		-		
1		LAND USE COMMISSION STATE OF HAWAI'I		
2				
3		Hearing held on November 6, 2019 Commencing at 9:00 a.m.		
4		Planning Department Conference Room First Floor, 250 South High Street		
5		Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793		
6	AGENDA			
7	I.	Call to Order		
8	II.	Adoption of Minutes		
9	III.	Tentative Meeting Schedule		
11	IV.	ACTION SP19-410 SACRED EARTH ASSEMBLY (MAUI)		
12		Consider Petition for Special Permit In the matter of the Application of Dr. Lew Abrams and		
13		Maria De Abrams on Behalf of the Sacred Earth Assembly to obtain a State Land Use Commission		
14		Special Permit to operate the Sacred Earth Assembly, a non-profit, interfaith church, in		
15		the State Agricultural District located at 3505 Hana Highway, Haiku, Island of Maui, Hawaii, Tax Map Key (2) 2-8-003:075(por)		
16	V.	Recess		
17				
18				
19				
20	BEFORI	E: Jean Marie McManus, CSR #156		
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
	1			

		2
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	JONATHAN SCHEUER, Chair	
3	NANCY CABRAL, Vice Chair DAWN N.S. CHANG	
4	EDMUND ACZON GARY OKUDA	
5	LEE OHIGASHI ARNOLD WONG	
6	STAFF: PATRICIA OHARA, ESQ.	
7	Deputy Attorney General	
8	DANIEL ORODENKER, Executive Officer RILEY K. HAKODA, Planner/Chief Clerk	
9	RASMI AGRAHARI, Planner	
10	DAWN APUNA, ESQ.	
11	Deputy Attorney General LORENE MAKI, Planner	
12	For State Office of Planning	
13	MICHAEL HOPPER, ESQ. Deputy Corporation Counsel	
14	MICHELE McLEAN, Director TARA FURUKAWA, Planner	
15	For County of Maui	
16	LESLIE ICZKOVITZ, ESQ. 1350 Ala Moana Blvd., Ste. 2304	
17	Honolulu, Hawaii 96814 For Sacred Earth	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

			3
1	INDEX		
_	PUBLIC WITNESSES:	PAGE	
2	Robin Vanderpool Direct Examination	12	
3		± -	
4	Karina Katherine Morgan Direct Examination	21	
	DITECT EXAMINACION	Z 1	
5	Aerie Waters	0.7	
6	Direct Examination	27	
_	Romy Bugg		
7	Direct Examination	36	
8	Michelle Drewyer		
9	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/Petitioner	4 0 4 4	
J	Closs Examination, recitioner	44	
10	Dawna Richmond	7.1	
11	Direct Examination Cross-Examination/Petitioner	71 74	
1.0			
12	Judith E. Levy Direct Examination	77	
13		, ,	
14	Christiane Douglas Direct Examination	82	
T.4	DITECT Examination	0.2	
15	Taya Raine Direct Examination	0.0	
16	Direct Examination	90	
4.5	Kedar St. John		
17	Direct Examination	9 4	
18	Alan Lott		
19	Direct Examination	101	
19	Jonathan Yudis		
20	Direct Examination	108	
21	APPLICANT WITNESS:		
22	Lew Abrams Direct Examination	111	
23	Cross-Examination/OP	135	
24			
25			

```
1
                 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha mai kakou.
2
                 This is the November 6, 2019 State Land
3
     Use Commission meeting.
 4
                Our first order of business is adoption of
     our October 24th and 25th, 2019 minutes. Are there
5
 6
     comments or corrections of those minutes? If not, is
7
      there a motion to approve the minutes?
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I will move to approve.
8
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral
9
10
     has moved to approve. Is there a second?
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Seconded.
11
12
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Seconded by
13
     Commissioner Ohigashi.
14
                Any discussion on the motion? If not, all
15
      in favor say "aye"; anybody opposed? The October
16
      24th and 25th minutes are unanimously adopted.
17
                Commissioners, are there any corrections or
     comments on our October 31st minutes? Seeing none,
18
19
     is there a motion to adopt?
20
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Move to adopt.
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Moved by
22
     Commissioner Ohigashi. Is there a second?
23
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Second.
24
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Seconded by
25
      Commissioner Wong.
```

Any discussion on the motion to adopt our 1 2 October 31st minutes? All in favor say "aye", 3 anybody opposed? The motion carries. 4 Our next agenda item is the tentative 5 meeting schedule. Mr. Orodenker. 6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 Tomorrow we are to be on Maui as well at the DOT Highways facility for Waikapu 48 Investment 8 9 A04-746, Consolidated Baseyards LLC A04-748, and 10 Spencer Homes Inc., A04-750. On November 20th, we will be on Oahu for 11 12 the Poma'ikai matter and the Waiawa matter. 13 And on the 21st of November we will also be on Oahu for the Motion to Intervene and the Hawai'i 14 15 Memorial Life Plan matter. 16 On December 4th, we will be back here on 17 Maui for Pu'ulehua. On December 17th, we will be on Kaua'i for 18 19 the Hokua matter, that's December 17th and 18th. 20 January 8th we will be on Kona for the U of N Bencorp and HHFDC. 21 22 On January 22nd, we will again take up the 23 Hawaiian Memorial Life Plan; and on January 23rd. 24 February and March calendar are currently

25

open.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Orodenker? Seeing none.

I'll take this opportunity, since there is a lot of folks in the room who we do not normally see, to very briefly explain a little bit about who the State Land Use Commission is.

We are nine possible Commissioners, one vacancy right now. There are eight seated

Commissioners with us today. We are all volunteers.

For those of us up for reappointment, you have an opportunity to talk about how great or awful we are to the state senate when that comes up. We do this on our own time as volunteers in order to fulfill the duties of the State.

Our next agenda item is a meeting on Docket No. SP19-410 Sacred Earth Assembly (Maui) to consider Petition for Special Permit in the matter of the Application of Dr. Lew Abrams and Maria De Abrams on behalf of the Sacred Earth Assembly to obtain a State Land Use Commission Special Permit to operate the Sacred Earth Assembly, a non-profit, interfaith church, in the State Agricultural District located at 4505 Hana Highway, Haiku, Island of Maui, Hawaii. Tax Map Key (2) 2-8-003:075 portion thereof.

Will the Parties please identify themselves

- 1 for the record?
- 2 MR. ICZKOVITZ: My name is Leslie
- 3 | Iczkovitz, attorney for Dr. Lew Abrams. In the room
- 4 | are Dr. and Mrs. Abrams.
- DR. ABRAMS: I'm Dr. Lew Abrams, and this
- 6 is Maria Abrams.
- 7 MR. HOPPER: Michael Hopper, Deputy
- 8 Corporation Counsel representing Maui County. With
- 9 me is Michelle McLean, Planning Director, and Tara
- 10 Furukawa, planner. We only have one microphone, so
- 11 | we are going to have to pass this.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We do appreciate the
- 13 use of space.
- MS. APUNA: Deputy Attorney General, Dawn
- 15 Apuna on behalf of State Office of Planning. Here
- 16 | with me today is Lorene Maki.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Let me update the
- 18 | record. On June 5th, 2017, the County of Maui
- 19 | Planning Commission received the Applicant's State
- 20 Land Use Commission Special Permit (SUPI)
- 21 Application.
- On July 3rd, 2019, the Commission received
- 23 | an inquiry letter from the Maui Planning Department
- 24 Director regarding whether or not the County may
- 25 | process HRS Chapter 205 Special Permits without Land

Use Commission review for uses which are limited to less than 15 acres, but on which the parcel proposed use is greater than 15 acres, where the use may not be limited to the footprint presented in the Petition.

On August 1st, 2019, the Commission provided its response to the inquiry.

On August 13th of this year the Maui
Planning Commission reviewed the SUPI and approved it
subject to conditions listed in its approval notice
letter.

On October 10th, 2019, the Commission received the Maui Planning Commission's proceedings on this matter from the Maui Planning Department.

On October 30th the Commission mailed and emailed the November 6-7, 2019 Land Use Commission meeting agenda notice to the Statewide, email and Maui mailing lists.

From October 30th through November 5th, the Commission received public testimony on this matter, noted it for the record, and posted it to its website.

For all members of the public, I will remind you that this Commission proceeding is to consider this 2019 SUPI 2019/0001 County Permit which

was approved by the Maui Planning Commission subject to conditions.

Let me go over our procedures for this docket.

2.1

First, those individuals desiring to provide public testimony for the Commission's consideration will be asked to identify themselves and will be called in order to our witness box where they will be sworn in prior to their testimony.

I believe there are a number of people who have signed in to testify; is that correct?

So first any individuals who are going to be desiring to testify, you're going to come up to the witness box, which is next to our court reporter. I will swear you in. You will swear or affirm that the testimony you will give is the truth. You'll then state your name and address for the record and then proceed with your testimony.

I may ask you to summarize your testimony if it appears we need to move the proceedings along.

After completion of the testimony, I'll ask for the Applicant to make its presentation. After the Applicant's presentation, there will be questioning by the Commission, then presentations by the Office of Planning. And -- pardon me, and Maui

1 County.

After that, the Commission can ask any other questions of any of the parties. And following that, we will go into deliberation.

From time to time I will take short recesses, as might be necessary for us and for our court reporter to take breaks.

Is that clear to all the parties, our procedures for today?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.

MS. APUNA: Chair, I would like to ask if after the public testimony I might be able to address a procedural or preliminary procedural issue for this matter which might be more efficient? It's regarding the jurisdiction of this Commission on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Any objection from the other parties?

MR. HOPPER: No, not for me, not from the County of Maui.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ ICZKOVITZ: We have submitted a letter to the Commission questioning jurisdiction, but we have no --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have any problem with us changing the order and allowing the Office of Planning to raise a jurisdictional issue

prior to presentation by --1 2 MR. ICZKOVITZ: No objection. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We can do that. 4 MS. APUNA: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Our first testifier 5 6 is Robin Vanderpool, followed by Katherine Morgan. 7 MR. ICZOVITZ: I do have one question. I've been told that we have a right to cross-examine 8 the testifiers. Do we do that at the time --9 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So, yes. The way -thank you. 11 12 The way our proceedings goes is that when 13 there is a witness, I will swear them in, they will state their testimony. You will then have a chance 14 15 to ask any questions of the witness followed by the County followed by Office of Planning, followed by 16 17 the Commissioners. So to those of you, if you're coming up to 18 19 testify, do not give your testimony and try to run 20 off. We might have questions. 21 Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're 22 about to give is the truth? 23 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your

name and address for the record and proceed.

1 ROBIN VANDERPOOL

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the

Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and

testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: I'm Robin Vanderpool. I live at 320 Waipolani Road in Haiku.

I have been privy to the growth of this farm and church project for the last perhaps eight years, involved in the construction of it.

I'm just here this morning to support the church and the farm and Dr. Abrams and his wife. I've known them for about eight or nine years, and they have taken this 14-acre property and created a beautiful farm and church upon this property.

What I would like to spend my time on is in watching over the creation of this Sacred Earth

Assembly and farm, I've noticed how not only is

Dr. Abrams a pillar in our community, but they've been very conscientious about its impact on the surrounding community.

So this property is out on a point, you might say. It's very far away from any neighbors, and I don't see that there's any negative impact at all on any of the surrounding homes or residential

```
1
      structures around, or the people around.
2
                So I know this was approved by the County
 3
      Planning Department, and I'm just here in support of
 4
     this project.
5
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is that it?
 6
                THE WITNESS: That's it.
7
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much,
8
     Mr. Vanderpool.
9
                Any questions of the witness from the
10
     Applicant?
11
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: No.
12
                MR. HOPPER: No.
13
               MS. APUNA: No.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
14
15
     Commissioner Chang.
16
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much
17
     for your testimony.
18
                I would like to ask you, you seem to have
19
     known them for as long as they have owned the
20
     property.
21
                What kind of farming activities do they do
22
     on the property?
23
                THE WITNESS: What type of farming?
24
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Yes.
```

THE WITNESS: I guess you would call it

organic farming and permaculture. It's just a really 1 2 beautiful place, and they have workshops and teaching 3 people. And, of course, they have the interfaith 4 church activities. 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: I'm more interested in 6 the farming activities. 7 What do they actually grow on the property? THE WITNESS: Little of everything, teas, 8 9 edibles, vegetables, fruits and various --10 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Is it for commercial 11 purposes, or what do they do with their farming 12 products, do you know? 13 THE WITNESS: This I don't know. 14 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Okay. Thank you very 15 much. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there others? 17 Mr. Vanderpool, would you please come back to the microphone. I think there's another question. 18 19 Commissioner Okuda. 20 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much, 21 Chair. 22 And, Mr. Vanderpool, please excuse me being 23 kind of not proper to you because I have to speak 24 into the microphone looking towards you.

