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County? 19 MR. HOPPER: No questions, Mr. Chair. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 21 MS. APUNA: I do have a few questions. 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MS. APUNA: 24 Was there a CIA, cultural impact analysis Q 25 done for the parcel for the Petition Area at any

1 time? 2 Not that we did, no. 3 And you found no record of cultural impact 4 analysis? 5 Α For the Project Area? 6 0 Yes. 7 No. We just reviewed ones that were done in close proximity to the Project Area. 8 9 Is that generally accepted as equivalent to 10 an actual cultural impact analysis for the Petition Area looking at surrounding CIAs? 11 12 Well, first of all, we don't generally do 13 CIAs, but I do know that that is part of the 14 practice, even in archaeology, you want to look at 15 the area as a whole. 16 So it is good to start off your research on 17 looking at the exterior to see what they have found. And then that will help guide you when you do, 18 19 whether it's cultural or archaeological work. 20 Did you interview any people with regard to Q 2.1 cultural practices within the Petition Area? 22 No, we did not. We just reviewed the 23 existing CIAs.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Thank you.

24

Q

Commissioner Okuda?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Do you consider yourself an expert in the area of identifying the scope of valued cultural, historical, or natural resources with respect to this parcel?

And let me not play hide the ball here.

I'm reading from the most recent Mauna Kea decision,
which starts -- which spells out some of the elements
of doing a proper Ka Pa'akai analysis.

Do you consider yourself basically an expert to render an opinion about whether or not that part of the Ka Pa'akai standard has been met?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't think that I would be an expert.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So your testimony here today is not intended to give an expert opinion with respect to that prong of the Ka Pa'akai analysis, assuming I read the prong correctly?

THE WITNESS: I can tell you that my testimony today was just to provide the information that we gathered from the CIAs in the surrounding area. That's what my testimony is for. And the people that conducted those CIAs are experts.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: But, again, in

response to the Office of Planning's question, you
did not see a specific cultural impact analysis or
CIA study for the parcel that we're dealing with here
today, correct?
THE WITNESS: No, I did not.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Commissioner Mahi.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: I guess my question is probably for the attorney of the Petitioner. Will there be a CIA prepared, hearing that's not been fulfilled yet on the particular parcel in question?

MS. LIM: On the 25-acre, the entire property?

VICE CHAIR MAHI: Right.

MS. LIM: Well, I suppose that has to be determined, because as I mentioned earlier in response to a question that Commission Okuda raised, the Commission made a Conclusion of Law that was never challenged by anybody that an analysis had been done.

Now, it's what it says, and I won't read it again, because you all heard me, Conclusion of Law 4 does say that based on the information that the

```
1
      Commission had before it at that time after a
2
     contested case hearing -- I mean, after evidentiary
 3
     determinations and hearing from witnesses, that no
 4
     use of the Petition Area for customary and
     traditional subsistence, cultural or religious
5
 6
     activity. That was the unchallenged Conclusion of
7
     Law at that point in time, based on the information
     that was provided to the Commission.
8
9
                So it's a little confounding to go back in
10
     time when the Commission already made that
     determination, and in fact --
11
12
                VICE CHAIR MAHI: When was that? That was
13
     back in what?
14
                MS. LIM: It was in 2007. So it was
15
      several years after the Ka Pa'akai decision came out,
     and the Commission was well familiar with its
16
17
     constitutional obligations.
18
                VICE CHAIR MAHI: But they didn't know
19
     about the fact that it's going to be a housing
20
      development now, right?
21
                MS. LIM: That is correct.
22
                VICE CHAIR MAHI: So with that alteration,
23
      I believe that -- and I wasn't there in 2007.
24
                MS. LIM: Nor was I.
```

VICE CHAIR MAHI: And had I -- I'm here

- now. You're here now. And we're going to do

 something else to this aina. So would not we

 consider the importance -- we're going to be digging,

 right? I mean there is a little bit of profit during

 the time when they had that for sugarcane, I would

 assume, but I think now it's a different picture,
 - MS. LIM: And I see your eyes going to the Intervenor, because, again, Emmanuel Lutheran's project is the same, just smaller within the same footprint.
 - MR. HOROVITZ: I'm happy to respond, if you like.
- 14 VICE CHAIR MAHI: Please.

right? Don't you think so?

- MR. HOROVITZ: I agree. I think the Commission back in 2007 made its ruling. I wasn't there for that, but they made the ruling, and it hasn't been challenged. We briefed that.
- I think there is a difference between the archaeological monitoring, which we are committed to, we're obligated to. In our 201H project, the County requires it. It's going to be a requirement. That's separate and apart from the cultural practices aspect.

Our stated position is we don't think a new

CIA, cultural impact assessment is required because of what the Commission did in 2007.

We do recognize that looking at cultural issues are important regardless. And, you know, that's why we have witnesses here today to address that.

But, again, as going back to Mr. Okuda's comments, we don't think it's a condition precedent, something you have to decide before you rule on the motion, because it was decided in 2007. The archaeological, as I mentioned, is ongoing. We are going to be doing that at every phase of the construction.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: Thank you. Mahalo.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions,

Commissioners, for this witness? Commissioner

Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Just a clarification, because of the usage will be so different when it was a church with a smaller imprint on the property than what the housing looks like from the drawing available here, build up the area quite a bit more than the church and school would have built it up.

So at that time, and probably Attorney Lim would be the one to answer or whoever has that study.

At that time the entire parcel ten years ago was examined for any cultural impact and any usage by cultural practitioners that were analyzed for the entire property ten years ago, not just for the area that the church and the school was going to locate?

MS. LIM: That is my understanding based upon two Findings of Fact that are within the Commission's Decision & Order, and the Conclusion of Law that I mentioned. That covered all 25-point-something acres, the entire Petition Area.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, further questions? Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Just to follow up, Ms.

Lim, not trying to put words in your mouth, but is

the argument you're making basically that even if we

might today have questions, maybe serious questions

about the adequacy of complying with Ka Pa'akai, that

once certain Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

are made, it amounts to what we in the trial industry

call "law of the case", and if it hasn't been

appealed within a timely appeal period, even if we

the present Commission disagree with those, we are

bound to follow them?

MS. LIM: Thank you for the question, Commissioner.

Yes, but with the caveat, if there was evidence showing that perhaps practices had been initiated, and recall I asked Mr. Sjostrand if he was familiar, and although I did not ask Dr. Reiley on the record, expect that we have had that discussion as well, are they familiar with anybody ever approaching them, since then they have had ownership of the property. I think they acquired it in 2004, and before the Commission in 2007. Nobody has ever been seen on the property except to do unfortunate dumping, and nobody approached them to access the property for any reason whatsoever.

However under a different set of circumstances, if there were concerns raised whatsoever, then I think the Commission has an obligation, notwithstanding conclusions and findings that were made in the past. New information requires new analysis.

But, again, from the Petitioner's perspective, these uncontroverted facts and conclusions for essentially the same project but smaller footprint, we would think really ends the discussion to the Emmanuel Lutheran Church project.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So in other words, the 1 2 absence of any new evidence means that the prior 3 findings and conclusions should remain undisturbed, 4 is that what you're basically saying? MS. LIM: That's correct. 5 6 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. No further 7 questions. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, other 8 9 questions? I have a couple, or perhaps more. 10 You prepared the AIS? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Did you do additional 13 trenching in 2016? 14 THE WITNESS: No. We just updated the 15 report according to the standards in 2016. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: What is the 16 17 relationship between an archaeological inventory survey and cultural impact assessment? 18 19 THE WITNESS: Well, oftentimes when we're 20 out doing our work during an inventory survey, 2.1 individuals that are from the adjoining area will 22 come out and talk to us about the property. 23 will ask them, you know, do you know of any sites 24 that are on the property? What do you know has been 25 going on in the area?

So there's maybe a relationship where we 1 2 find things out during our inventory survey about 3 possible cultural practices, but that's not the 4 intent of the archaeological inventory survey. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you believe that 5 6 burials known or unknown might be a valued natural or 7 cultural resource --8 THE WITNESS: Absolutely, yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: -- that should be 10 protected under Ka Pa'akai? 11 THE WITNESS: To quite honest, I'm not 12 familiar with Ka Pa'akai, so I can't speak to that, 13 but they should be protected, yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I want to also follow 15 up on one of the questions from Office of Planning, 16 because I think your answer, if I understood the 17 question and the answer correctly, I think it 18 diverged a little bit from what was being intended. 19 The additional information that was 20 provided to us, including the diagrams that were 2.1 handed out today, you reviewed the CIAs prepared for 22 surrounding areas? 23 THE WITNESS: Yes, my partner I and 2.4 reviewed.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: But no CIA, to your

1 | knowledge, was ever done for this particular parcel?

THE WITNESS: None that I know of.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe Office of Planning's question was: Is it common practice that in the process of where a CIA is required, one could only look at CIAs prepared for surrounding parcels but not have a CIA for that actual parcel?

THE WITNESS: Again, since we don't prepare CIAs, I cannot speak to that. I believe that, even similar like archaeology, if the CIAs had findings of traditional, cultural practices in close proximity to this parcel, then there could be a chance that those were ongoing on this parcel.