Let me preference my questions just so that

1 you don't read too much into it.

First of all, please don't take my questions as indicating I have a view one way or the other on any of the issues here.

THE WITNESS: I can hear you.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: But the court reporter might not be able to, so that's why I have to ask.

And please don't take my questions to mean that I have any views on religion or anything like that.

In fact, just so that everyone is clear, my background, so people can make a determination of bias, when I was very young, I used to attend the Buddhist church. But I just don't attend any organized religion.

But the reason why I'm asking you these questions, and I'm only speaking for myself personally, I think there might be some constitutional issues here, so I just want to get some information from you.

How long have you been a resident on Maui?

THE WITNESS: Oh, 45 years.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And have you attended or participated in any churches on the Island of Maui over the years or decades you've lived here? And I'm

not asking whether you are actually a member, but whether you participate in these churches so I can determine the extent of your personal knowledge with respect to these few questions I'm going to ask after this.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have. And I'm a bible scholar, you might say, religious scholar in comparative religions.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And the reason I'm asking these questions, I don't want to get too technical here, because us lawyers are always being accused of being technical, and not looking at really reality.

Let me ask the question here, and these are specifically about the conditions being proposed by the County of Maui on Sacred Earth.

And before I get to that, there's no question in your mind that Sacred Earth is a church; correct?

THE WITNESS: That's not for me to answer.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: The supreme court, I believe in one of their cases, the Hawaii Supreme Court indicated that, you know, you look to like the dictionary definition of what a church is, and it can include very broadly place of worship. And it

doesn't say the worship has to be of any specific 1 2 denomination. 3 So do you agree or disagree that Sacred Earth would fit that definition? 4 5 THE WITNESS: I believe they have a church charter. 6 7 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Let me ask you about the specific conditions here, and I'm paraphrasing 8 9 some of these things. 10 Special Condition 4 essentially limits the 11 time of, and I quote, church or religious activities. 12 In all your years living here in the County 13 of Maui, have you ever seen or do you specifically know of any other church where the government has 14 15 limited the time when church or religious activities 16 could take place? 17 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure of the statutes. 18 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Personal knowledge, 19 where, for example, a church has told you we can't 20 have services at this time because the government has 2.1 told us we can't have services at this time? 22 THE WITNESS: I don't recall.

With respect to Special Condition No. 5, which limits the days that the church can hold church

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Okay, that's fine.

23

24

or religious activities.

In all your years living in the County of
Maui have you ever personally known of a church where
the government has told the church the days when they
can or cannot hold church or religious activities?

THE WITNESS: That's a very good question.

And, no, I don't.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Let me ask you this. Special Condition No. 6, which allows the County to inspect the church property simply by presenting credentials to inspect. In other words, no probable cause, no reasonable suspicion.

Do you have any personal knowledge of any other church in the County of Maui where the government can just come in and present credentials to inspect the church, even though there's no probable cause or reasonable suspicion that some type of violation of law has taken place?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And if you can bear with me for my last question, and that's regarding Special Condition No. 11, which requires 72 hours notice to neighbors for events with more than 40 participants.

Do you know, or do you have any personal

```
knowledge, or do you know of any church in the County
1
2
     of Maui that has to give 72 hours notice to neighbors
 3
     for events with more than 40 participants?
 4
                THE WITNESS: I know of possible others,
5
     but no, I don't know anything about that.
 6
                But I would say that I'm sure that
7
     Dr. Abrams will conform to whatever is asked of him
8
      in order to have his church services out on the point
9
     there.
10
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And, again, please
11
     don't prejudge my questions.
12
                THE WITNESS: No, those are good questions.
13
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm not questioning
14
     anyone's good faith about this. I just want to make
15
      sure that we, as a government agency, conform with
      the requirements of the First Amendment and the
16
17
     Hawai'i State Constitution.
18
                Thank you, Chair. No further questions.
19
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:
                                      Thank you,
20
     Commissioner Okuda.
21
                Any further questions for the witness?
22
                Commissioner Ohigashi.
23
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Have you attended
24
     any of the activities on the church?
25
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
```

```
1
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: What kind of
2
     activities have you attended?
 3
                THE WITNESS: Just gatherings and
 4
     ceremonies. Mostly just small potluck dinners and
5
     conversations. It's nondenominational.
 6
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Were you ever there
7
     when there was more than 100 people or about 100
     people there?
8
9
                THE WITNESS: I wasn't, no.
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was there ever, to
10
11
     your knowledge, anything greater than 40 people
12
     there?
13
                THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so.
14
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: When you were
15
     there, did you go by car?
16
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
17
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just was curious.
18
     Where did you park?
19
                THE WITNESS: There's parking on the land
20
     there.
21
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Where is it?
                                                     Do
22
     you know where it is?
23
                THE WITNESS: Where the parking is?
24
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes.
25
                THE WITNESS: You go onto the property and
```

1	out to the point. And it's a dirt road, and usually
2	just park on the dirt road. There's sort of a
3	designated small parking area there.
4	COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: On the dirt road?
5	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
7	Commissioner Ohigashi.
8	Any further questions for our first
9	witness? If, not, thank you very much.
10	Ms. Morgan, followed by excuse me if I
11	mispronounce your name Aerie Waters.
12	Aloha, good morning.
13	Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're
14	about to give is the truth?
15	THE WITNESS: I do.
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your
17	name and address for the record.
18	THE WITNESS: My name is Karima Katherine
19	Morgan, and I live at 453A Hoala Drive, Kihei.
20	KARIMA KATHERINE MORGAN
21	Was called by and on behalf of the Public, was sworn
22	to tell the truth, was examined and testified as
23	follows:
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	THE WITNESS: I've been a resident of Maui

for almost five years, and I'm here in support of the application.

I became acquainted with Dr. Abrams and his wife and the activities on his property very early in my stay here, and it has become a real anchor for my love of the life that's available on Maui for two reasons.

1. One of the first things I did was to tour the property and be introduced to the scope of the organic farming and permacultural activities they have there, which I don't have an opportunity to garden in my own home right now, so I'm very much appreciative of people who are taking land that was fallow here, overused, and having turned it into something that is very productive of food.

And he can certainly tell you more about the variety of things. But I have been to a number of dinners out at that facility, with the food of the farm being prepared for the meals. And there is an enormous variety, and they use a lot of permaculture activities like having duck ponds where the water is used for fertilizer for some of the crops.

It's a very integrated system. So that's been very important to me. I think at a time in our world when we are at such a crisis, we need more and

more people knowing how to do that.

I have seen on many visits young adults that come there and learn how to do this kind of farming, and I totally support that.

In regards to what might be called the future church activities, I have been there to a number of gatherings in celebration of birthdays; celebration of special times of year; in celebration of what I have valued very much, which is a very universal approach to spirituality, where there is no dogmas, there's no specific form that is required, but everyone that's comes there, in my experience, has had a very strong orientation to kind of an earth-based spirituality. A recognition that we're all connected, all connected to each other, all connected to the earth.

So those activities have been very valuable to me, and I would entirely support an application for there to be a more formal church there that would allow for these kinds of gatherings to be made a little more available to other people besides the small personal group that's been invited today.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Are there questions for the witness from the

Applicant?

1 MR. ICZKOVITZ: No. 2 MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair. MS. APUNA: No. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral. 5 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: You mentioned the type 6 of soil that was there. Can you tell me what was 7 being farmed? It appeared it's been abused in the past or misused. 8 9 Do you know what the land was being used 10 for prior to the church? 11 THE WITNESS: I think it was pineapple. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other questions, 13 Commissioners? 14 Commissioner Wong. 15 COMMISSIONER WONG: Just one question. 16 know, when you went to the site for functions, 17 approximately how many people were there? THE WITNESS: I've been there when there 18 19 has been a couple dozen people there. I've been 20 there, I would say -- it was a birthday gathering I 21 was at, may have been 50 people. 22 COMMISSIONER WONG: Parking was okay? 23 THE WITNESS: Parking is ample there. 24 have parking areas off of the road that's right next 25 to the building, quite a perimeter around the

building that allows for parking without obstructing the roadway at all.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Wong.

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Chair. And with your indulgence, Chair, if I can just ask and answer with respect to the line of questions that I asked before.

I won't go through each of the special conditions that I went over with the prior witness, but do you remember me going through that list?

THE WITNESS: I'm familiar with your questions. I haven't been involved in any other churches on this island, so I can't speak to what Maui government's have been in regards to those questions, but I appreciate those line of questions.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Well, have you ever heard, even secondhand or second or even thirdhand of the County of Maui, or any government agency, imposing similar types of conditions on any other church in the County of Maui?

THE WITNESS: I never have, and I'm so surprised that the State would think they have a role in governing a church activity. I have not heard of

1 any.

2.1

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Just a short follow-up question about the number of people that might attend or be present on the property.

How many years have you lived in the County of Maui, if I may ask?

THE WITNESS: Almost five.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: During the years that you've lived in the County of Maui, have you ever heard of a limitation placed by the government on how many members of a church, or people who want to participate in the church, can go onto the church property?

THE WITNESS: No, I never have. And I have been in another church I'm just recalling, where there were certainly probably close to 100 people coming for a memorial service, and there was nobody telling them that was too many people.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Again, I'm personally not advocating violation of any occupancy rule regarding a building, but I'm talking generally of church property.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

Commissioner Okuda.

1 Are there other questions? Thank you very 2 much. 3 Our next witness is Ms. Waters followed by 4 Romy Bugg. 5 THE WITNESS: Aloha, good morning. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 7 affirm the testimony you're about to give is the 8 truth? 9 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: State your name and address for the record. 11 12 THE WITNESS: My name Aerie Waters, and my 13 address os 3173 Hoomua Drive, Kihei. 14 AERIE WATERS 15 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 16 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 17 testified as follows: 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 THE WITNESS: I've known Dr. Abrams and his 20 wife for about 20 years. I really don't know, I've 21 been here on Maui for 42 years, and I've known 22 Dr. Abrams in his capacity as a doctor helping 23 mentally ill, et cetera. 24 Anyway, I know the character of these 25 people, and I've noticed their kuleana is to serve

the community, and in many ways, and with the farm opportunity, the Hawaiian saying of Ua Mau ke Ea o ka Aina i ke Pono, meaning the life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness. That came into my mind, and I thought what is righteousness? I thought, well, it's something that serves body, mind and spirit in a most uplifting way.

So this farm, Sacred Earth sanctuary meets all of those qualifications that I believe to be righteousness.

Feeding people from healthy organic food, that then benefits the land, because the land is not being poisoned, it's being nurtured. It's being stabilized. We've seen where it's happening with land unplanted blowing dirt. I watch it going across all the way to Lanai where it's not planted.

So here we have the earth being served, people being served by sharing beautiful organic food. And then the education of young people, and it's really open to any age, but young people come there and learn, as Ms. Morgan was saying, how to grow food properly. And how to work in respect and honor to this earth that is holding and feeding all of us.

So it's body. It's mind. It's teaching.

It's educating. And then the earth sanctuary part of it is educating our connection, our internal connection. It's not like there's some form of how it is that we connect with our source. It's that we connect with our source.

And this is what is nourished at the Sacred Earth Assembly, is that we take time, and we take —find our own way of how do we want to really connect in gratitude. So I would say that is the essence feeling I have of the Sacred Earth Assembly.

Whatever the gathering, it's coming together in heartfelt gratitude for all we have been given, and part of that gift is what they share as food in potluck that's grown right there.

So that covers education. It covers nuturance on a physical, mental and spiritual level. So Ua Mau ke Ea o ka Aina i ka pono, that the life of the land be perpetuated in righteousness. This is the core valve our life in the Hawaiian Islands. And hopefully it well spread far and wide, farther and wider.