I think with the negative findings of these other CIAs, excluding the Waikapu Town one up in the valley, I think that you can make some conclusions that this parcel is in the same condition as the others, traditional and cultural practices are probably not occurring.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there -- to your knowledge, have there been recent discoveries of burials in the surrounding Waikapu area?

THE WITNESS: Yes, on the east side of Waiale Road there have been burials discovered.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: In the course of

development?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Despite this whole area having been under agricultural production?

THE WITNESS: Well, to the east, portions of it were not developed. So some of that was original remnant sand dunes. It's a little bit different situation when you go the west of Waiale where these affordable housing projects are proposed.

That area has been more disturbed from the agriculture, as well as you have different soils in the area. From the mountains you have more like silty clay soil eroding down over the years. And closer to Waiale Road you have the remnant sand dunes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is the point that you're trying to make that burials have been primarily discovered in sandy areas?

THE WITNESS: In this location, I believe most of them have been in the remnant sand dunes.

Not to say they can't be discovered in other types of soils.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: My last question.

Are you familiar with instances, at least on the

Island of Oahu, where burials have been discovered in

1 fully urbanized areas? THE WITNESS: Yes. We have had that over 2 3 here as well, but, yes, I am familiar with that. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I have nothing else. 5 Anything else from the Commissioners? Thank you very 6 much. 7 MR. HOROVITZ: No further questions for 8 this witness. Ask for Kimokeo Kapahulehua. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha. 10 THE WITNESS: Aloha. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the 12 13 truth? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. I do. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your 16 name and address. 17 THE WITNESS: My name is Kimokeo Kapahulehua, 1011A South Kihei Road, Kihei, Hawai'i 18 19 96753. 20 KIMOKEO KAPAHULEHUA 21 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 22 Intervenor, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined 23 and testified as follows: 24 DIRECT EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. HOROVITZ:

Q Tell me where you grew up and a little bit about yourself.

- A I grew up, born and raised on the Island of Kauai. I moved to this island in 1970.
- Q Can you tell me a little bit about your background, ethnicity and cultural background?

A I'm Hawaiian/Portuguese. My dad is from the Island of Ni'ihau. My mom is from Kaua'i. My grandmother is from Portugal, and my grandfather Kimokeo is from Kaua'i, being a pure Hawaiian.

Q You're fairly well-known in our community, but for the benefit of the Commissioners who may not know you, tell us a little bit about your cultural background. What you do with the various organizations you're involved with on this island?

A I'm the president of 'Ao 'ao O Na Loko I'a O Maui, which is the Maui Fishpond Association, established in 1996. And our vision and mission is to preserve, perpetuate, revitalize the wall, the Ko'ie'ie, to revitalize the culture.

I'm also the president of Mo'okiha O Hui Wa'a Kaulua. That's a double-hull voyaging canoe from Maui. It's been in the establishment for 20 years. Now, we are the children of Hokule'a, which is Polynesian Voyage Society, the main voyage.

My uncle is the captain of the first maiden sail from Maui to Tahiti 35 days in 1976.

Since this development, we have had everyone of the crew come back and make their own canoes.

On the Island of Hawai'i, we have the

Makali'i. On Maui we have Mo'okiha O Pi'ilani, which
is founded by the Lindsey family out of Lahaina. And
Oahu, Hokule'a, Hawai'i Loa. And now we have

Hikianalia, which is a fairly new technical canoe
that we have that escorts the Hokule'a pretty much
around the worldwide voyage.

And then on the Island of Kauai, which was the last established canoe, it's called Namahoe.

So with that, we have more than 20 years of preserving, perpetuating, educating Hawaiian culture with Polynesian Voyaging, Hokule'a. We now have our own canoe in Ma'alaea and instituting with nine high schools, including Island of Lanai and Molokai, teaching all the students in high school and University of Hawaii teaching celestial navigation.

Q Have you been involved in preparing or assisting in preparing cultural impact assessments?

A Yes. I have been doing that with Hana Pono, LLC, and we have been doing it, I would say,

1 | over 18 years now.

- Q Approximately how many have you either prepared on your own or been involved with?
- A I would think I couldn't give you a good handle, but I know that we done more than 20 cultural impact assessment here on Maui.
- Q Have you done a fair number in the Kahului/Wailuku area, or where approximately where would they have been?
- A Yeah. We were involved, I think it's on the map here, you can see that we were doing that with A&B.
- Also was involved with some work with Waikapu Country Town, and we also involved with the Safeway development. So we have three, and maybe four that's familiar with this area.
- Q Just the reference to Waikapu Country Town one is the one shown in orange on the map, and the A&B one is down below Waiale Road, under Waiale Master Plan on the map?
 - A Right.
- Q What is your -- where have you -- looking at our particular property, are you familiar with that location?
- 25 A I definitely am.

Q And what is your knowledge as to cultural practices that are in the area or specifically on this property?

A You know, we never did a cultural impact assessment on this particular area. But I should say that, first of all, cultural people like myself, we have what you call introduction of the project. With the introduction of methodology. Methodology is taking a kupuna, mo'olelo about what was and what is and what kind of impact does it do with that area.

After we done a methodology, you know, we also take in consideration the flora and fauna, endangered plants, endangered animal, endangered insects, and what impact if someone does to that.

So in our CIA we do introduction, we do methodology, and then we do an assessment. And the assessment would be what kind of impact has it done within the cultural practices on the property.

So that's kind of -- I think you haven't asked me about your particular property. I couldn't give you what we have done in our reports, taken someone's translation of what was and what is, you know.

But on that particular area we have not, but I can just say what was done around the area.

Q In the surrounding area, where would you tend to find cultural practices occurring?

A I think immediately we see a lot of agriculture, because of the streams. And because of this area, geologically, it allows the enrichment of the volcanic soil that we have on the side of the hill, mauna ka hale wai, that's described as house of the water. So just with the water, it means life. So we can say that this area was really active with agriculture right off the bat.

As to where they reside, would reside in as close as possible to walk to work. So they wouldn't be resided in so much far away, you know.

Q When you say so much far away, trying to place where my understanding is. The stream is about half a mile away. Would that be more of a concentration for people living, farming practices?

A Of course. You know, they would be living close to the stream and using the stream. They call that appurtenant water rights. Appurtenant water rights is you're part owner of the stream. Today it's called diversion of appurtenant water rights.

In 1900 taking the water going away for agriculture, so we would question that.

The question from you that our agriculture

1 be as close as possible to the stream.

Q Thank you.

And would you have expected to find anything, any ongoing, especially in the last ten years, cultural practices in this particular area of our particular project?

A No. We would not consider anything in the last ten years. The last ten years this property has been, I wouldn't say fallow, but not vacant. It might be owned by someone, but there was no cultural practices or cultural things that we have seen there that's been done.

- Q What do you think in general a use of a portion of this property for housing?
 - A You mean --
- Q Housing for the proposed affordable housing project. Do you think the use of this property for an affordable housing project is appropriate or inappropriate?
 - A I think it's appropriate.
- Q Why is that?

A If you go back to the guiding principles of what you talk about in your project, it's called respect for host culture and natural resources. And if you go to that page, this has been taken out of

context of our lifestyle of living called the ahupua'a, learning from the past to plan the future, it's used by your company or your representative cultural overlay. The ahupua'a of Maui, and it talks about the overlay malama aina, pono, kuleana and community.

And you go back to the next page and you see a gentleman by the name of John Kahilikawa (phonetic) and eight principles. So he's a really good friend of mine, well-established person, scholar. And he was responsible to establish what we call today the 'aha moku, where the State of Hawaii recognized this 'aha moku as like a commission, advising DLNR the use of the land for mauka/makai.

So now we have 'aha moku on Maui and 'aha moku on Lanai and elsewhere. They're responsible to go back to the Commission and say that when you have a development, this would be the recommendation of that.

So if you came -- not to the 'aha moku, to me, I would say that that would be part of the ali'i or kuleana to have houses for his people in this time and age, new era, but having houses for your people would be the thing to do.

Q Let me ask you, in preparation of cultural

impact assessments that you've done, if other cultural impact assessments have been done for other properties, and then they contain interviews with people, would you consider those as good resources, the interviews that have already been conducted when you were doing your research?

A Yeah. I think that the individuals that we have talked to, one of them was supposed to be here this morning, his name is Randy Peltz, one of our elders, and he would be included.

But all the CIAs, we have other individuals that we have talked to within the area of the elders in giving, I would say, a few they're not here now, they've passed away. You know, Kaneko (phonetic) was one of them. Yes, we have talked to people who lived within the area and share some resources.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ HOROVITZ}\colon$$ Thank you. No other questions at this time.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Chair, I won't be here. I'm not going to ask questions, just a comment.

I believe that the issue before the Commission on this particular motion is a modification of the original decision. It would

appear that some of the issues of whether or not a cultural assessment should be updated or prepared, seems to be something that we may want to consider in the modification portion, or in the other motions that have been filed by the developer.

So what I'm trying to say is I believe that the last two testimonies related to supporting the questions of whether or not we were going to move forward with modification of the original order and consider those particular issues in the subsequent motion. And that's all I've got to say. I have to be excused.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You're excused, Commissioner. Thank you.

I apologize, we're going to have to take a break and come back to you after lunch for further questions.

THE WITNESS: That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We're going to take a 45-minute break for lunch. We will resume at 1:02 p.m.

(Noon recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are back on the record, and we were on the testimony of Mr.

25 Kapahulehua. I believe we were with Commissioner

1 questions.

MR. HOROVITZ: That's correct. If the Commission have questions, obviously.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Staff reminds me and corrects me where we were procedurally. We hadn't actually gotten to Commissioner questions. Commissioner Ohigashi wanted to make a statement, so we're at the point where it's Maui County.

MR. HOPPER: County doesn't have questions for this witness.

MS. APUNA: We have a few questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. APUNA:

Q Thank you for your testimony.

My first question is, what is your focus as a cultural practitioner? Do you have a focus in a certain area? I think you mentioned ocean navigation and some agriculture.

Do you have a specific focus or focuses?

A You know, as an ocean guy, my focus has always been there, but recently because of the needs of mauka-makai in the last, I would say, 15 years has been on the land to bring back canoe, food

development. So besides canoe, food, there are more recently caretaker of Lo'alo'a, which is a heiau out at Kaupo and has to do with celestial navigation.

Working with Dr. Kirschbaum for the last 15 years about, educating me more about archaeological findings of the way the navigators had used the land

So I would say that my focus is either been in the land, in the ocean of relationship of not only navigation, but I mentioned before in 1976 my Uncle Kawika Ku'ualoha Kapahulehua was the first captain for Hokule'a. And he had gotten most of the food from Honokohau.

versus the heavens versus what I do on the ocean, and

related to me what was before and how they did that.

So I've been the owner of Honokohau since
2005 making -- what was missing from the property was
the ahupua'a. So a lot of that made focus on the
land in the recent years.

Q How about other more land-based cultural practices, like gathering? Do you consider yourself having a lot of experience or study in Native Hawaiian gathering practices?

A Yeah. So I mentioned to you before that I was born on the Island of Kauai, so our gathering has always been ocean and the streams, the streams are

rivers. We have five main rivers on Kauai. So my gathering of hihiwai, opae, and also the ocean shore dive and deep has been my gathering on that, you know.

But with the gathering come the pu'ole and a lot of other stuff that come with that, the ulu. So that would not have been something that I would consider recent, because I brought up with that in the Island of Kauai being that we have Mount Waialeale and five main rivers, versus Island of Maui, we just have streams.

So I do know the gathering on this island here, but not in abundance as we would consider on the Island of Kauai, o'opu and hihiwai, and limu ele'ele and other things we would gather on Kauai. So I would consider gathering here is really, really minimum compared to where I came from.

Q Have you testified as a cultural expert at any other hearings?

A Yes, I have. I couldn't give dates, but, yes, I have.

Q For instance, before what body, before what agency?

A I think came before the Land Use Commission before in testifying. Again, couldn't give you

dates. I know several projects that came before you that I have testified on behalf of the developer and on behalf of Hana Pono LLC.

Q And so your understanding, as far as cultural practices in the Petition Area, it's based solely on the cultural impact analysis that were done for the surrounding property.

Is that the way your resource for making a determination for the Petition Area is based on the surrounding CIAs?

A Correct.

- Q Thank you very much.
- A You're so welcome.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

 15 Commissioner Mahi.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aloha.

I know when talking about the criteria you use when you're searching information. And it's totally understood, because we have the same -- as the Commission, we have had the same issues about losing history through mo'olelo, because of the fact over 100 years now they been doing sugarcane. And because of that, you know, about three generations passes by, and the practices of what used to take place, there are no longer.

So in this case, I remember you had mentioned, what is it, mythology? You use mythology as one of the ways to research whether something culturally was practiced in the area; is that right?

THE WITNESS: I'm just saying the method that's used, method, not mythology. The mythology would be different perspective. That would be like, you know and I know what's in songs and what's in chants and from there. That's mythology.

Methodology was -- they require in the CIA, or part of the CIA to go out and seek out kupunas in the vicinity. And then also in the system also reflect back on the flora and fauna report that we receive. And look and make sure that if there is any lifestyle of, such as pueo or anything else that around the area, you know.

And then, again, would be -- we've had areas where we have insects. Our own Hawaiian dragonfly. And besides that black moth sphinx, so methodology, not mythology.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: I was wondering because we lost so much history as our people. And then, of course, the acculturation, another culture came in and started practicing.

Has it ever been the practice for you to go

back to mo'olelo, ka'o, which means legends, and
then -- or oli, stories of the past. Has that ever
been relative to, you know, say pana, you can tell
the names of different areas, and then from the name
you can tell whether there was a practice over there
or not? Has that ever been a part of that practice?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, part of that is our practice going back to Samuel Ka'au, and all the other records that written to the area. Part of that go to Bishop Museum, Hawaiian Missionary. We have gone back as far as up in the main Smithsonian Institute in Maryland.

So it is part of the practice to reference, if information you have in the report, we have reference where we got it from.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: From Waikapu, what was research for that ahupua'a of Waikapu? I always wondered how much is revealed through the name already, just the no' a of the aina, and then we can try to figure out, and then you got to search, yeah? Is that also a method that you use?

THE WITNESS: That's part of it. Part of our kauna is to understand wai, and understand wai ola o kane, water of life given by God Kane. Also understand just with that would tell you that

1 | Waikapu, Wailuku, Waiehu was a wealthy place.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: (Indecipherable) those are the traditional names for the waterways that come under and feed that area?

THE WITNESS: Exactly. So in that also say to you that, you know, we understand auwai, the pulima (phonetic) and all the small ways of irrigation from top to the bottom, how they spread the water. And also with that, lo'is on the side takes the larger portion of the water as it comes down to lessen the pressure of the water so it doesn't destroy the smaller lo'is down there.

That's all considered in going back and study a time. Truly you can say that we will research as far as back as we can bring history to the present time.

And, of course, you know that a lot of that has been lost, even written. So we have people, you know, would say some things and we will go back and look at what the saying is. And many of the times, even at this time, is difficult to understand, but if you keep on going and using the words, whether statement or whether it's a mele or chant, and then you kind of can understand that.

But, yes, we have lost a lot. It's a

challenge for us, because as you state, we have no kupuna that's 200 years old, we have no kupuna.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: Pule, we can only pray to them.

THE WITNESS: We always pule to na pule kalani, na pule kawana, na pule kualua and hope that the Hawai'i luna come upon us. And that would motivate us to continue to overcome the challenges and with their 'ike and their knowledge.

VICE CHAIR MAHI: Mahalo.

THE WITNESS: Mahalo.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners.

Aloha?

THE WITNESS: Aloha.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I have a few questions.

I want to first begin with saying that I haven't actually interacted in any meaningful way with you over the years. Your cultural mission on Maui is well known to me and for many people, so mahalo for that.

And I did have the opportunity a little over year a ago to go to Willy Woods' lo'i in Honokohau, which I understand you taught him how to grow kalo.

THE WITNESS: You know, Willy is a natural of kalo, but, yes, he's one of my alaka'is. And a graduate from Lahaina Luna. So I have several graduates from Lahaina Luna up there now. That was part of the development, developing the ahupua'a, and bringing the kalo back in Honokohau.

My uncle first went there in 1976. There was an abundance of kalo. Since then, short time, we lost a few patches, so with his help and other people's help, we brought back the kalo in a way that we can say that Honokohau truly raise kalo.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And water is an important issue in that valley.

But to come back to around this side of the island, even though you're from Kaua'i originally, you do appreciate that this whole Na Wai 'Eha area was historically very heavily used and heavily populated, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So that it is likely that whole areas, even areas now that are really in the midst of urban areas, were once areas of very heavy use and cultivation?

THE WITNESS: Definitely.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I just want to go

۷.

to -- you expressed, in response to a question from the Intervenor, your support for housing. And that this is actually something that a chief would provide housing for his people, and that there is a need for housing on this island?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think it's a sentiment of this Commission by and large that holds true as well that we want to see housing for people.

But I want to talk about or get your thoughts on the relationship between housing and any cultural resources that might exist on a property.

So like two sort of lines. One is, since you've prepared, helped to prepare cultural impact assessments before, how might those assessments be used to guide development?

When you've done an assessment for an area and found some of the cultural history and resources in the area, how might that guide developers, be they a church or affordable housing developer, as they learn to use the property in a new way?

THE WITNESS: I think what was made back for CIA is very important, and the guide should be followed as it presents a value as to why it was made, you know.

What was before was not done, and what it is today since 1997, OEQC allowed us to have this local practitioners come in and do such a report called CIA. I think it's a great guide.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So how might it in this situation, hypothetically, how might it guide how this particular property could be used?

Or if you have an example of another CIA you've found, where like you found this and then you told that to the landowner. The landowner says, oh, we're going to do something differently that we thought about before the CIA was done.

THE WITNESS: Could you reframe that question?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay, I'll try again.

So CIAs, ideally in my mind at least, when you learn more about a property, maybe what we first thought we were going to do changes a little bit in response to what we learned. I don't know if you have an example of that.

THE WITNESS: One of the examples is in the CIA report that we did for a property 18670 we found the black moth sphinx. So that owner bought 400 acres to take that population in his own, or where the other population was growing nearby. So

1 the owners did comply.

And there were other areas that we found

burials that had to be left for the families who had

a genetic, and are still being working with the

landowners and the new landowners on visitation

rights.