And these -- Dr. Abrams and his wife are exemplary in our community in offering so much.

They've put everything into creating this. And then sharing it with, you know, now a limited number

because of legal -- what we're here for today is that 1 2 this can be shared to those who are thirsty, and 3 many, as we know, are really thirsty today. 4 So I'm just here in support that this go 5 forward. Thank you. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo. Are there 7 questions from the Applicant? 8 MR. ICZKOVITZ: No. 9 MR. HOPPER: No, Chair. 10 MS. APUNA: No. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 11 12 Commissioner Chang. 13 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much 14 for your obviously heartfelt testimony. 15 You shared that meals are served there. 16 Are the meals -- are the meals served by the products 17 that are grown on the farm? 18 THE WITNESS: The format has pretty much 19 been potluck. And in the great generosity of spirit 20 that the Abrams have created this sanctuary, they 2.1 make food from what they grow there as offerings in 22 these potluck different occasions that Ms. Morgan was 23 saying. There's different celebrations of holidays.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Because this is zoned

Agricultural land, I'm trying to understand and

24

appreciate what agricultural activities are occurring on the land.

So could you describe for me what kinds of agricultural activities are occurring on the land?

THE WITNESS: Education.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Agricultural?

THE WITNESS: Agricultural education. Young people come and are taught how to do organic farming and how, you know, having ducks, chickens, the things that you can create your own fertilizer to nourish the land in honor and respect for the land, that we don't give it poison, but we give it life and food, and so that beautiful cycle of how to do proper organic farming is offered to people that come, and they offer to learn and help. It's like a hands-on in the dirt education.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: What do they grow on the farm?

THE WITNESS: Wonderful vegetables. Let's see, I think I've eaten --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: One moment. The Applicant, you'll have a chance to present your case after public testimony.

THE WITNESS: I think I can remember having a zucchini and a bunch of different wonderful greens.

I think there was spinach and -- just these beautiful vegetarian creations that -- of things grown there. Sweet potatoes. Herbal teas that were served with the meals. Salads, all of the greens and I think there -- I mean there is been many, many different celebratory moments there that have included -- so I don't know how specific I can be. A beautiful medley.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Chair, and I apologize for kind of repeating myself. But for me I just want to find out information on what I see is a potential constitutional issue.

Same question I asked the prior witnesses.

You said you've lived on Maui for 42 years?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

you've lived here on Maui, do you know of any other church which has been subject to restrictions placed by the government of time of when services can be held, days when services can be held, or requiring notice of religious events to be given to neighbors or other people before it can be held?

```
THE WITNESS: I'm probably not like deeply
1
2
      into an organization to know all those details, but I
 3
     have not heard of that. And I'm trying to think, if
 4
     there is any -- no, I really can't think of any time
5
      in which I've been aware of that happening.
 6
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much.
7
      Thank you, Chair.
8
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are
9
     there further questions?
10
                If I may briefly. You mentioned a phrase
     which is also the State motto Ua Mau ke Ea o ka Aina
11
12
      i ka pono. You provided a common translation with
13
     it.
14
                Are you familiar with other translations?
15
                THE WITNESS: I've heard instead of the
16
      life of the land is perpetuated in life, and
17
      righteousness I've heard, perpetuated I've heard.
      I've heard life of the land is --
18
19
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's not a test.
20
                THE WITNESS: It's all in that vein the
21
     translations that I've heard.
22
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are you familiar with
23
     who first said that statement?
24
                THE WITNESS: No, who?
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Kauikeaouli
25
```

Kamehameha III upon the restoration of Hawaiian sovereignty after the British government had asserted sovereignty over the Hawaiian Islands.

And so actually Ea in that context is not actually translated as "life", but literally the sovereignty of the island is perpetuated through proper acts.

THE WITNESS: But it's about proper acts in relation to the land.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: In this case it was about foreign power asserting sovereignty over control of Hawaii, and then the fault of that being recognized and the sovereignty by the native government being restored.

THE WITNESS: And at the root of all of that would be then respect for the aina, how it was disrespected by foreign powers, and how claiming again to have respect for the land, I would say, would be -- there would be in the motivating drive to even make that the state motto.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your testimony. \\$

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes, thank you very much for your involvement and your good information.

Because you appear to spend a lot of time there being involved with growing, it appears there is a kitchen on the property also.

2.1

Are you guys doing any added value, like helping to learn to make preserves or fruits or jellies or canned fruit, can your vegetables, anything like that?

Are you able to grow it and take it one step further to preserve it or dry it on the property, or are any of those activities happening there at the church?

THE WITNESS: I am probably the wrong person to ask. I really don't know. I'm not actively involved on that level. I've walked the farm and been impressed by what's going on there, but most of the time that I spent there I've come for celebrations. So I'm not really privy to that information. Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much for your testimony. Our next testifier is Romy Bugg, followed by Michelle Drewyer, I believe.

So as the Chairperson, one thing I have to navigate and have the privilege of doing is limiting testimony to three minutes. I will note that I've been timing it and everybody has taken their

1 testimony to three minutes. It's the Commission's 2 questions that's much longer. 3 We will take a couple more and then take a 4 ten-minute recess and proceed with further public 5 witnesses. 6 THE WITNESS: Romy Bugg. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 8 9 you're about to give is the truth? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: State your name and 12 address for the record. 13 THE WITNESS: Romy Bugg, 111 Kahului Beach 14 Road, Unit A214, Kahului. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Please 16 proceed. 17 ROMY BUGG Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 18 19 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 20 testified as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 THE WITNESS: So I've known -- I've been 23 working on the farm for like the last year, last 24 seven months, since spring or March of this year. 25 And I first met Mr. Abrams at Temple of

Peace ten years ago. I lived here for like a year, 1 2 then I moved to Oahu, and been here now for about 3 eight months. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Not to disturb you, 5 if you can maintain a close distance to the 6 microphone. 7 THE WITNESS: So the last seven months I've been working on the farm volunteering my time on 8 9 Wednesdays, volunteer, and learning how to work and 10 cultivate organic foods. Maintaining the property. 11 I've been to two or three gatherings there. 12 I volunteer my time, I like being on the 13 property. I like how I feel when I'm there. I try 14 to hang out on the property as much as I can. I like 15 the way I feel when I'm there. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much 17 Are there questions from the Applicant for 18 the witness? 19 MR. ICZKOVITZ: No questions. 20 MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair. 21 MS. APUNA: No questions. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 23 Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: I'm not from this island, so I don't know the area that well. I see

24

```
1
     pictures of it, but how far is it from the ocean?
2
                THE WITNESS: I'd say halfway between the
 3
     ocean and Hana Highway.
 4
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Less than a mile.
 5
                THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. Haiku by Jaws,
      there is a store there called Jaws something market
 6
7
      right down the street.
                COMMISSIONER WONG: So you've only been
8
9
     there for a year. Have you been to any of the
10
      functions there?
11
                THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
12
                COMMISSIONER WONG: And some of the
13
      functions some people said had 20 people, 30 people.
14
                THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
15
                COMMISSIONER WONG: The egress going into
16
     and out of the church area onto Hana Highway, does it
17
     back up, or people -- is it congested?
18
                THE WITNESS: No. Off of Hana Highway
19
     there's a -- it's an ocean-makai turn towards kai.
     And it's a big cul-de-sac. I assume maybe two or
20
21
      three properties share that cul-de-sac, that street.
22
      Then you go down the hill on a gravel dirt road where
23
     the farm is.
24
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Thank you, Chair.
25
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:
                                      Thank you,
```

1 Commissioner Wong. 2 Are there other questions, Commissioners? 3 Commissioner Chang. COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you, I 4 5 appreciate your testimony. You mentioned that over the last several 6 7 months you've been actually volunteering on the farm 8 on a regular basis? 9 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. 10 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Do you help with any of the organic farming? 11 12 THE WITNESS: Yeah. There is some flowers 13 that are cultivated. COMMISSIONER CHANG: What kind of flowers? 14 15 THE WITNESS: Dragon -- I'm not too much on -- dragon something. I've seen a lot of ginger root, 16 17 and tumeric and some tea blends, fruit trees. 18 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Chang. 20 21 Are there other questions? If not, thank 22 you very much for your testimony. 23 Our next testifier is Michelle Drewyer. We

will then take a ten-minute recess, followed by

testimony from Dawna Richmond and Judy Levy.

24

1 Aloha. 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you for coming to Maui 3 today. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 5 affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the 6 truth? 7 THE WITNESS: I do. 8 My name is Michelle Drewyer. 9 MICHELLE DREWYER 10 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 11 12 testified as follows: 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 THE WITNESS: I am a next door neighbor to 15 Mr. Abrams. I have been on my property, which is 4495 Hana Highway, since 2005 we built our house. 16 17 I'm hoping that you all have had time to look at the exhibits that I have posted on the 18 19 website. 20 For the last ten years since Mr. Abrams has 21 moved in, before that, it was very quiet. We are all 22 aq. 23 Jerome Labat has posted a letter. He owns 24 two properties. We share the same street. I share

the same driveway with Mr. Labat and Mr. Abrams.

There have been other testifiers, Malone who lives on the property who also shares the same driveway. Tim Robins who is adjacent, and many various folks from the subdivision have opposed it.

We don't oppose the farm. We encourage farming. I have a lot. I do a lot of ag on my property.

What we oppose is the last decade of concerts, parties, traffic, noise pollution. It's been constant. And I pulled together and posted things. I didn't post them in the internet, but I found them on the internet, invitations. These are paid events. These parties also have ticket sites.

So it's not just a couple people for potluck. There have been -- and I posted videos of cars backed up onto Hana Highway. Every car that comes to Mr. Abrams' parties, events, concerts, passes my house. Every car passes it twice, on the way in and on the way out. Same with Mr. Labat.

There are safety issues. The intersection where our driveway meets Hana Highway, there's a very blind curve right before it. I often have to even not stop. I continue onto Manawai and turn around and enter the driveway that way, because I'm concerned about being rear-ended.

And it goes on all night, you know, like the New Year's parties. They go on all night. If you look at the advertisements that they posted over the last ten years, they're weekend events. They're camping events.

It's simply not what he's portraying it to you folks to be. It's not a simple church service where 30 people come and go. They cone the driveway, you know. There's signs all over the place. It's a mess. It's like a total nuisance to everyone who lives near him.

I just urge you to really -- you know, if this was a case where Mr. Abrams wanted to start a church, and we didn't already know what kind of activities went on, I would say okay, give him a chance. Let's see. Give me your permit, let's see what happens.

But we know. We know from his violations, you know, \$524,000 in fines. I mean, look at the violation reports. They concerned concerts. They concerned -- there was a kitchen there. This is an ag building. Its zoned for ag storage. He shouldn't have had any of these people in this building. It's not zoned for occupancy. He has no Certificate of Occupancy.

So the impact it has on all of us in the neighborhood is huge. And he wants to start a church, I don't begrudge him that. I just ask that he do it in a neighborhood that is zoned for that.

I don't want to live next to a concert hall, and that's what I have.

It's very emotional too for all of us, because it's -- you know, we're in a neighborhood.

And I haven't made formal complaints because I'm an attorney, and I know what happens when neighbors start suing each other. It's horrible. So I haven't.

But I don't want him to have a license to hold these events that have been happening over the last ten years.

And to your question, I guess it's

Commissioner Chang, about limits on churches and

times and days, I would say, you know, it's an ag

zoned neighborhood, special management.

So I think that neighbors and the surrounding area that is a criteria that he not disturb the area around him. Those were legitimate concerns that the Maui Planning Commission had, that the time that these things were happening was going well into the early morning hours. I mean, he has

the right to have a church if he wants to have it in an appropriate area. I'm saying the farm is an area for where he has it. The church, no. Because the church is really a venue for him to hold concerts and weddings, and everything else he's advertised that he's done.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: May I ask you to summarize your testimony.

THE WITNESS: I'm totally opposed to the granting of a Special Permit for the church. I think that it negatively impacts every neighbor and every neighbor except for one person who is, I guess, a religious teacher who attends their services, has opposed it. And has stated how negatively it has affected our neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your testimony.

Any questions from the Applicant?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. ICZKOVITZ:

Q Ms. Drewyer, you're a lawyer. How long have you been an attorney on Maui?