So that tells you that our report, our findings are somewhat very significant.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Just for the record, respectfully, I think you're referring to the Blackburn Sphinx moth.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: On burials, is it generally your recommendation as a cultural practitioner that burials be preserved in place?

THE WITNESS: We would prefer that it would

be stayed in place.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I have nothing
19 further. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any further questions

from the Commissioners? Any redirect?

MR. HOROVITZ: No redirect.

24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think we're done.

25 Thank you.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

22

23

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe, and I will turn to the counsel for the Petitioner and Intervenor to understand if I'm relating this correctly. I believe this concludes the process that you outlined, Ms. Lim.

MS. LIM: It does except for some closing statements which I would like to make.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You could make them now, but we also have the chance for County and Office of Planning.

Please go ahead.

MS. LIM: Thank you. I'll try to make my remarks short and I'll try to really dive into the issue that seems to be really of the most concern to the Commission, which is whether or not the cultural work that was done ten years ago is sufficient for this Commission to take action on the request before you today.

And I've already stated my opinion on the unchallenged findings and conclusions that are in that Decision and Order from 2007.

But notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding the fact that there is no evidence of

anything new happening over the last ten years.

I mean, over the lunch break, both

Petitioner and Intervenor conferred. I think it

should be, and it will be very evident, if it's not

already, that these are very credible local entities

that want to do the right thing. And if doing the

right thing in this instance involves additional or

refreshed cultural work to ensure that findings that

were made ten years ago are still valid -- and,

again, the archaeological monitoring that's required

by law, that's done. There's no questions of

notification on that.

If additional -- if a refreshed review of cultural issues related specifically to this 25 acres is something, it seems very apparent that the Commission and also the Office of Planning is interested in, both Petitioner -- and not to put words in your mouth -- Petitioner and Intervenor are very happy to have that additional work prepared.

We're just very eager to get started on these, for my clients on our project, but obviously I can't speak for WDV on their project as well.

I did want to put that out there before you turned to the other people on the side of the room to see if they had comments.

MR. HOROVITZ: On behalf of the Intervenor, I echo Ms. Lim's comments that the Commission did make findings back in 2007 which I think we could rely upon, but irrespective of that, we went into this project wanting to do it correctly, and go beyond requirements if it was appropriate.

2.1

And we are more than happy to update, and do an additional cultural impact assessment for the full 25 acres, taking into account our development project, as well as ELC's project, assuming we get through with approvals today.

If the projects aren't approved, then they're not approved. But if we get through approvals, then we're more than happy to begin immediately on a cultural impact assessment for the full 25 acres, taking into account both our project and ELC's project.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I want to allow the chance for the Commissioners to ask any questions on this point before we move onto County of Maui and Office of Planning.

Do I understand -- I'll at least say something. Do I understand that there's more than the commitment to undertake a CIA, but should there be some valued resource found, and in particular,

what I am thinking of burials as the most likely valued resource that could be found in the course of this project, there is a commitment not to just to identify, but to work to design the project in a way to achieve its goal, but still protect those in culturally appropriate ways that our witness just referred to?

MR. HOROVITZ: Absolutely, the only caveat is, one -- well, the only caveat would be when we see, if something does occur or is found that makes the entire project unviable, well, then, preserved because we can't do the project.

But we've worked with, and both -- testify later -- we've worked with all the relevant County and State departments through the design of the project and modified it significantly based on those comments. I've seen nothing different with regard to cultural impact assessment. If it comes back and says here's something you didn't know, you should make this modification or that, we will definitely work to accommodate that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there other comments from the Commissioners? Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So if I get this straight, you're willing to do a cultural impact

assessment? Will this be done prior to Phase 2 for the Petitioner?

MS. LIM: So actually this is a question better addressed to Mr. Horovitz, but the answer is yes, and that is because the intent is to do it immediately as soon as possible. And, of course, as you'll find out through Mr. Horovitz' motion next, they're under an extremely tight timeframe to start building as well. So with that I'll turn it over to him.

MR. HOROVITZ: I would agree with that. If we came out of here today saying, yes, proceed, or you have the authority to proceed, our next phone call is to start that process.

We will get into it later, but the County did give us a two-year deadline to commence construction, and a four-year deadline to complete construction.

I would expect this to be done well before any of that to occur, and it should be.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions from the Commission?

I'll just say, at the risk of sounding like
I'm moving forward to deliberation, my concern is we
make decisions now, and then later on, oftentimes our

communities -- and I'm not just referring to Hawaiian community, but our whole community gets thrusts into situations because of incompletely thought out decisions earlier on where we suddenly seem to be facing decisions between housing versus cultural protection.

I want to avoid a situation with that as the last choices that we are left with. Hopefully this will be a process that can avoid that kind of false dichotomy.

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I would like to express that I have -- part of me has this feeling that since so much research has been done in the past, and there's clearly not come up any evidence that would lead one to think you need to do it again, and it was approved ten years ago, I have to echo the thought that I would prefer to err on the side of being too cautious, as opposed to not being cautious enough.

So I appreciate the offer of the Petitioner and Intervenor to step in and make sure this is taken care of properly with maybe some overkill. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think we are now ready to move on to County of Maui.

1 MR. HOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The County of Maui, this was -- the modification motion from ELC was one of the motions the County did address in its response.

The County supports the motion. The County found that the project does have a similar footprint as far as the development, even though it's only on half the project.

There will be the same conditions for the most part with some exceptions, and so those conditions will remain except as altered in the request, or if there are additional conditions the Commission want to impose, such as the issue with the cultural impact statement. I don't know if that's something the Commission will be considering.

This would -- granting this motion, we do think, like the previous motion, is a bit dependent on the future motions on the agenda. It does appear that without the approval of a sale and affordable housing project that there may be financing issues with this.

So County does keep that in mind, and as stated in support for those motions as well, but recognizes with the phasing issues and financing issues, that that project would be required for the

financing as represented by the Applicants in this case.

The County does note that a 201H approval was granted for affordable housing component which, as we said, is sort of tangentially related to this motion, but it's still, I think, significant with respect to this motion.

With respect to the cultural issues discussed today, the County generally refers to the State where SHPD and other entities are available and have that level of expertise. We are not certain, at this level of discussion, sounds like there may be other either new requirements or assurances granted with respect to those items, and I think that's significant to discuss and we would want to be aware of those discussions.

Finally, if the Office of Planning has raised some compliance issues, with respect to the issues with compliance with the conditions as far as annual reports and other issues, which, of course, they can address, but the County recognizes that those are important issues.

If a six-year timeframe is more preferable to the Commission, I don't think the County would object to that. But that's something that's within

the Commission's discretion.

As far as overall granting the request for modification, I don't think this is a case where a developer has just done -- is not making any further efforts toward development. We do think, obviously, as evidenced before you, the application is filed, the approval of the 201H with County Council, that there are efforts to move forward with development of this project, and it's not a case where there's been, basically the Commission's order, and the development has been ignored.

So we do think that it would be worth it to grant this motion in order to give this developer, as well as the new affordable housing developer the opportunity to develop the projects in compliance with the conditions on the property.

That's all we have for you. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioners, questions for the County?

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I understand that the doctrine of law of a case may or may not apply to administrative agency and the scope of the application, as far as I can tell, has not really been decided by the Hawai'i

Appellate Courts.

But do you see a good reason why this

Commission should not be bound by the earlier

Findings of Fact, specifically, Findings of Fact 75

through 80 of the initial Decision & Order with

respect to the cultural practices issue, or better

yet, the Ka Pa'akai issues?

MR. HOPPER: There would appear -- based on the information before the Commission at that time and the scope of that project, I think, yes, with respect to that, that's a binding Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law.

If there is a different project, the affordable housing project that, if the Commission has additional cultural concerns, you could perhaps look at that to the extent that additional discretionary approvals are being sought.

But based on this record, however, I don't really see -- and, again, I think State Historic Preservation, with their archaeologists who are qualified to look into those issues, I think those are key, but I think based on this record, we have no knowledge, or at least County has no knowledge of any additional facts that have arisen since that Decision & Order that would give rise to a concern that there

may be cultural practices on the property, or other -- anything that was overlooked and not considered in the existing, for example, the AIS that we have.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So is it the County's position then that even if a further CIA, either in full or in part is not done, it's not done, there is still sufficient oversight by other government agencies to protect cultural practices or cultural resources?

MR. HOPPER: Again, the County has a bit of a limited expertise. We do not have archaeologists on staff that have that degree of review.

What we have seen in this case was the application did have approved AIS that has been updated. There is an existing Decision & Order. It also has conditions related to cultural practices as well as archaeological issues.

The affordable housing application, as I understand it -- not as I understand it -- based on the record, was sent to SHPD, as well as various other State agencies that have expertise over that area, so I do believe that, based on the record, and that was in part based on the County's -- formed the basis for the County's recommendation for approval,

that there has been a significant amount of information provided with respect to cultural and archaeological practices on the property.

2.1

2.4

That being said, I do think the Land Use

Commission, you have a duty under State law and under

the constitution to review those issues, and can

discuss with your counsel your options with respect

to the binding effect of that order.

But the County, in making its recommendation, that is what we had in the record to review before us.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Any other questions for the County? Hearing none, Office of Planning.

MS. APUNA: Thank you, Chair.