A 30 years.

Q You're aware of procedures before the Maui Planning Commission? 1 A I am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

2.1

22

Q Were you aware that there was room for open public testimony at the May 28th hearing meeting of the Maui Planning Commission?

A I am.

Q Did you testify? Did you have an opportunity to testify and give testimony while the record was open regarding your opinion regarding the Special Use Permit?

A Like I said, I have been reluctant to speak publicly or to make a complaint. It should be known that Mr. Abrams controls my ocean view, which he's made very apparent to me. So I have been very careful about my complaints. I wish I would have testified.

- Q So you had the opportunity to testify?
- 17 A I did.
- 18 Q You chose not to testify?
- 19 A I did.
 - Q And you knew that the testimony would be closed at the end of that hearing, correct?
 - A Yes. And I'm here today to testify.
- Q Did you ever ask the Maui Planning
 Commission to reopen the record to allow your
 testimony?

1 A No. I wrote a letter.

- Q So you wrote a letter to the Maui Planning
 Commission after you knew public testimony was
 closed?
 - A I'm not sure when I wrote it.
 - Q When did you submit that letter?
 - A I'm not sure of the date.
 - Q Did you submit it on Friday afternoon at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon, before a Tuesday Maui Planning Commission?
 - A Like I said, I'm not sure of the date.
 - Q Now, you referred to all these events. Can you please point to the record any evidence whatsoever of any event that you say was in violation of their zoning violation? The record before you.
 - Did you receive a copy of, because I noticed that the Maui Planning Commission sent you a complete copy of the record. So please let me ask you. So you make all these accusations. You make all these conclusions. But all that matters is what is in the record.
- So the Abrams believe that you're just exaggerating and making these things up.
 - COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chair.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner

1 Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Sorry to interrupt.

I think this is badgering. I'm going ask the Chair to control the proceedings.

Mr. Iczkovitz has a right to ask questions. Ask your questions, but not to preface it.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Sure, I agree.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I withdraw.

Q So I just would like to ask the witness to identify the particular events in the record that you're referring to, instead of making just broad based statements.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Objection. Again, come on, ask the question simply.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe the question for the witness is:

Can you identify specific events that are in the record in front of the Land Use Commission which was handed to us by the Planning Commission of Maui.

THE WITNESS: I believe that those who did testify, Tim Robbins, Frederito Malone, Mr. Labat, all neighbors testified to various events that were held on drumming into the night. Back up of cars. All of these things.

I'm personally aware of many events that I saw hundreds of cars pass my driveway. I've heard and listened to the dogs barking.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may. I think the question, despite the long preface to it from counsel, was very simple.

Are any of these events that you're personally aware of, can you point to them as existing in the record?

THE WITNESS: I don't have the record before me.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's the record that we have received as posted to the State Land Use website.

also because the Maui Planning Department did not include a lot of the letters that other neighbors wrote. They were rejected. And I object to my testimony, my letter and Mr. Labat's exhibits being stricken because Mr. Abrams' attorney asked the Maui Planning Commission to strike them and they did. So you don't have a complete record actually.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So just to clarify your point.

You submitted information to the Maui

1 Planning Commission on this matter. 2 But that is not in the record that was 3 transmitted to us? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. No. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Are there anything 6 further? 7 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay, but I'm going 8 9 to ask you to please limit it to simple questions. 10 Don't badger the witness. MR. ICZKOVITZ: I understand, Mr. Chairman. 11 12 So you submitted information via email 13 after the close of the May 28th hearing, a letter to the Commission. Is that correct? 14 15 I'm not sure if it's after. I submitted a 16 letter that you later asked to strike. 17 And then Mr. Labat also submitted a letter and also submitted 100 pages of documents; correct? 18 19 Yes, he did. 20 And the Maui Planning Commission ruled 21 those documents, that I had the right to 22 cross-examine both you and Mr. Labat regarding the

A No, that's not true. The Maui Planning Commission, when you asked them if you could

letters you submitted and the documents that --

23

24

cross-examine us, they said they hadn't the right to 1 2 compel us to come in to be cross-examined. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Hold on. 4 This is not going to be super helpful to 5 this Commission to hear two different versions of 6 what each of you think the Maui Planning Commission 7 did. Can you ask questions about things that the 8 9 witness has personal knowledge of and relates to her 10 testimony? (By Mr. Iczkovitz): Did you accuse 11 12 Dr. Abrams of stealing water? 13 Α I have not accused him. I have -- we share 14 a common well. I don't see how this is relevant 15 either to the church. This issue is really --16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You may decline to 17 answer the question. 18 THE WITNESS: I decline. 19 (By Mr. Iczkovitz): You had an opportunity 20 to show up at the August 13th hearing to respond to 2.1 questions that I was going to give you regarding --22 This is asked and answered. 23 0 I'm just asking --24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Excuse me, both of

you, at a minimum for the sake of our court reporter,

you cannot interrupt each other. 1 2 THE WITNESS: I had an opportunity to show 3 up and testify. I chose not to testify then because 4 I really didn't want to create any more disharmony in the neighborhood. But I'm testifying now, and I 5 6 don't appreciate your badgering. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi. 8 9 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: My understanding of 10 the purpose of asking questions at this juncture is 11 for the purpose of clarifying testimony. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That is correct. 13 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: This is not 14 cross-examination. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's correct. 16 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And the technique 17 used for cross-examination should not be permitted in this matter. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So the last 20 instructions I gave for counsel for the Applicant was 21 to ask questions related to the witness' testimony. 22 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I will relate directly to 23 them. 24 Q So, Ms. Drewyer, you said these activities

25

go on all night?

1 A They have, yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q When was the last time that happened?
 - A It hasn't happened in awhile. Well, last

 New Year's Eve, but since 2015, I believe Mr. Abrams,

 that's when he acquired all those fees and fines from

 the county. He's been a little more quiet in his

 activities.
 - Q So I'm waiting for the answer. When was the last time that happened that you had a problem?
 - A New Year's Eve last year.
- 11 Q And is your understanding that New Year's
 12 Eve parties are not --
- 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That is not related to the testimony.
- 15 Q (By Mr. Iczkovitz): So the --
- A October 30th there was a party that lasted well into the evening this year.
- 18 Q Do you have any evidence of that?
- 19 A I was there. I was at my house.
- 20 Q What time did it end?
- 21 A I went to bed before it ended.
- Q What time did you go to bed?
- 23 A This is after we've had meetings and after 24 they have been told that they couldn't --
- 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm losing my

1 patience.

- Q (By Mr. Iczkovitz): You mentioned safety

 issues, a blind curve. Have you seen the pictures of

 the intersection and --
 - A I've taken pictures of my own. I live that. I do it every day. I know how dangerous it is.
 - Q Do you have a -- point to a picture -- do you have any evidence to present to the Commission that it's dangerous other than your personal --
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can you please confine your questions to the witness' testimony?
 - Q (By Mr. Iczkovitz): Other than New Year's Eve, have there been any activities that have gone on past 10:00 o'clock?
 - A Over the last ten years there have been hundreds of activities that have gone on, some all night, some all weekend.
 - Q Do you have any evidence of any particular date where that happened?
 - A Yes. I submitted many exhibits into the record for the Council Members to see what was advertised. What went on over the last decade.
 - Q So you're saying you submitted to the record, but they're not in the record; is that

1 correct? 2 I submitted advertisements that I have --3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Hold on, hold on. 4 One more time. Just her testimony today. 5 Do you understand? 6 (By Mr. Iczkovitz): Yes. 7 You mentioned ticket sites. Do you have 8 any evidence to present? 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No, no, no. You may 10 ask her for clarification as to statements that she 11 has made. You may not ask her for evidence of 12 anything that she said, that's not standard for a 13 public witness in this kind of proceedings. 14 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have anything further? 16 17 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes. 18 You mentioned 524 --19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: How much longer? 20 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Less than five minutes. 21 You mentioned 524,000 in fines. Where did 22 you get that information? 23 From the county site, and from County 24 Department submittal which is in the record. 25 Q And were all those, as far as you know,

1 where all those issues resolved? 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You may ask her --3 you may ask the witness for clarification as to the 4 statements that she made in her testimony. 5 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Can I ask where in the 6 record the \$524,000 --7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No. You may ask her if she meant that, whether she was particularly 8 9 referring to something. That's it. You can't ask 10 her to produce evidence. MR. ICZKOVITZ: I can't ask her where in 11 12 the record she's coming up with those numbers? 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No. 14 (By Mr. Iczkovitz): And the information 15 regarding all the neighbors who allegedly are against this, these neighbors, do they have any evidence in 16 17 the record other than what was submitted? 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Again --19 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I'll withdraw. I'm done. 20 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Good. County? 21 MR. HOPPER: No questions. Just a 22 suggestion. If there is a reference to the record, 23 if you are taking additional public testimony, I think the Commissioners could ask if the witness has 2.4

their own basis for the testimony, you can certainly

determine that now as this is testimony. Just a suggestion.

I know there is a record and there is discussion of the record, but --

MR. HOPPER: If you're taking testimony in considering that though, unless that's not going to be part of the record, and you can rely on that, presumably the testimony is going to be added to your record. If it's not, then this would all be disregarded.

But to point out that if there is an option you can get this additional information from the witness if that is something that you're interested in.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Hopper.

Office of Planning.

MS. APUNA: No.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: If I may just make one request to the Commission to not accept the letters that were submitted after the close of testimony -- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Your procedural

25 request is noted.

1 Commissioners? Commissioner Ohigashi. 2 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: My question is 3 mostly functional. 4 You live next to the property? 5 THE WITNESS: I do. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And can you 6 7 describe generally there is a driveway that's your 8 driveway. Is there a common road going into the 9 property or --10 THE WITNESS: Yes, there is a common road, 11 a private drive that the four properties share, Mr. 12 Labat has two properties, I have a property, and Mr. 13 Abrams has a property. 14 So it's one common drive with a cul-de-sac 15 at the bottom, which -- and they abut Hana Highway. 16 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is there a portion 17 of that road that enters into Mr. Abrams' property? THE WITNESS: The road serves all four 18 19 properties. So as you turn off Hana Highway onto the 20 private road, turning towards the ocean, you're going 21 down the driveway. Mine is the first left. You go 22 down to the cul-de-sac, and Mr. Labat's property is 23 on the right side of the road, and Mr. Abrams is the 24 farthest person off the cul-de-sac at the bottom.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: In these activities

```
1
     that are conducted over the last ten years that
2
     you've mentioned, have -- where do the cars park?
 3
                THE WITNESS: The cars go right by my
 4
     house, and then park on Mr. Abrams' property. And
     then I see and hear all of the lights.
5
 6
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just curious
7
     where they park.
                THE WITNESS: Abrams' property.
8
9
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Do they park on the
10
     common road?
11
                THE WITNESS: They used to. That's why he
12
     cones off the road now.
13
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: All of that is
14
     confined to his property?
15
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
16
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral.
17
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: In regards to that
18
      roadway, someone else mentioned something about
19
               Is your common driveway paved or gravel?
     gravel.
20
                THE WITNESS: The common drive is paved.
21
     The gravel portion is on Mr. Abrams' property. So
22
     every car that comes down leaves the paved property
23
     and enters onto his property which is gravel, so that
24
      is the noise pollution Mr. Labat was referring to in
     his letter and also Mr. Malone. I also hear it from
25
```

my house.

It's been represented to you that, you know, we're so far away and they're so far away at that point, but that's not true. The gulch amplifies the noise, we hear everything. So every car that crunches on the gravel, I hear.

Dogs, they have five dogs. Every time a car goes by, the dogs bark. Every time a car leaves, the dogs bark. This is not something that just occurs like once a week. This is daily coming and going, and it's not all farm traffic.

I mean, there's belly dancing classes, yoga classes and a multitude of activities that happen on that property that is not church related.

And everything that is happening on that property in that building right now shouldn't be happening, because it doesn't have a certificate of occupancy, and it's still occurring even through these hearings.

You know, when they're asking for a Special Permit, they're still violating the law.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much.

I do have an email we received. We got a whole pile of these emails, and I think yours is in here.

```
1
                You're Michelle Drewyer, with two LLs,
2
      Drewyer, D-R-E-W-Y-E-R. I have an email from you.
3
     Thank you. A letter that's been part of an email, a
 4
      large number of them are together. Most of the rest
5
     of them are all in favor, but you have yours. I've
6
     read that.
7
                THE WITNESS: There were quite a few that
     were submitted in opposition also.
8
9
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further?
10
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: No, that's it.
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Wong.
11
12
               COMMISSIONER WONG: I have just one
13
     question.
14
               How far is your house to the ocean,
15
     approximately?
                THE WITNESS: I don't know in distance.
16
17
     There's -- I don't know, because Mr. Abrams' property
18
      is in front of mine, and then there is property in
19
     front of his. And it's north shore, so it's all
20
     cliffs.
21
               COMMISSIONER WONG: That's all. Thank you.
22
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Chang.
23
               COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you for your
24
     testimony. I know this is a little awkward.
25
                I'm going to ask you a procedural question.
```

You're a lawyer. You were aware that the record on 1 2 this matter before -- let me ask you. 3 You're aware that the Land Use Commission is confined to the record provided by the Maui County 4 5 Planning Commission? 6 THE WITNESS: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER CHANG: And it is somewhat awkward. Our own procedures, we take public 8 9 testimony prior to us hearing the actual arguments on 10 the matter. So in this matter, the Planning Commission had a hearing on May 28th, 2019; is that 11 12 your understanding?

THE WITNESS: I believe so.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And I heard your testimony earlier was that you did not provide any testimony at this point in time.

THE WITNESS: I did not.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Then they had another meeting it appears on June 25th, 2019. Did you attend that hearing?

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure if I did. didn't attend all of them because I was working.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: When did you become aware -- when you submitted some additional testimonies that you wanted some letters and some,

you know, material to the Planning Commission. 1 2 When were you aware that they were not 3 included in the record? THE WITNESS: When I saw the record. 4 5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: When did you see the 6 record? 7 THE WITNESS: Once it was transmitted to 8 you folks. 9 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So you weren't aware 10 in the last -- Planning Commission decision-making 11 was an on August 13th. 12 THE WITNESS: No, I had assumed that they 13 had taken all the letters and put them in the record. 14 When I looked at the record, it was very incomplete. 15 COMMISSIONER CHANG: And you did not participate in that August 13th Maui County Planning 16 17 Commission. 18 THE WITNESS: No. 19 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Okay. Thank you very 20 much. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 22 Commissioner Chang. 23 Commissioner Okuda? 24 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: This is kind of

awkward. Thank you, Ms. Drewyer, for testifying; and

thank you very much for taking the time, because even in what might seem contentious issues, it's really, really, really important that everyone come out here and give their position, because if we don't hear all sides, and we don't hear argument from all sides, you know, we may not make the best decision we have to make under the law. So thank you very much for coming out here.

You might have noticed in the vein of the prior questions I asked, one of the things, one issue that I'm having a little bit of trouble with is what standard we have to apply if we're dealing with a church as an Applicant.

And tell me whether or not you agree with this. I'm quoting from this federal law called Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons, which is found at 42 United States Code Section 2000cc.

What that federal law seems to do is summarize what the standards are that government agencies have to follow when dealing with religious institution or churches in making decisions?

And what it basically says is that we're supposed to determine first of all -- well, let me just read it.

It says: No. 1, General Rule. No government shall impose or implement a land use regulation in a manner that imposes a substantial burden on the religious exercise of a person including a religious assembly or institution, unless the government demonstrates that imposition of the burden on that person, assembly or institution.

Sub paragraph (a) in furtherance of a compelling government interest; and subparagraph (b) is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling government interest.

Does that sound familiar as far as the constitutional standard that government agencies, like the Land Use Commission, have to apply if we're dealing with land use rules to be imposed on religious institutions?

THE WITNESS: No. I don't think that -- and you can refer this to corporation counsel -- we're here because it takes a Special Use Permit to have a church in an Ag zone. So they have to show -- one of the most important things that they have to show is does it negatively affect the surrounding area. And they have. So I think they're apples and oranges.

The first step is to apply -- they first

have to see, is it an appropriate use where they're asking to have it? And my response is no. It does negatively affect all the adjacent landowners. So I don't know how planning is coming up with their recommendation that it doesn't, because we've all testified that it does.

As far as your federal law, I think that would be something that you would consider if the church were in an area zoned for a church, and then I think the government would have problems placing restrictions. But you don't have to grant the permit just because they're a church.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm not saying we have to grant the permit. My question goes to more the standard which is applicable. Let me ask you this.

THE WITNESS: I'm not an expert, and I'm not here testifying on church law or that statute.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I was just inquiring because I notice, and most -- we generally try to read every single piece of paper that's in the record. And I noticed and I read your submission very carefully, and I noticed your letterhead indicated you were attorney of law. So I was just finding out if you had any information regarding that.

Let me ask you this about the requirement of least restrictive alternative. It's very clear in my view that Hawai'i Supreme Court made clear that just because you're a church, it doesn't give you exemptions from certain types of zoning or building requirements.

Like, for example, there was the Korean Dae
Won Sa, or what we call the Palolo Valley case, where
the supreme court said just because you're a church,
you can't have your roof exceed the height
limitations. There's the Charles Marsden versus -CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner,
respectfully.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: We have -- we are not trying to say church gets away with anything.

My question is this. Is it possible to remedy the problems you see being raised by enforcement of other laws, like, for example, the noise statute, common law nuisance --

THE WITNESS: I understand your question, and I'll just say this.

No, I don't think it is. I don't think that any of those restrictions that were placed on by the Maui Planning Commission on the Special Use Permit when they approved it, I don't believe that he

will follow any of those.

I've got ten years of my neighbor holding events that shouldn't have been held there in an Ag farm that doesn't even -- is not even supposed to have people in it.

It's a 7000-plus foot party barn. So he's been breaking the law now for ten years. And so your question to me, can we put reasonable restrictions on this? You can put them on there. And then it's going to be up to the neighbors to police it. And that's going to be more of a burden on us, and it's going to create even more, you know, neighborly good will when we have to make police reports at 12:00 in the morning because he's having a concert, or call the zoning department the next day or on Monday because all weekend we had events happening.

Like I said, if this was a person coming in who has not had this illegal activity occurring on his property for a decade asking for a chance, I would say, okay, let's give him a chance. But that's not case. So, no, I don't think any restrictions will work.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Okay, thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Aczon.

1 COMMISSIONER ACZON: Thank you, Chair. Ι'm 2 sorry to hear about the trouble, but how many 3 property owners are using that common road? 4 THE WITNESS: There's four, actually four lots, so there's actually Mr. Labat, Mr. Malone, 5 6 myself and Mr. Abrams. 7 COMMISSIONER ACZON: There is a lot of incidents that you kind of mentioned. During those 8 incidents, what action did you take? 9 10 THE WITNESS: I, like I said, I haven't taken any actions other than to call Mr. Abrams and 11 12 try to work things out. And I've done that over the 13 past ten years. 14 And the dog barking thing, it just goes on 15 and own. So, for example, your lights --COMMISSIONER ACZON: Did you call in 16 17 enforcement --18 THE WITNESS: No. 19 COMMISSIONER ACZON: What about your 20 neighbors? 21 THE WITNESS: My neighbors in Manawai did, 22 and they had complaints. 23 COMMISSIONER ACZON: So you didn't see any 24 police officers? 25 THE WITNESS: There were police reports

```
1
     made and that's in the record.
2
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: So they're all in the
 3
     record?
 4
                THE WITNESS: It's in the Violation Section
5
     of the Planning Department.
 6
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Thank you.
7
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, are
     there any other questions? If not --
8
9
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: May I cross-examine?
10
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: No. That's not how
11
     our procedures go.
12
                It is 10:35 and we are going to take a
13
     15-minute recess to 10:50.
14
                THE WITNESS: Thank you.
15
                (Recess taken.)
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's 10:50 and we're
16
17
     back on the record.
                I'm, as a point of privilege as the Chair,
18
19
      I'm going to say something right now.
20
                A couple weeks ago we went through two days
21
     of Land Use Commission hearings related to Mauna Kea.
22
      I think you're all familiar with the high stakes
```

controversies going on on the mountain there, and the

very intense emotional issues on all sides related to

that. Yet in two days we have managed to hold a

23

24

- hearing with less acrimony than we had in the first part of this hearing.
- It is possible to have respectful

 discussions about difficult issues, and I will highly

 encourage myself in my own heart, my fellow

 Commissioners and all the parties to conduct

 ourselves in a manner that is appropriate.
- 8 Commissioner Aczon, you asked for a chance 9 to ask a question.
 - COMMISSIONER ACZON: Mr. Chair, permission to address the Petitioner's legal counsel.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please, go ahead.
 - COMMISSIONER ACZON: Mr. Iczkovitz, I don't really appreciate you following a testifier or witness, following the testifier or the witness and yelling at them. For me it's intimidation, just personal opinion.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
 Commissioner Aczon.
 - We still have a number of people signed up to testify on this matter. Dawna Richmond, followed by Jody Levy, followed by Christiane Douglas.
 - Aloha, good morning.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 DAWNA RICHMOND

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the

Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and

testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: My name its Dawna Richmond, 241 Manawai Place. Manawai is the subdivision east, straight east of Mr. Abrams' property.

And I am the president of our homeowners association. I did write a letter. None of us knew about the hearings, proceedings that are going on, because we are further than 500 feet away from the property. But we can always hear what is going on up there.

So we did write a letter once we found out what was going on. I wrote the letter on August 5th. We had other people in the association that also wrote letters but they were rejected.

I don't know if our association letter is in the proceedings or not, but I did bring it. But we are opposed to it, because, as Michelle stated before, there have been several parties that go into the night. It has been quiet since 2015 after several -- our neighbors have -- sorry, I'm very

1 nervous.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We haven't lost a witness ever.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

Our neighbors down below, they weren't able to come today. She is not feeling well. And she did have some complaints. So I think everything since 2015 has been settled down since then. But before that, there were definitely parties that went on all night, especially New Year's Eve.

I did listen to the testimony. I think it was in May, televised or recorded, and I noticed that Mr. Abrams was talking about New Year's Eve party and he said it ended at 10:00, and most people don't have New Year's Eve parties that ended at 10:00. But he stated that to you, and I kind of laughed because it did go on all night.

Even his brochure said drumming into the night and even the next day, and they were going to have a prayer ceremony the next morning. And it did go all night and all day the next day. Just drumming all night long.

I can hear it. This is not -- I'm not lying here. We can hear it. And it's just -- it's like I said, it's been quiet lately because of the

infractions from before which I believe that's why it's kind of quieted down.

I agree that having all this farming is wonderful. We have a farm too. We have hundreds of trees and things that we grow. So we appreciate the farm, and all the people who want to come to their farm and look at it. But changing the code from Special Management Area to having a church where we have no recourse if this stuff keeps going on. If they start up again, we have no recourse.

And I know we talked about putting limitations on it. I don't know that you can do that. Do we go back to calling the cops all the time? Or because of a church, do we not even have that option any more?

Here are a couple of the fliers that went out.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You can give them to the clerk.

THE WITNESS: These are parties that they were charging money for. And there's a PA system, and bands. It's great having a party, but it's -- having a party and you're not in it, and having to listen to it all night is not exactly fun.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is that the

```
1
      conclusion of your testimony?
2
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
 3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
 4
                Mr. Iczkovitz?
5
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: May I see those documents?
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, copies will be
 6
7
      shared. And then will be posted to the Land Use
      Commission website.
8
9
                THE WITNESS: I sent those also to -- yeah.
10
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you have questions
      for the witness, Mr. Iczkovitz?
11
12
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yeah, I do.
13
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Confined again.
14
                         CROSS-EXAMINATION
15
     BY MR. ICZKOVITZ:
                Do you know what year these documents were?
16
17
                2015. As I stated before, 2015 was when
      everything kind of calmed down.
18
19
                Did you ever call the police about the
20
      complaint about noise?
2.1
          Α
                No.
22
                Did you ever once call the owner of the
23
      farm to complain about noise?
                I didn't know who it was.
24
           Α
25
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Again, Mr. Iczkovitz,
```

can you confine your questions to her testimony? 1 2 the first question you asked was a reasonable and 3 helpful one. She produced something, you wanted to 4 know the date. 5 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I'm just getting at the 6 fact that she is saying there was noise. I'm asking 7 if she ever called the police or submitted a complaint to the County regarding these alleged 8 9 violations. She is saying it happened all the time. 10 All I'm asking, did she ever actually complain about 11 it to a County authority. I'm not trying to be 12 aggressive, I'm just asking if she felt it was so --13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please proceed. THE WITNESS: No, I'm not a complainer. 14 15 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I have no more questions. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: County. 17 MR. HOPPER: No. 18 MS. APUNA: No. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 20 Commissioner Cabral. 21 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: In regards to your

homeowners association, is that a formal association? So like when you buy your land, you know that you have to share together in this association? THE WITNESS: Yes.