OP has reviewed Petitioner's motion and has a few comments.

First, regarding Condition No. 2, OP recommends that Petitioner will be held accountable at least for the initial two phases, which encompasses six years as reflected in Petitioner's timetable. So we would ask that the newly extended ten-year deadline be reduced to six years to ensure

the use of the property as envisioned.

And, secondly, OP has no objections to the proposed deletion of Condition No. 20 that eliminates Commission approval of any sale of the Petition Area. And OP would like assurances that Petitioner and Intervenor will provide timely submittals of annual reports.

Finally, OP was concerned that CIA and Ka
Pa'akai analysis were not performed for the area, and
this is based on -- we understand that the Finding of
Facts and Conclusions of Law as stated -- as Ms. Lim
stated that there was some cultural review, but our
issue is that the Finding of Fact and the Conclusion
of Law is a cultural impact analysis was performed,
which we, based on the record, and I think based on
some of the testimony today, there was no cultural
impact analysis for the Petition Area.

So that's where this has all come from, and if the Finding of Fact says there was a cultural impact analysis, and that they made conclusions based on that analysis, and yet there is no record of analysis, and there seems to be a hole there that we were concerned about, but the fact that Intervenor and Petitioner commitment today to perform a CIA and to protect cultural resources, accordingly, this

```
should -- so based on the foregoing, OP does not
1
2
     object to the Motion for Modification.
 3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners,
 4
     questions for OP?
                Commissioner Okuda.
5
 6
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7
                Is it untimely to bring up the fact that
8
      the Commission might have made a Finding of Fact
9
      which was not supported by the record, which when I
10
     asked untimely, untimely because no one filed
     objections as far as we could tell to the Decision &
11
12
      Order or the form of the Decision & Order, and no one
13
     took an appeal from the Decision & Order.
14
                So is it untimely now for us to bring up
15
     that issue?
16
                MS. APUNA: I think we weren't there, or I
17
     wasn't there, but this is new information as far as
     trying to find that record that would reference in
18
19
     the Decision & Order, and if it's not there, we -- OP
20
     wasn't able to review that information.
21
                I don't think it's untimely. I think, if
22
     there is a puka there, we want to look at it.
23
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA:
                                     Thank you.
```

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any other questions

for OP? Commissioners? Ms. Lim.

24

25

MS. LIM: Thank you, Chair. Just quick closing remarks.

Thank you for your patience and attention today. I do want to clarify a couple items if I may.

We requested the ten-year extension. When the Commission approved the ten-year extension under the first motion today, we acknowledged that this Commission has full authority to modify that ten-year extension, period, end of discussion.

However, I do want to point out, I'm a little confused by what Office of Planning just said about that we have to be complete within six years, because that does run contrary to what is in our development schedule.

Our development schedule is Phase 1 is the fundraising; Phase 2 is multipurpose building, and that is projected to be completed in 2024. But that is not complete buildout of the project, as you heard from Dr. Reiley.

Phase 3 is the construction of middle school classrooms and office space which is projected to start 2025 and be completed 2028.

So Petitioner is completely ready to stand by its representations that the fundraising and first phase of the construction will be done. And perhaps

as Dr. Reiley said, perhaps the second phase of the construction will be done within six years, but perhaps it won't be. And we would hope that this Commission would understand that if we're talking about Condition 2, where it will be language that we will complete the construction of the project no later than, if the Commission is going to make that six years, then we would hope that the Commission recognizes that completion of construction of the project involves just Phase 2, multipurpose building.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I know you said you had a couple things in your closing. I want to give a chance to OP to clarify.

MS. APUNA: We would clarify. We mean

Phase 1 and Phase 2, according to your timetable. So

Phase 1 and 2 would be completed within the six

years. That would be the fundraising of Phase 1, and
then the construction of the multipurpose complex of

Phase 2 within six years.

MS. LIM: Thank you very much for the clarification.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there anything further in your closing, keeping in mind we have other motions?

MS. LIM: Thank you for your time. We

truly appreciate the attention, and we very much hope this Commission will give us another chance, give us another breath of life here.

You've heard from Dr. Reiley, you've heard from Mr. Sjostrand. We want to get going, but we do need your approval and permission to let us do that.

With that, I'll stop and I'll close and thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commission, what's your pleasure?

COMMISSIONER WONG: Okay, I want to move to grant the motion to amend Condition 2 to allow for ten years to complete the project provided that the initial two phases will be completed within six years as represented.

To also delete Condition 20 and that

Petitioner and Intervenor provide regular timely
annual reports, including status of development and
compliance with condition of approval, and provided
that -- and conditioned upon Petitioner and
Intervenor completing a cultural impact assessment
prior to completing Phase 1 for the Petitioner. And
adhering to the recommendation of the CIS, cultural
impact study.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: CIA?

1 COMMISSIONER WONG: CIA. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There has been a 3 motion by Commissioner Wong. Is there a second? 4 VICE CHAIR MAHI: I'll second. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The motion has been 5 6 seconded by Commissioner Mahi. 7 Is there discussion on the motion? COMMISSIONER WONG: Just wanted to say that 8 I would like to thank the Petitioner and Intervenor 9 10 for coming up with the new terms of the CIA. That 11 really satisfied my concerns. And that also the last 12 statement of the Phase 1, Phase 1 done within six 13 years, that's why I did that motion. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda. 14 15 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would -- I'm inclined and would urge 16 17 voting in favor of the motion, but I would like to say one thing. 18 19 I don't believe at this point in time on 20 the record, even though I'm going to vote in favor of 2.1 the motion, that a cultural impact analysis, 22 additional study, or study should be required at this 23 point in time. 24 I do agree, and I thank the Office of

Planning for raising the point that a proper CIA was

25

probably missing in the earlier proceeding. But we as the Commission, we're stuck and bound with what prior Commissions have done, bodies might change, but the Commission is the Commission, and frankly, earlier Decisions & Orders, Findings and Conclusions, unless they're modified, I believe are the law of the case.

But in any event, I will vote and urge voting in favor of the motion. I think this is a very good plan. There's no guarantees in life, but I think the evidence and the demeanor of the witnesses demonstrate people with commitment to the community indicate that they not only have, but they will continue to do their best. And I think that's all we can expect from a lot of people. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there other discussion on the motion? Seeing none, Mr.
Orodenker, please poll the Commission.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The motion is to grant the motion to amend with conditions.

Commissioner Wong?

COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Mahi?

VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aye.

1	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
2	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Aye.
3	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
4	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
5	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Ohigashi
6	is absent.
7	Commissioner Cabral?
8	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
9	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
11	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you. Mr. Chair,
12	the motion passes with six affirmative votes.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,
14	and congratulations on this motion on the agenda. I
15	am hoping this agenda might go more quickly based on
16	the decisions made today.
17	Are we ready to move forward, at least
18	through the next one?
19	Mr. Horovitz, are you going to make a
20	presentation on your client's Motion to Approve a
21	Sale for the Portion of the Petition Area?
22	MR. HOROVITZ: Certainly I can take it in
23	that order, if you like. We only have one further
24	witness, that would be Bill Frampton who will present
25	an overview of the project and where we are on the

approval. And you can take questions, and then all the motions kind of flow from that.

If you prefer we bring him up now, happy to, otherwise on the Motion for Approval of Portion of the Sale, I think that really flows along with the funding request or needs of Emmanuel Lutheran, and I think that, in our view, stands independent of our development.

Certainly our purchase of the property is not dependent on the 201H approval. If the Commission would prefer simply to take that motion and ask questions of me on that, it's fairly straight forward.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let's do that. Do you have anything further to say other than what you submitted in your written motion?

MR. HOROVITZ: Nothing further.

MS. LIM: I believe that the motion that the Commission just passed deleted Condition 20, which was the prohibition of sale of the property.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That is correct.

MS. LIM: So that moots WDV's motion on that point.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me turn to my attorney general. Two-minute recess.

1 (Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We're back on the record.

While I appreciate the observation by the Petitioner's counsel that our last motion might have, from the LUC's perspective, obviated the need to approve the sale, I'm also under the understanding that under County approval, one of the County's requirements was that the LUC approve the sale of the property. So let's make our way through this motion.

MR. HOROVITZ: I rest on my submissions, unless there are further questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, counsel.

MR. HOPPER: We obviously support the sale, in fact, there was a condition to the 201H approval that said that that approval from the Land Use Commission, which was required at the time, but seems no longer to be required, be obtained within six months of that date of approval of the 201H, which would fall in March.

I think it would be easier for everyone if there was on the record an approval of that sale notwithstanding the previous deletion of the condition. That's still our position.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

1 Commissioner Cabral. 2 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I will make a motion. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Hold on. We still 4 have to have Office of Planning, and still some 5 questions from the Commissioners. We'll get there 6 soon. 7 MS. APUNA: We have no objection to the 8 motion. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Petitioner. 10 MS. LIM: No questions or comments from Petitioner. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, 13 questions on this motion which is approval of the 14 sale? 15 Commissioner Cabral, you may now make a 16 motion. 17 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you, Mr. 18 Chairman. I would like to make a motion that we will 19 20 approve the sale for the Petitioner in order to have 21 it transferred for the affordable housing program. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There's been a motion 23 made for approval of the sale of the portion of the 24 Petition Area by Commissioner Cabral.