25

22

23

```
1
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: It's not one that you
2
     made up?
 3
                THE WITNESS: No. We have had the
 4
     association for over 25 years.
5
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: So when you buy, you're
 6
     a member whether you like it or not.
7
                Is the prior testifier, is she in that same
8
     homeowners association?
9
               THE WITNESS: No.
10
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: So it's a separate
     subdivision in a sense?
11
12
               THE WITNESS: Yes.
13
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you very much.
14
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, any
15
     questions? Commissioner Chang.
16
               COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much
17
     for being here this morning.
18
                I just would like to ask you whether you
19
     provided similar testimony to the Maui County
20
     Planning Commission at any of its previous hearings?
21
                THE WITNESS: No. I didn't know there were
22
     any. We weren't informed of any.
23
               COMMISSIONER CHANG: How did you know about
24
     today's hearing?
25
                THE WITNESS: I was told by a neighbor.
```

1	COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Further questions,
3	Commissioners?
4	Only because it's come up for other
5	witnesses, how long have you lived on Maui and in
6	Haiku?
7	THE WITNESS: We have lived on the property
8	for 23 years.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
10	Our next witness is Judy Levy, followed by
11	Christiane Douglas, followed by Taya Raine.
12	Good morning, Ms. Levy.
13	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I've called your
15	name, there is a chair next to the witness' chair so
16	you can be ready.
17	Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're
18	about to give is the truth?
19	THE WITNESS: Absolutely yes, sir.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your
21	name.
22	JUDITH E. LEVY
23	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
24	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
25	testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: My name is Judith E. Levy.

My address is 11 Uakoko Place in Haiku. I've been a resident on Maui almost 11 years and I've had the privilege of being introduced to Dr. Abrams. We met at Temple of Peace, and I saw the quality of people these were, and I was very happy I had found my tribe.

I attended many wonderful gatherings, holiday gatherings. I'm 72 years' old. We're grateful that those of us -- I would say that the majority of people that I've seen as we've gone for Thanksgiving, and the New Year's Eve gatherings, are people over 50s and 60s, so it's really a very precious sanctuary for us to know that we can have a place to go.

It's a vegetarian potluck for Thanksgiving, which I'm very grateful for. The New Year's Eve gatherings have been very spiritual, that's why I appreciate them. This is not a "woo, whoop it up" evening. Yes, there is music and we dance, and it's a beautiful spiritual event.

We stop at 11:30. We have beautiful devotional moments. Sometimes our Reverend Kedar is there from Temple of Peace to join us. We

spiritually bring in a new year, and it's very precious. Something I look forward to.

I really take issue with some of the previous testimony of some of the neighbors. I must say I have never ever witnessed any back up of traffic. I have helped at New Year's Eve. I've been at the gate. There has never been any back up. It's not a dangerous place to make a turn. It's the biggest cul-de-sac I've ever seen, never been any danger whatsoever to pull in there. Very easy to spot.

And it's a very glorious space. There's more than plenty of parking on the land. We have never had a problem with parking back up onto the road. We drive very carefully and respectfully. This is beautiful sacred land.

I'm a substitute teacher. Also I took a day off today to come here because this is very important to me that this place be honored and that it get Special Use Permit as a church, because to me it is a spiritual sanctuary that I look forward to attending.

I'm a member of the farmers' union as well, so I'm beyond thrilled that they are training new farmers. We need to be modeling sustainability on

1 | this island for the planet, and they're doing it.

They're shining examples of having a

permaculture installation that could feed hundreds of

people. So the goals are exemplary. The qualities

of what these people's intention are to serve the

community has been very evident, and I'm very

grateful to call them my friends, and to look forward

to these wonderful family gatherings.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

Questions for the witness.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: No.

MR. HOPPER: No.

MS. APUNA: No.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?

Commissioner Cabral, followed by

Commissioner Chang.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: You reference you work at the gate or something, and the cul-de-sac is large. So you're talking, once you drive down is this gate where it enters off of the Hana Highway, or down where you enter off the cul-de-sac?

THE WITNESS: Onto their property, further down. So there isn't a backup.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: The question previously was the concern up at the highway. So it's two

1 different locations. Thank you. 2 THE WITNESS: I felt like that was 3 misleading. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 5 Commissioner Cabral. 6 Commissioner Chang. 7 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Good morning, Ms. 8 Levy. Thank you for being here. 9 Did you provide similar testimony before 10 the Maui Planning Commission? THE WITNESS: I was able to come twice to 11 12 do that. 13 COMMISSIONER CHANG: How did you know about 14 those hearings? THE WITNESS: I'm a friend. I'm a friend 15 16 of the community. We have a pretty loving community 17 that wants to see this magical place continue to serve and broaden its scope. 18 19 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So the Abrams told you 20 about the Planning Commission hearings? 21 THE WITNESS: Someone in the community let 22 me know that it was happening today, and it was 23 important to me. 24 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further,

1 Commissioners? 2 If not, thank you very much for your 3 testimony. 4 Christiane Douglas followed by Taya Raine. 5 Good morning. 6 THE WITNESS: Good morning. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the 8 9 truth? 10 THE WITNESS: Truth, yes, yes. CHRISTIANE DOUGLAS 11 12 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 13 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as followed. 14 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION THE WITNESS: I know that I have a 16 17 three-minute limit, and I want to read you my points 18 because I want to make them all. 19 My name is Christiane Douglas. I live on 20 424 Kapakalua Road in Haiku. I'm the co-founder of 21 the SHAKA Movement, the Community Farmland Initiative 22 and Maui Pono Network.

And I believe that you're about to make a very, very important decision here today, and I really hope that you will make it in favor of giving

23

24

the Abrams couple the possibility to have a church on their land.

So I feel that it's really -- you've been given a very big responsibility. I'm honestly very shocked about what I just heard from the two ladies that are unhappy with what's going on.

So let me get into a different speed, otherwise I'll never make it here.

It's because the owners had the well-being of the whole community at heart when they took a huge part of their money and invested in building a temple with the intention to invite and serve people of all colors and creeds, that's why I feel it deserves our support.

You may be somewhat unaware of the role that Ahimsa has already played with all of the volunteer efforts, private initiative and good will that the owners have dedicated toward the common good with the building and generous sharing of the temple.

I have known the owners for 15 years now, and they have truly impressed me with their generosity of heart. They have been willing to first open their own home for community gatherings and started services. And when it became too small, then they went on to Sunday morning gatherings. And then

they went on to spend their own money to build a bigger temple for the community and services for a healthy future for Maui, and the people they love and care for so much.

They are amongst the most soft spoken, gentle people I've ever known, and I'm sure they will do anything they can to take their neighbor's needs into consideration and remove their concerns concerning the church status.

And in listening to the two ladies here, they acknowledge that since 2015 they have been extremely careful to abide by all the noise and time requests.

So in all, from what I've seen, the space that they have been providing with their temple has already truly served the community, and it's a great responsibility for you today to decide how it may continue.

Concerns that neighbors may have voiced around parking or potential reckless driving, questionable company or noise disturbance resulting, I believe, are based in fear of potential problems rather than they are based in prior real experience with any of these.

I think these concerns are purely

hypothetical. So I want to just say why I think there's nothing to worry about in those areas.

First of all, the temple is way down on the property, and so the land surrounding offers ample space to provide all the visitors with the necessary parking.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I can ask you to start to summarize? It's been three minutes.

THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.

So I've been at many events that have truly served the community. They have held free -- we were able to have the SHAKA movement and GMO Moratorium events there. I feel that they're really serving the spirit of aloha and acting on behalf of the common good, and joining people of all walks of life, all creeds. And so it's an open heart place.

I really would like to say to the lady here also who just testified that she's always welcome. Everyone can feel welcome there.

And I would love for you to give him the church status so that they can have larger gatherings so that they can spread the word about all the beautiful ways that we can come together.

And I hope that you will read this last time, this letter. I wasn't on island, so I couldn't

```
testify in person, but there is more here to read.
1
2
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And you have a copy
3
     of that for us?
 4
                THE WITNESS: Yes. You have the copy
5
     already in your -- yeah. Because, you know, there
 6
     have been celebrations of life. There have potluck
7
     gatherings. So many different ways that they have
     been generous. My husband's birthday celebration.
8
9
                You know, so many ways and I have never
10
     seen anybody charge for anything. If people wanted
11
     to make a donation, there was a donation basket, but
12
     nobody has ever been asked to pay for any of these
      things. That's a misinformation. I can say that
13
14
      from my own experience.
15
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.
               Questions for the witness?
16
17
               MR. ICZLPVOTZ: No questions for the
18
     witness.
19
               MR. HOPPER: No.
20
               MS. APUNA: No.
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Chang.
22
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Did you testify at any
23
     of the Planning Commission hearings?
24
                THE WITNESS: I was off island, so I
25
      couldn't come in person, so I wrote a letter.
```

```
1
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: How did you know about
2
     those hearings?
 3
                THE WITNESS: Well, through our community
 4
     network.
5
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: When you say your
 6
      community network, what network is that?
7
                THE WITNESS: Well, it's big. I'm
     personally -- the Temple of Peace. We also
8
     personally do send out locally about all events that
9
10
     we consider worthwhile. Its called Maui
11
     Events-Mandala, but we are also the organizers of the
12
     Earth Day Festival once a year.
13
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Did the Abrams ask you
14
     or tell you about the hearings?
15
                THE WITNESS: I spoke with them about a
16
     different issue, so they mentioned to me, yes.
17
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: One last question.
18
                How did you hear about today's hearing?
19
                THE WITNESS: In speaking with the Abrams,
20
     yes.
21
                COMMISSIONER CHANG:
                                     Thank you.
22
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
23
     Commissioner Chang.
24
                Commissioner Ohigashi, followed by
25
      Commissioner Cabral.
```

```
COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm a little
1
2
     confused about the testimony, about the part where
 3
     you said that they constructed this temple on the
 4
     property.
5
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's the temple
 6
7
     that exists now?
8
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
9
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And that's the one
10
     that's part of this application?
                THE WITNESS: That's where the church
11
     gatherings will be held. Before --
12
13
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's what I'm
14
     trying to clarify.
15
                THE WITNESS: I knew them.
16
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: My question is,
17
      simply is that: Was this a temple prior to this
      application? Was this building constructed as a
18
19
     temple prior to this application?
20
                THE WITNESS: It was -- I believe it was,
2.1
     you know, to hold space for people, folks, you know,
22
      to gather, and as a place also to educate I believe
23
     about sustainable practices.
24
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Were you in on the
25
     planning for the building?
```

THE WITNESS: No. I was -- I known them 1 2 since they had gatherings in their living room. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral. 4 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: When you first 5 introduced yourself I got impression that you had 6 something to do with the farming or some kind of a 7 farm organization. THE WITNESS: In the way that, yes, we 8 9 founded the SHAKA Movement, Sustainable Hawaiian 10 Agriculture for the Keiki and the Aina. 11 And it took it upon itself to address and 12 educate about the GMO issue with the pesticides being 13 spread, and GMOs on the island, yes. 14 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I just needed 15 clarification. Thank you very much for your input. CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further, 16 17 Commissioners? If not, thank you very much. 18 Our next witness is Taya Raine followed by 19 Kedar St. John. 20 Aloha, good morning. 21 THE WITNESS: Aloha, good morning. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or 23 affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the 24 truth? 25 THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your name and address.

TAYA RAINE

Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Taya Raine, 124 Keoniloa Street.

I'm a little bit nervous being up here. So
I came to Maui in 2015 from the Big Island. And I
was in the middle of divorce at the time. I'm going
to make my testimony a little bit more personal
because I feel like I could repeat a lot of what has
already been said. Sitting here I tried to think
about what was most useful.