Is there a second.

25

1	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Seconded by
3	Commissioner Aczon. Is any discussion on this
4	motion? Hearing none, Mr. Orodenker, please poll the
5	Commission.
6	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7	The motion is to approve the sale of the property
8	subdivision of the property excuse me the
9	sale
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The motion is to
11	approve the sale of a portion of the Petition Area.
12	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: a portion of the
13	Petition Area.
14	Commissioner Cabral?
15	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
16	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
17	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Aye.
18	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
19	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
20	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Ohigashi
21	is absent.
22	Commissioner Wong?
23	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
24	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Mahi?
25	VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aye.

1	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
3	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: The motion passes
4	unanimously.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We will now move on
6	to consider WDV's Motion to Allow for Subdivision of
7	the Petition Area. Mr. Horovitz.
8	MR. HOROVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
9	don't know that this was entirely necessary, but it
10	is a belt and suspenders, so we are in the process of
11	subdividing the property. That should occur in a
12	month or so. And so we would ask the Commission's
13	approval of that authority to subdivide. The County
14	obviously will process the subdivision itself.
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Petitioner?
16	MS. LIM: Petitioner is in full support.
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County?
18	MR. HOPPER: County is supportive of the
19	motion.
20	MS. APUNA: No objection to the motion.
21	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners,
22	questions for the Intervenor on this motion?
23	I believe I'll just state for the record I
24	believe it would be more awkward if we didn't take
25	this motion and then we move to hifurcate So it's

1	one of part of the suspenders, I would suppose.
2	MR. HOROVITZ: Absolutely.
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any other questions
4	or comments from the Commission? Hearing none, does
5	somebody care to make a motion?
6	VICE CHAIR MAHI: I'll move that we allow
7	for the subdivision of the Petition Area.
8	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Mahi has
9	moved. Is there a second?
10	COMMISSIONER WONG: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Seconded by
12	Commissioner Wong. Any discussion on the motion?
13	Hearing none, Mr. Orodenker, please poll
14	the Commission.
15	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: The motion is to allow
16	for subdivision of the Petition Area.
17	Commissioner Mahi?
18	VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aye.
19	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
20	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
21	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
22	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
23	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
24	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Aye.
25	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral.

1 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Aye. 2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer? 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye. 4 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Mr. Chair, the motion 5 passes unanimously. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are now moving on to WDV's Motion for Modification to allow for use of 7 8 a portion of the Petition Area acquired for a 9 workforce housing project recently approved by the 10 County of Maui. MR. HOROVITZ: I think our submissions are 11 12 straight forward. We would like to call Bill 13 Frampton to the witness stand just to present the 14 project again, and also be available to answer 15 questions that the Commissioners may have. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. 17 MR. HOROVITZ: With the Chair's indulgence, 18 we have a blowup of the approved plan of the project. 19 It actually is one of the pages in the exhibits to 20 our motion for the 201H Application. It's already in 21 the record, but just so you don't have to search 22 through 500 pages to find it. 23 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have a

specific page number, or some referencing in the

application just for the benefit of anybody reading

24

25

- 1 this transcript in the future?
- 2 Mr. Frampton, do you swear or affirm that
- 3 | the testimony you are about to give is the truth?
- 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your
- 6 name and address.
- 7 THE WITNESS: My name is William Charles
- 8 | Frampton. I live at 56 Alicui Place in Kula, Maui,
- 9 Hawai'i.
- 10 WILLIAM CHARLES FRAMPTON
- 11 | Called as a witness by and on behalf of the
- 12 Intervenor, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
- 13 and testified as follows:
- 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 15 BY MR. HOROVITZ:
- 16 Q Can you tell me your position with the
- 17 developing -- Waikapu Development Ventures?
- A Yes. I am one of three partners. I'm the
- 19 project manager for the project, for the proposed
- 20 affordable housing project. So I was in charge of
- 21 helping to hire, retain the team, select the team,
- 22 help even with the steps before that was to come up
- with the project vision with the team and the members
- 24 and eventually come up with design.
- 25 Q Tell me your development background.

A Yeah. From a background, I would note I've been blessed to be raised on Maui my whole life.

Mentioned earlier by Mr. Reiley that my father came to Maui 1970 to start Big Brothers/Big Sisters, and he did so, was executive director for many decades.

And it gave us, myself and my siblings -- there are

five of us -- an incredible opportunity to grow up in respect and love and care for this island.

Ironically, myself and my two brothers were all in the field of land use planning and consulting. So I've been doing land use planning and consulting for over 27 years. I've worked for land use planning firms, private firms. I've worked for development companies. I've worked for the Kaho'olawe Reserve Commission. And now I have my own consulting company, William Frampton Consulting.

Q Is this the first affordable housing project you've done?

A No. We actually had one immediately contiguous to this property. It was one we had done previously, 70-unit project. Similar in nature. And the idea of it being 100 percent affordable housing. No market housing. I've been involved in market housing projects, commercial projects, residential, industrial.

But we've really focused in lately on

coming back more towards the roots of my father,

focusing on affordable housing. And we believe it's

desperately needed on this island.

Q That was my next question. Why affordable

Q That was my next question. Why affordable housing at this point if time versus --

A It has a lot, I think, to do with, again, I was blessed to be raised here. And I have a ton of grade school friends who are up in the mainland now, high school friends in the mainland now, and other friends that we have known that can't afford to live here just from the lack of supply of housing.

It's very difficult to develop housing on the island. And it's something I've been lucky enough to have been around, and I believe the partnership that we have assembled brings a great wide experience of the ability to develop housing.

Q Just for the record, this is the colorized version of what appears, it's Exhibit B to our 201H Application, and our 201H Application is attached as Exhibit E to our Motion for Modification.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Q (By Mr. Horovitz): Bill, tell me about the genesis of this particular project. How did this particular project come about?

A Like we mentioned previously, the project next door, which would be to the south, was a ten-acre, almost 11-acre parcel of land that we did 100 percent affordable housing project on. It's actually under construction right now.

When we went out to the community to talk about that previous project at one of our community association meetings at the Waikapu Community, I was talking story outside afterwards with some of my friends that were there, and that project was going to provide housing for the range beginning with 80 percent of to 140 of the median income. So the target zone was 80 to 140 percent.

And my friends outside were noting that that's great, but even 80 percent, three bedroom, two bath at 80 percent level was still unattainable for them.

So eventually we found out, I think we happened to know some of the folks at Emmanuel Lutheran, but we talked to some people and got through word of mouth that the property next door, there was an opportunity maybe to do something similar, where we could come in, work in partnership, work with the owner, with the church, Emmanuel Lutheran, which I'm very familiar with. And I think

they do represent an incredible entity on this island. And the idea that we could possibly work with them and help them and still provide housing and help them go forward is how that came about.

And so we sat with them early on, ending of maybe 2016, and came with a solution that maybe if we took half the property. We tried to figure out -- we did not want to in any way impede with ELC's ability to do their vision. They had a vision that we thought was great, but by coming in to say, hey, we will buy half your land, I didn't want to say by going in and buying half your land, you know what, now you have to cut half your dreams in half, or sever your vision in half, just because -- we realize that 25 acres is a large piece of land. Therefore, we thought if we did 12 acres, could it work?

We worked with the architects and engineers and did several designs, and we came up with something we thought was very compatible, but still lingering with what were the price range going to be.

Our architect was able to come up with an idea that by producing some duplex units, we got to go down to 70 percent. And we're the first 100 percent affordable housing project, I think, on Maui to go down to the 70 percent level. All the other

1 ones originally started at the 80 percent and up.

- Q 80 percent is the minimum requirement?
- A It's the minimum requirement. We had to get permission actually. To go below 80 required permission from the council.
 - Q What is the current status of the entitlement? Has it gone before the County?

A Yeah. In order to do the 201H, as was mentioned by the Petitioner's attorney earlier, in the background there was debate as to whether or not maybe we could go to them last year sometime. They can only work so fast, and they had a big backlog of projects, and we just flat out could not get in front of them.

When we finally were able to work with them, council staff, and we were scheduled last year in summertime for the beginning of the hearing 201H. And it resulted in September 2000 -- this year in September we got the full approval by the County Council, the resolution approved the 201H project.

- Q And there is some time deadlines attached to that. What are they?
- A Yeah. As should be, I think it's fair to ask, the County wanted to make sure that if we're coming forward saying we wanted to fast track this

project, we go before the Council and ask them to approve it in 45 days. We also asked for a fair amount of exceptions.

Q I meant the time deadlines that the development team is under to --

A Yes. So what I was going to say is that given the fact that we asked the County to expedite everything, I think it's fair for them to want us to perform as well. They can't just push people out of line and shove us through and have us sit there and do nothing, it's not right.

So the timeline that you're referring to,
I'm saying I believe it's tight. We have four years
to complete the project. I believe we have to be
under construction in two. And that started the day
we got the approval back in September.

So part of this process was hoping we could work with State LUC, that it would line-up appropriately, and it seems like it's going good so far. But there is a tight timeline that he have to adhere to.

But that being said, the project immediately next door was under a very similar timeline, similar in size and scale. And they're under construction and they're going to meet their

deadlines.

Q As part of the conceptualization and design of the project, you did a fair bit of meetings with the community as well as County departments.