So at that time I came here with all four of my children on my own. And I kind of thought that there would be lots and lots of people that would really just welcome us in.

And I really didn't find that to be the case. But the one place that I could go was the Ahimsa Farm. And the first time I went there I was just welcomed in such a beautiful way that having come from the Big Island where there was a much

greater sense of community for me and my children, I really felt like we had come home. And my children, they range in age. At the time they were five, eight, 12 and 14.

And this was a place that we could go and be shown around the property that was growing food, being welcomed to pick food from the trees. And there were birds, love birds, ducks and just a real feeling of coming back to the earth.

And since that time, we attend many, many of their gatherings, and I've as always just felt very welcome. There's never been, in my experience, a charge other than to donate, which I think is a common practice for any church facility. There's never been any issue with parking in my experience. The road is very bumpy coming in, so there's no way you can drive in and out of that place quickly and create noise.

It is a place a lot of elders come, and that to me has been important. I was born in Kentucky, and I was raised around a lot of elders. And as the experience here in the islands, there can be a great gap, and it's hard to find that way to connect the generations. For my children to be around elders who have knowledge and wisdom and

kindness that are in some ways maybe aunties and uncles to them, it's been really important.

It's a place -- during these gatherings there is no alcohol -- I'll try to wrap it up -- so my children can be there safely. I feel like they're safe. Other children they can play around and play hide and seek. There is a pool table. There are things that they can do together when we're all praying.

And I think it's important for me to just to touch on that before I close, but not being Christian or Buddhist, a lot of us have a more eclectic view of our spirituality. I have native American blood, and when I go to the Ahimsa Farm there is a lot of honor of that lineage in addition to the Jewish ways.

They really try to call on so many different lineages. And I find that there are very few places on Maui where any of us can go who really want to be in prayer and worship.

And to me that's very, very important.

It's kind of a central part of my life to be in prayer. And it's really the only place I can go where I feel safe. I can close my eyes. I can pray in my own way, and feel like there's a sanctuary for

1 that. So I feel like what they're offering our 2 community has value for many generations, and 3 hopefully if this gets approved, for generations to 4 come. Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much. 6 Questions for the witness? 7 MR. ICZKOVITZ: No questions. MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair. 8 9 MS. APUNA: No. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral. 11 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'm from the Big 12 Island, so mahalo, thank you for your positive 13 comments there. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I saw Commissioner 15 Cabral jumping up and down during that portion. Got 16 her excited. You could have just talked about 17 horses. 18 VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Right. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Other questions, 20 Commissioners? Thank you very much. 2.1 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. Thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Our next witness 23 Kedar St. John, followed by Alan Lott, followed by 24 Jonathan Yudis, who is the last person signed up. 25 THE WITNESS: Respected Land Use

94 1 Commissioners, it's a great honor to be in your 2 presence. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 4 Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're 5 about to give is the truth? 6 THE WITNESS: I do. 7 KEDAR ST. JOHN Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 8 9 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and 10 testified as follows: 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 THE WITNESS: My name is Kedar St. John. 13 I have lived here on Maui for the last 30 years. I'm 14 director of the Temple of Peace in Haiku. We have a 15 half acre right on the main road. Our church has been in existence, the 16 17 church building has been in existence since 1938. have lead weekly religious services four of the 18 19 19 years. 20 Starting off doing house churches, as we 21 call it, at the Abrams' family home, for many years

I offer my support to Sacred Earth as simply a request to regular weekly religious services, special holiday gatherings and potlucks,

before we actually got our sanctuary.

22

23

24

the rights of passage ceremonies for community members.

I also support Sacred Earth plans to host visiting teachers from numerous religious and spiritual lineages once the SUP is granted.

I've known Dr. Abrams and his wife for more than 22 years and have valued his friendship and weekly participation in our weekly Sunday service at the Temple of Peace in Haiku.

We have collaborated in countless prayer ceremonies and spiritual celebrations. He was one of the very first people I ordained as a minister in our church as part of a lineage dating back to Joseph of Aramathea.

I rely on Dr. and Mrs. Abrams to lead our Sunday services when I am called out of town. I can attest to his outstanding character and am confident that he will provide inspiration and leadership for the Sacred Earth Assembly.

The environment and proposed church building at Ahimsa Sanctuary is very conducive to our growing community. The fact that Sacred Earth Assembly will be located at organically certified Ahimsa Sanctuary Farm is consistent with its commitment to earth-based spirituality. The farm

demonstrates natural farming and stewardship on a practical level which supports Sacred Earth

Assembly's mission. Sacred Earth Assembly is a valuable resource for Maui. The building and surrounding land on Ahimsa Sanctuary Farm is ideally suited to provide a safe, spacious, uplifting setting for interfaith worship services.

Please grant the permission necessary for Sacred Earth Assembly to operate to its full potential on this beautiful property.

May I take a sip of water?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You're right at three minutes.

CHIEF CLERK: Excuse me. No, that's not for you. Don't help yourself to my water.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

I just wanted to also point out that His
Holiness the Pope talked about the degrading of the
church. And in the age of science denying, it's very
important for the body of the church to send to the
community the ability to be able to grow food for
themselves, organic foods to nourish them and their
families.

So I think this is a perfect combination that there is agriculture being done on there for ten

```
1
     years. Beautiful agriculture, and the addition of
2
     the church building would be a very great value to
3
     this community.
 4
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Reverend.
5
                Are there questions?
 6
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: No.
7
                MR. HOPPER: No.
               MS. APUNA: No.
8
9
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
10
               Commissioner Cabral.
11
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Since you've been
12
      involved with the activities of the church or the
13
     building since its inception or its initial
      construction, am I clear from what I'm reading that
14
15
     it's actually been built as an agricultural
16
      structure, but then it's been built for agriculture,
17
     but it's being used as a church or place of worship?
18
                THE WITNESS: Informal church gatherings
19
     have taken place, yes. For instance, like the New
20
     Year's Eve celebration, Thanksgiving celebration.
     Celebrations of life for our elders who crossed over.
2.1
22
      Different things like that, yes.
23
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Okay, thank you very
2.4
     much.
```

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:

Further questions for

```
Reverend St. John? Commissioner Chang.
1
2
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much
 3
      for being here this morning and providing your
 4
     testimony. I have a few questions.
5
               You seem to be very familiar with the
 6
     property and their activities, is that correct?
7
                THE WITNESS: Correct.
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Can you describe for
8
     me what is -- what kind of structures are on the
9
10
     property?
11
                THE WITNESS: The Abrams' personal home is
12
     there. The large building, community building is
13
     there, the bond as it's called.
14
                There are a few little, I think, like
15
     greenhouse. There's a couple of little bali houses.
16
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Where do they -- a lot
17
     of the testimony was about these gatherings,
18
     potlucks.
19
                Is there a place they cook all these foods,
20
      in their kitchen, or a place to cook?
21
                THE WITNESS: Well, potluck, people bring
22
     their foods. Sometimes catered, people bringing
23
     catered food.
24
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Are you a surrounding
```

neighbor? Do you live nearby?

```
1
                THE WITNESS: No, I'm way up in Haiku.
2
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: It sounds as if you
3
      were saying this land is really ideal for the farming
 4
     activities.
5
                THE WITNESS: Agriculture, absolutely it's
      agricultural land. And they've done a fantastic job
 6
7
     at not only demonstrating how to grow for our
      community. Every Sunday I'm talking to my
8
9
      congregation saying how important it is that we make
10
     a connection with the earth; that we're not science
11
     deniers. That we are very much into malama aina.
12
     And that's very much our position in regards to
13
     having this building become a church building.
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: One last question.
14
15
                Did you provide similar testimony before
     the Maui Planning Commission?
16
17
                THE WITNESS: I did. Yes, I did.
18
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: How did you hear about
19
     those hearings?
20
                THE WITNESS: I'm very much on top of every
21
      single thing going on about this.
22
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Did the Abrams tell
23
      you about the hearings?
24
                THE WITNESS: Of course.
25
                COMMISSIONER CHANG:
                                     Thank you so much for
```

```
your testimony.
1
2
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
 3
     Ohigashi.
 4
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just curious.
5
     You indicated that there would be visiting teachers
 6
     at the, I guess, at the church facility.
7
                THE WITNESS: Did I say -- sorry.
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Visiting teachers?
8
9
               THE WITNESS: Yes.
10
               COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Would those be
     housed there?
11
12
                THE WITNESS: I don't believe so, no. I
13
     have teachers coming in all the time.
14
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand.
                                                       I'm
15
     just curious if part of the plan was for these
     visiting teachers to be housed there on the farm?
16
17
                THE WITNESS: To my understanding there is
     no facility for that.
18
19
               COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Okay. Just wanted
20
     to know.
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything further,
22
     Commissioners?
23
                Reverend, what is your understanding of the
24
     proper pronunciation of the name of the town that you
25
      live in?
```

1	THE WITNESS: Hi-e-ku (phonetic).
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
3	Our next witness is Alan Lott, followed by
4	Jonathan Yudis.
5	Are there any other individuals of the
6	public wishing to testify in this matter besides the
7	two gentlemen I mentioned?
8	Good morning.
9	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or
11	affirm the testimony you're about to give is the
12	truth?
13	THE WITNESS: Absolutely. Thank you all
14	for coming.
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your
16	name and address.
17	ALAN LOTT
18	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
19	Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and
20	testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	THE WITNESS: I am Alan Lott, 575 Haiku
23	Road.
24	I've known the Abrams for at least
25	15 years, maybe longer. I've known them. They have

become dear friends. I speak to their character, their very generous character.

First thing, what has been said before, but they're just incredible human beings, wonderful elders. I really admire them and respect what they're doing. And we are not living in normal times. Another report came out just the other day, another report. Thousands of scientists all over the world are saying we are facing a real climate emergency.

This is something being done. They're actually doing something positive as has been stated so many times by different people in different ways.

So many wonderful things are being done on this land, and so many more potential can be happening. We are so blessed to have this family and this community here. I am so sorry about the acrimony earlier. It was painful to watch the interaction. And I'm sorry, I'm hopeful that we can work this out. I'm hopeful that the neighbors can find peace with each other.

What other hope do we have? This is not normal times. We really have to rise to the occasion. I've never paid. I love the events that have occurred, the Christmas -- I go to bed often

1 little bit earlier. Sometimes it goes -- but it 2 becomes quieter during the night. Like the New 3 Year's celebration, it becomes quieter after 4 midnight. It does get quieter. And you have to 5 drive slow on that road. I don't want to damage my 6 wife's car. 7 So I'm just very mindful, it's a love offering basis. It really is. I don't want to go on 8 9 and on. I love these people dearly. 10 I appreciate your time and energy. Please 11 do the right thing. Grant the Special Use Permit. 12 And I pray for resolution in healing with the 13 neighbors, because we can all get along. I really 14 believe it's possible. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you for your 16 testimony. 17 Questions? 18 MR. ICZKOVITZ: No. 19 MR. HOPPER: No. 20 Ms. Apuna: No. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners? 22 Commissioner Chang.

You talked about you're so grateful that

and I'll keep my questions very short.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much,

23

24

```
1
      this property is here. If they didn't have the
2
      church, would they continue to grow, do the
3
      sustainable ag?
 4
                THE WITNESS: Yeah, perhaps, but I don't
5
      know how they can support them. This is like -- they
 6
     poured all their savings into making this happening.
7
      They poured so much savings into acquiring the land,
8
      developing it, and with the structures, it would be
9
     very hard I would think. They've invested so much
10
     money into this.
11
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: When you say so much
12
     money, this being the church?
13
                THE WITNESS: Yes. Yeah, I would say so.
14
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: People don't pay, they
15
     don't pay, so they're getting money back --
16
                THE WITNESS: Infrastructure. Well, I
17
     don't know if they get money back from the church,
18
     but from the land itself I would hope over time. I
19
     think the church would contribute, I would say, but
20
      I'm not an authority in this area.
21
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Do you live around the
22
     church?
```

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And you believe this land continues to be valuable for agricultural

THE WITNESS: I live in Haiku.

23

24

1 purposes?