Describe those a little bit for me.

A Yeah. One of the things that's really important, I think we've just learned, we just know from being from here, also is the making sure there is a fair amount of community outreach, and there's no surprises or shocks. And after assembling our team, and after assembling the preliminary plans, we scheduled to go -- the first meeting we had I believe was the Waikapu Community Association, their annual membership meeting was held. And there was probably 100 people there that night. And in attendance were many long time residents of Waikapu including the Pelegrino family. They were all there to review the ideas of what we were talking about.

And it was our goal to go to them and share our design, our idea; is something that would be compatible in their area? Are they open to it? It was actually a very good meeting. A lot of discussion.

And it resulted in the revisions of our plans. We increased the size of our community park,

retention basin areas. And we were able to commit to the 70 percent idea that night at that meeting.

Subsequent meetings, we met with Face Maui, they're a group that's been formed on the island.

The acronym of faith is face -- I don't remember the acronym, but multiple religious groups on the island get together and have been focused on the affordable housing.

And they review projects. You can go before them, and there is a bunch of folks that will sit there, critique it, give you good comments, feedback.

We had a meet with them. And we didn't do any changes because they liked everything that they saw. They were in support of everything the Waikapu Community had asked for.

We also met with Catholic Charities. Those are the outside nongovernment entities. The next entities me met with was of course the County of Maui. We met with the Department of Housing Human Concerns to make sure they could support our idea of a housing project. They supported it.

And one of the biggest things they did, they helped arrange for a meeting in June, with what I call it "the all county heads meeting". We went

and they arranged for having all of the heads of the various departments, planning department, water,

Public Works, police, fire, wastewater, every agency that's normally involved in reviewing of our projects, came to one room and we sat down and we had a meeting sort of similar to this where we presented everything, including the talk about some of the exemptions, design parameters.

And the idea was -- we had just gotten word we could be scheduled with the County Council within two months. So in order to try to make sure that that Council meeting ran smoother, instead of debating projects on the floor at the Council with your agencies, we met in advance to try to do as much early consultation as possible.

And that actual meeting was in June. Over the next six weeks we had several detailed meetings with just one on one with each agency that might have had comments or concerns. And we did so. And it was very helpful, and again, a lot of it had to do with roadway design, width of roadways, on-street parking or no parking. Sidewalks or no sidewalks. The greenways.

All of that was refined during those meetings. By the time we got to the County Council,

we had gone through a pretty exhaustive assessment.

And it paid off in that I think the review went

really well with the County and we got approved.

Q So the project has changed its character based upon the interaction with both community groups and government groups, and the developer has been willing to modify accordingly?

A Yeah. And you can see on the site design, if you look on the right-hand side, there is those boxes in sort of tannish/yellow color. That purpose of that description there is to talk about some of the issues that came out of these meetings, but especially having a lot to do with the pedestrian connectivity of this community, making sure that the greenways reconnect to the regional greenway system, and that we incorporate a plan that is functional, and that you can get around safely to some of these park areas without having to use your car and can be safely done.

But the plan did go through an evolution, if you well, based on good feedback from the various departments that didn't want to not just -- you know, they weren't trying to throw any wet blankets on it, they were just trying to help troubleshoot, make sure we weren't going to create something that provided

1 affordable housing, but then left us with unsafe 2 roadway systems or unsafe access. 3 That was all flushed out, and it's a really 4 nice plan where it sits now. 5 MR. HOROVITZ: I've not got no other 6 questions at this time. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Ms. Lim. 8 MS. LIM: Thank you, Chair. 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION 10 BY MS. LIM: 11 Q Hi, Bill. I'm so glad we are here together 12 today. 13 Yeah, little different. (Laughter.) 14 I have two quick questions. 15 I believe it's Exhibit 2 to the Motion to 16 Approve the Sale, the Motion for Subdivision, the 17 Motion for Bifurcation, but your Exhibit 2 is WDV's 18 detailed timeline for completion of the WDV project. 19 Α Yes. 20 Items 31 and 32 in that schedule is what I Q 21 want to bring your attention to. Item 31 is public 22 works is anticipated to issue final subdivision 23 approval to create the two lots --24 Α Correct.

-- in December 2018. Is that still

25

1 | accurate?

A That's the goal. If anything, we would like to -- I think Mike Reiley mentioned earlier, if it could be done sooner, we hope we won't be penalized, but that's our target date right now.

Q It's November 29th, so probably won't be done much sooner than that?

A Yes. Our goal is by the end of the year we're hoping to have complete subdivision. But this step today is something that obviously is required before we can get that.

Q And then item 32 indicates that the closing will happen -- really, it's the very next step after the final subdivision approval?

A Yes. That's an action-base sort of closing where the idea was, as soon as we can get final subdivision, and then we can assemble up the deed, the title, and we will close. And no more than 30 days after is the way the contract is written, within 30 days of receiving final subdivision approval, we will close.

O Terrific.

A Yeah.

Q So even today's discussion, and our agreement to pursue the cultural impact assessment

would in no way delay the closing as stated in the timeline?

A That's correct. SHPD, as noted earlier, has already commented on everything, so they're okay with where we're at. So that would be a supplemental step we would take. And I think it's pretty clear and I appreciate how it was discussed today, and I appreciate the recognition that the body knows that that is something that is very, very important to us, and in no way looking for any kind of -- we weren't looking to do one less study, or one less shortcut, that we need it so we can make a profit or something, it was just trying to do what we needed to do and get done as quickly as we can.

And I would note to the Chair earlier that his concern about the potential for burials in this vicinity of the island, and this region is extremely keen and important and a good assessment. I've sat on the Burial Council, Maui Burial Council for eight years, and I got too serve, and it was eight great years of extremely difficult issues and challenging issues, but for the protection of the iwi kupuna, it was a very great ability to have an impact on knowing that what can happen when something like that does come up.

Some of the questions you have, were asking earlier, I wanted to expand to say plans can be changed. Nothing is ever final, especially when it comes to something as important as the iwi kupuna, and protecting our culture.

We have flexibility in this design, enough large green spaces, and the talent of our architects and engineers, I know preservation in place, God forbid if we do find precontact, there's ways to make sure we do it right. And we would be very proud to show that it can be done. I know it can be done.

Q Thank you, Bill.

I don't have any further questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOOPER:

Q Could you go over the income ranges once again for affordable units?

A Income ranges that were approved via 201H, we call it the proposed allocation of affordable housing units by income range starting off between 70 and 80 percent.

Q If you are referencing an exhibit, could you let the Commission know --

A It's definitely the second page of the handout of the plans, that includes site plan and a

table of information, just reading from that. I
don't know where it would be in the filings.

- Q I'm sure that can be found just for the transcript.
 - A Thank you for doing that. I'll just read between the 70 to 80 percent range, 15 percent of our units will sold in that range, that equals 12.

 15 percent of the 80.

The next bracket range is 81 to 100, 12 units again, or 15 percent.

The next income range is 101 to 120, those are 40 units will be sold at that range, 50 percent.

And then the last one is the 121 to 140, 16 units or 20 percent of the total project unit count.

Q Do you know off-hand what those numbers are at this point?

exactly what it is. I have a lot of families calling me every day wanting to know those numbers. It's a difficult -- the only reason -- I'm not wanting to dodge anything, is that number will be set as soon as we get this approved, if this can be approved, we go right back to County of Maui, Department of Housing, Human Concerns, and we will record with them a development agreement. In that development agreement

it will be called out, and the prices will be determined upon -- it's a formula that is very public and transparent based on your mortgage rates, average median income level, and the size of the house.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Horovitz?

MR. HOROVITZ: Just to reference the numbers, the range of percentages would come from at the end of Exhibit F to our Motion for Modification, which is the affordable housing application, the project summary pages Roman numeral III, Exhibit F.

Q (By Mr. Hopper): I think the Commission is generally familiar with the 201H process before the County Council. As they probably know the County Council can grant exemptions from certain county requirements for affordable housing projects.

Could you briefly summarize -- now, again, this is part of the record, so this is in the County's Response to the Motion as well as the Application, but could you briefly go over any of the exemptions that you think -- that were obtained, that you think are of note for the Commission here?

A Sure. I know offhand, I think, one of the first ones you would see would be your lot sizes.

Lot sizes are subject of your zoning, Title 19 of zoning, as well as the subdivision Title 18.

In order to increase the density and provide a certain number of units, we needed to have permission to have smaller than what's normally allowed lot sizes, that's a big one.

Another one relates to roadway types, sidewalks. But we actually ended up skipping that. At one point, one of the original designs had sidewalks only on one side of the roadway around the perimeter, it was something we thought we could -- any money we saved in construction gets passed directly to the buyers.

So we were trying to find a way if that is something we could possibly cut from the financial feasibility assessment. Turns out after talking with Public Works and enough of the community folks, it was something the community wanted to see sidewalks on both sides, so we have them on both sides. The rest of the other exemptions -- give me one second.

Q You don't have to go over them. For the Commission's benefit, this is in the County's Responsive Motion. It goes over in Exhibit A there's the resolution as well as the exemptions listed, so if Commissioners have questions, I just wanted them to know that that was in the record to see what exemptions were granted by the County Council.

1 And then last, the timeline stated, I 2 believe the resolution states that the start of 3 grading should be considered the commencement of 4 construction within two years from the date of approval, and that you believe is a timeframe that 5 6 you can meet? 7 Yes, I believe we can. We have to. committed to the County that we would, and that's 8 just based on experience. I believe we can. 9 10 And it's I believe best efforts to complete construction within four years? 11 12 That's correct. And we really -- I mean Α 13 this is to provide housing, affordable housing that's 14 so desperately needed. The list of members of people 15 that have contacted us demands that we move fast and 16 expeditiously, but we will meet those timelines. 17 Thank you. I have no further questions. Q. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Office of 19 Planning? 20 MS. APUNA: No questions. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, 22 questions? Commissioner Cabral. 23 I'll advise -- I'm not wanting to dampen

discussion among our members, full and free discussion, but we are getting later on time as the

- 1 day goes on.
- 2 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: That cuts into several
- 3 of them.
- So this -- the church then, after this goes
- 5 through, the church will be sandwiched between Legacy
- 6 affordable housing that you've been the planner?
- 7 THE WITNESS: The other side. There is
- 8 one -- you are correct, Legacy does have a project on
- 9 one side. The project I was involved was near Valley
- 10 | Isle Fellowship Church.
- 11 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: So the church will
- 12 be -- it's the blue on this map here?
- THE WITNESS: Yes.
- MR. HOROVITZ: To clarify, the blue is the
- 15 | entire 25-acre parcel. The half of the blue is
- 16 closer to Kahului Town, so that the right side of the
- 17 map, that is what Emmanuel Lutheran church will be
- 18 | retaining, the half that is towards the left of the
- 19 map is what Waikapu Development Ventures is
- 20 purchasing and in developing.
- VICE CHAIR CABRAL: The church and school
- 22 | will be between two different affordable housing
- 23 | projects?
- MR. HOROVITZ: I prefer "well positioned".
- 25 Lots of students in those units.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Lots and lots of future school and church attendees.

And then I see that you have a drainage basin designed in that, and I know your engineers are going to think about it, but I'm from Hilo. We are starting to see an increase in flooding, so you might want to make sure your houses are slab on grade construction, that we make sure we don't have future flooding homes where you clearly -- I live in a water situation. So that was something else. Then when you a talk about --

THE WITNESS: Just good to note.

Absolutely, that's an important -- and, in fact, when we had our first hearing at County Council was when the hurricane was approaching Maui. I forget which one it was. We were very aware of water.

This project is oversized. We are going above and beyond standard requirements. And I believe strongly in that, and that not only do we wait -- the one that's highlighted, that's one of the bigger ones, but there's a lot of green strips throughout the project that we want to capture much closer to the source instead of waiting to the bottom.

So that the quicker you can catch it the

cleaner it can be, and we have an opportunity to treat it through low impact development measures.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: When you have your duplexes, because you're selling -- 201H is a sales project, lower income sales project, and when you have the duplex, what does that allow for you to sell someone? If they buy that, can they rent out the other half, or is it a condo unit?

THE WITNESS: It will be a two-story, one single unit of a building, two stories separated by a CPR unit. It will be considered a duplex, one ownership down below, one ownership above.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you. That answers my primary questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions from the Commission?

Hearing no further questions,

Commissioners, does somebody wish to make a motion?

VICE CHAIR MAHI: I'll make a motion.

I move to allow for modification of the Decision & Order to allow for the use of a portion of the Petition Area acquired for workforce housing project approved by the County of Maui, provided that the 201H housing project is developed within four years.

1	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Second the motion.
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Motion made by
3	Commissioner Mahi and seconded by Commissioner Aczon.
4	Is there any discussion on the motion,
5	further discussion? Hearing none, Mr. Orodenker,
6	please poll the Commission.
7	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: The motion is to allow
8	for modification for use of a portion of the Petition
9	Area acquired for workforce housing project approved
10	by the County of Maui with conditions.
11	Commissioner Mahi?
12	VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aye.
13	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
14	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Yes.
15	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
16	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
17	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
18	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
19	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
20	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Aye.
21	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
23	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Motion passes
24	unanimously.
25	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We are near the

1 finish line.

Mr. Horovitz, will you lead us through the Motion for Bifurcation?

MR. HOROVITZ: I'll keep this very brief.

We're simply asking at this stage that we be afforded our own docket so that Emmanuel Lutheran will have their docket, and there will be a separated docket purely for Waikapu Development Ventures. I think that's appropriate for a few reasons:

One, we are going to have separate ownership of the property very soon.

Two, we are on separate development timelines. If things go as we expect, within four years we are going to have families in those units.

Emmanuel Lutheran may still be developing their property subject to further action or reporting requirements.

We don't want to saddle our homeowners with having further LUC work, that's our kuleana. So I think at this stage --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You objected to our use of the word "sandwiched", I'll object to the use of the word "saddle", please.

MR. HOROVITZ: Please, place appropriate conditions. I think it's appropriate if there is

something in the future where we need to -- Waikapu Development Venture needs to come back and ask for some clarification, modification or whatnot, we shouldn't have to drag Emmanuel Lutheran, and I don't think the Commission wants to as well, and I think vice versa, with no issue remaining under LUC's jurisdiction, so I would think it's appropriate we have our own docket.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Petitioner.

2.1

MS. LIM: Petitioner supports Intervenor's request, and we also note there is precedent where the Commission has bifurcated when there were separate development projects proposed after an initial dba is issued, so we hope the Commission will grant the request.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County of Maui?

MR. HOPPER: County supports bifurcation.

We do recognize it won't be release of all of the conditions of the project, but to bifurcate for the different ownership issues, we do support as stated in our documentation.

MS. APUNA: OP supports bifurcation. I think there is some reference to Amendment of Condition 10 on page 14 of Petitioner's Motion, but I

think that's a typo. I don't think you need to amend specifically 10, sorry, Intervenor.

And then OP has no objection to the four year timeframe proposed to develop the workforce housing project, and notably, yes, Intervenor is not seeking release for any condition of the original Decision & Order and hope that the bifurcated docket includes the CIA condition.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are there questions? I will note that it is my understanding that -- Commissioner Aczon.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I just want to clarify conditions where mentioned, just want to know who's responsible for those conditions, still the Petitioner or --

MR. HOROVITZ: Our request was that we simply bifurcate the docket. The conditions with the exception of the ones that purely related to Emmanuel doing a church and school would carry over onto ours. In fact, I think in our motion I prepared a table showing the existing conditions on the project.

The conditions that the County imposed upon us for the 201H, they all kind of match us of up.

We have no objection to the existing conditions including the CIA that we committed to

carrying over. The only ones we're asking for deleting is conditions purely relating to the church and school, and I believe there was one condition about fencing the lower portion of the property which is on Emmanuel Lutheran's piece, not ours. Other than that, we're not asking for deletion of any conditions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any further questions? Commissioner Cabral.

2.1

WICE CHAIR CABRAL: I would like to make a motion, move to grant the Motion to Bifurcate into two portions approximately 12.5 acres of which will be used for workforce development housing in compliance with the conditions of the 201H approval with the understanding that both bifurcated properties will be subject to the conditions imposed today with regards to the completion of the cultural impact assessment, and being completed and adhered to prior to commencement of construction on both properties -- actually, on either property.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Motion is made by Commissioner Cabral.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Second to the motion by Commissioner Wong. Any discussion of the motion?

1 | Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm inclined to vote for the motion. This is the reason why retaining jurisdiction probably does not add any enforcement to the conditions because I anticipate, based on the testimony here, that there probably would be substantial commencement of the use of the property based on the representations.

So even if some condition is not met, LUC probably is not going to have much ability to enforce the conditions, and so retaining jurisdiction by denying this motion is probably not going to be in anyone's best interest.

I think the evidence has shown, without any 100 percent guarantees, but I think we can be satisfied that the parties here are acting in good faith, and in the best interest of the community.

So based on that, I would vote in favor of the motion.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

Commissioner Okuda. Any further comments on the

motion? Hearing none, Mr. Orodenker, would you

please poll the Commission?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr.

25 Chairman.

1	The motion is to allow bifurcation of the
2	property with conditions.
3	Commissioner Cabral?
4	VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Aye.
5	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
6	COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
7	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Mahi?
8	VICE CHAIR MAHI: Aye.
9	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
10	COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
11	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
12	COMMISSIONER ACZON: Yes.
13	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
15	EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you. Mr. Chair,
16	the motion passes unanimously.
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much
18	to the Petitioner, to the Intervenor, to those who
19	have attended today, to the fairly incredible LUC
20	staff who make our work possible. I appreciate it.
21	This meeting began yesterday morning at
22	9:30 in Kona and is now adjourned.
23	(The proceedings adjourned at 2:48 p.m.)
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF HAWAII)
3) SS. COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on November 29, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., the
6	proceedings contained herein was taken down by me in
7	machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
8	typewriting under my supervision; that the foregoing
9	represents, to the best of my ability, a true and
10	correct copy of the proceedings had in the foregoing
11	matter.
12	I further certify that I am not of counsel for
13	any of the parties hereto, nor in any way interested
14	in the outcome of the cause named in this caption.
15	Dated this 29th day of November, 2018, in
16	Honolulu, Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	/s/Jean Marie McManus
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	1