THE WITNESS: Oh, absolutely. I love the papayas and the tea, some of the best tea I've ever had in my life. Awesome.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Wait, wait.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, sorry. I'm not used to this.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I don't want you to feel like you're on the hot seat. We're trying to get a picture of what's going on, because we're really being asked to determine a zoning situation I think, more so than a personal preference situation or religious situation.

So you said to do the right thing. Would you think that basically in doing the right thing, that one would follow the laws of the community and the County and the State when you're doing the right thing? Do you follow the laws?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely, but I think that in taking in account of the law, there's always the spirit of the law above the letter of the law. Both are important, but I think truly the spirit of the law is what the essence, you know, what this is about.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Okay.

And you commented too wanting to have the neighbors get along with themselves.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: My concern is that it seems like the neighbors aren't coming to the party. So when you're at the party, you don't hear the loud noise, because you're part of the loud noise, so it's not a disturbance to you.

Not knowing the land, are there any large trees that could be planted without blocking anybody's view or breezes? Or is it possible that things could be done to separate the land in a physical barrier that would help control sound?

THE WITNESS: I would be speculating.

That's not my area of specialty. But there's always things that can be done, it's just a question of the money, the investment in the money. They have already poured so much in. How much more, and what would really be effective to make a difference.

So I think community interaction would be a good thing to do, you know, to bring people together. It's happened before. Even in war zones people have gotten to together and have true convictions. But I think it's entirely possible, where there's a

```
willingness with all the parties. If all the parties
 1
2
     are willing to be together, I think it's entirely
 3
     possible.
 4
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Thank you.
5
                THE WITNESS: Thank you for your questions.
6
     Anyone else?
7
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'll handle that
8
     part.
9
                Thank you for the correct pronunciation of
10
     Haiku.
11
                Do you know any of the meaning of Haiku?
12
                THE WITNESS: I know the poetry, the form
13
     of the poetry.
14
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Not haiku, that's the
15
     Japanese poetry.
16
                Haiku can mean a short break, or can mean
17
     to speak abruptly, which is not necessarily
18
      irrelevant to our proceedings.
19
                THE WITNESS: Thank you for enlightening
20
     me.
21
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Jonathan Yudis, and
22
     are there any other members of the public wishing to
23
      testify today? If not, I will close public testimony
```

25 Good morning.

after Mr. Yudis.

108 1 Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're 2 about to give is the truth? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Please state your name and address for the record and proceed. 5 6 THE WITNESS: Jonathan Yudis, 198 7 Holomakani Place, Kula, Hawai'i. 8 JONATHAN YUDIS 9 Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the 10 Public, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 11 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 THE WITNESS: Let's see. So aloha 14 everybody. I just want to say thank you to the 15 Commissioners, because I've been here for different 16 times, testimony and things, and appreciate your 17 service to the County. 18 And I'm here to testify on behalf of the 19 Ahimsa Sanctuary Farm, and also speak to the 20 integrity of Dr. Lew Abrams and Mirayah. I've lived 21 on this island for a decade, and I've known them 22 almost as long.

So I've brought my family to the farm. I've shown my children the fishponds and the sustainable agriculture. And really appreciate the land. I feel

23

24

like these are true lovers of the earth, the aina, and want to give back to the community and teach sustainable practices.

I also think it's really important because I don't think it's in a lot of our wheelhouses when you hear like an earth-based church. I think a lot of us are familiar with church, and we're familiar with farming, but the two don't seem synthesized. They're not together.

So I think it's easy to have the perspective of why don't they just do the farm? And what is the church? And what are these parties?

I think anybody that has been at spiritual religious services at churches has experienced maybe a gospel choir singing celebrations in connect to prayer. And I think it's important to recognize that this is no different than that.

This is a church which is celebrating the planet itself, the aina itself, and trying to teach how our commitment of the planet, our love of the planet, our love of taking care of the land is a spirituality in and of itself.

So I wanted to share that with everybody. I also wanted to speak to their integrity, because I also want to honor the neighbors. We all have

```
neighbors. I don't think anybody appreciates noisy
1
2
     neighbors, but my experience of the Abrams and this
 3
      community is one of the utmost integrity. I feel
 4
      like they've done everything possible to honor the
 5
     previous Commission guidelines, and I feel like what
 6
     we are doing today is trying to make a decision for
7
     the present and the future.
                So I think as long as there would be
8
9
     guidelines that could be met, and they were honored,
10
     that the neighbors would be satisfied and moving
11
      forward, this could be a healthy thing for the
12
      community.
13
                So, yeah, that's basically my testimony
14
     that I wanted to share.
15
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mahalo.
16
                Questions for the witness?
17
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: No questions.
18
                MR. HOPPER: No, Chair.
19
                MS. APUNA: No questions.
20
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
                                                       Ιf
21
     not, thank you very much.
22
                THE WITNESS: Thank you, guys.
23
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So public testimony
```

Office of Planning, you had requested to

on this matter is now closed.

24

1	have a consideration taken out of order.
2	MS. APUNA: Yes, Chair, I did, but I will
3	withdraw that request and go in order after the
4	Applicant's quick presentation.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So our proceedings is
6	for the Applicant to present. About how much time
7	did you want? I need to juggle a necessary break to
8	feed ourselves and things like that.
9	MR. ICZKOVITZ: I think we would like to
10	have Dr. Abrams make presentation for maybe
11	15 minutes, and then I would like to make a summary
12	presentation for five or ten.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Just a one-minute
14	recess before I swear you in.
15	(Recess taken.)
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do you swear or
17	affirm the testimony you're about to give is the
18	truth?
19	THE WITNESS: I do.
20	LEW ABRAMS
21	Was called as a witness by and on behalf of the
22	Applicant, was sworn to tell the truth, was examined
23	and testified as follows:
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	THE WITNESS: My name is Dr. Lew Abrams.

I'm a licensed clinical psychologist. I've been in practice on the island for about 22 years. I have devoted by my life to be of service as a psychotherapist, and I also have other interests.

I've been involved with the Temple of Peace for about 20 years. We used to host the early stages of the gathering of the Temple of Peace in our home, our previous home up on Awalau Road. And I've also developed a parallel interest in organic farming and permaculture, and that was one of the reasons why we moved to a larger property down from Awalau Road which was -- is a two-acre parcel.

When we encountered it, it was pretty much depleted old pineapple land. It was one small citrus orchard already planted and a house on it. And we put our heart and soul into rejuvenating and restoring these soils, planting fruit orchards. More than 200 fruit trees, coconut orchards. We built aquaculture fishponds. We built a greenhouse. We opened up a main garden where we brought in many amenities to restore the microbiotic life and mineral content to these depleted pineapple soils. We planted windbreaks and privacy breaks initially bamboo along the windward side of the property. Also to provide some privacy from the neighbors.

We have many types of bananas, papayas, citrus orchards and we also are specializing, our first valued added product is a soothing herbal teablend.

We've learned that farming and directly selling the produce is a negative game. It's very difficult to meet the expenses that it take to weed and feed and harvest if I had gone to the farmer's market, although we have brought our produce to Mana Foods, and I do supply a couple of restaurants up in Lahaina, where I work at the West Maui Counselling Center, so I bring boxes of tumeric and ulu and such, but that doesn't really add up to too much.

We're hoping to develop more of our value added products, and I did bring our first sample of of our soothing herbal tea blend that I just wanted to offer you guys to see what it is that we're --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So the gift is greatly appreciated, and there are obviously general restrictions on public officials receiving gifts during a hearing from people who are seeking a decision from us.

THE WITNESS: I was mainly wanting to show you the labeling.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's fine. I want

to be clear. Person to person the gesture is very appreciated, but within the structures of the system we are working in, it would not be appropriate.

THE WITNESS: I respect that. I would like you to look at the labeling because -- maybe can we just pass one sample around, because we are a certified organic farm, and they regulate everything that goes in our products, every ingredient must be certified organic. And they have some very specific requirements about how the ingredients are described and how the organic certification is denoted, so on and so on. I wanted you to take a look at that.

We also have taken the opportunity to share some information about the underlying value system that we have built on our farm on, which is the name of our farm Ahimsa, which means nonviolence or non-harming.

We interpret that to mean honoring all life is sacred. So our goal is to grow healthy food in a way that enhances the life force of the land and rebuilds the soil as opposed to depleting it.

We don't use any chemicals, fertilizers or pesticides. We try to grow the amendments that we need to restore the soil right next to the orchards and the gardens so that we don't have to have a

negative impact on global warming by shipping in fertilizers from the mainland. We try to grow crops like comfrey, beterberg (phonetic), lourisidian (phonetic) where we can chop and drop it like a mulch, a fertilizer around the trees.

So we implemented a permaculture design.

It's not on a scale to be a large scale commercial farm, but it is a demonstration project where we can educate people who come and hopefully inspire them to take some of these ideas and apply them in their own home gardens, or even on the balcony of a condo. So

That's an important piece of what we are offering at the farming level.

We also have been a host of various community potlucks and gatherings for 30 years, wherever we have lived, we have opened up our home for full moon, vegetarian Thanksgiving. And when we we moved to this property. We saw it as a potential to really expand our agriculture, and also to have a lot of space around where we could create a place where people could gather without impacting the neighbors too significantly.

So the building that we built is a multipurpose building. It is zoned as an agricultural workshop for drying and processing the

herbs, like are present in the herb tea. And also we planted a lot of different kinds of bamboo, so it also was described for growing bamboo for musical instruments and toys.

But we did build it also as a place for people to come and gather. Sort of a multipurpose place.

I really appreciate having this opportunity to come before you, and the fact that you guys are volunteers, and I want to hopefully impart an appreciation for what we are doing. We're trying to make a positive difference in this world by, a part of the value system inherent in the Sacred Earth Assembly is to recognize that human beings are stewards for the planet for future generations.

And this is very consistent with malama aina, the core Hawaiian valve of taking care of the land so that we pass on something vibrant and beautiful for future generations.

And so as stewards of this planet, we need to figure out two main things. One of them is how to grow healthy food without depleting or polluting the environment. And we need to generate energy in a sustainable way that doesn't contribute to global warming.

So we do have demonstrations of both those
things. We have a photovoltaic system, and a
vertical access wind generator. So when I take
people around on our permaculture farm tours, I get
to educate and inspire people to move in that

direction.

And then we have a variety of foods that we are growing, both fruit orchards, herb gardens, a greenhouse, which we have used more lately to avoid rat lung disease problem on the island. Any greens that are consumed raw have the potential to transmit rat lung disease because of the relationship between slugs and rats. And we do have them on our property.

So for lettuces, we grow them in the greenhouse. And we use the greenhouse as a place to start our other plants so we can put them out in the field.

So the parallel development of our ministry arises out of our relationship with the Temple of Peace which is an interfaith ministry that honors many different paths, so that's something that Reverend Kedar St. John and our family sort of are resonant with.

So we, over the last 20 years, have helped with the Sunday services there. And it's in a fairly

small parcel of land, and so in part of our rationale for acquiring this large -- stretching to buy a 25-acre parcel, was so that we would have the possibility of inviting the community to come out and gather and learn about growing food and generating energy in that way.

I am concerned about the complaints raised by the neighbors. I feel that there was some misrepresentation and exaggeration on the level of impact that we have had on them. I have been very attuned and meticulous about trying to accommodate to the requests, especially of Michelle Drewyer, by hearing her concerns.

Basically they come down to this one stretch of driveway, which is actually our land. The shared driveway is a flag lot that is part of our property, and they have an easement, the Drewyers and Jerome Labat have an easement to use that. It's actually a very short little stretch of driveway that exposes the Drewyers, and to a lesser extent the Labats.

I actually do have some pictures that were in that record. I don't know if I can pass them around, but you can see there is really only about 100-foot view from Michelle Drewyer's where cars

drive off the Hana Highway, and then they're already on our land, because we own the driveway, but they disappear from their view onto our property and around our loop gravel drive to get to the lower portion of our land where our farming activities happen, and where this agricultural building is built that we are proposing to seek approval for church activities.

And there is a natural division. The upper portion or the southern portion of our property is where our home is, and it's fenced in. We have a private garden and some orchards there. But it's really quite separate from the lower area where the various farming activities happen.

So there's no -- a lot of people don't even know that our house is on the property. Once you leave the cul-de-sac and drive down to the lower portion, you're on the farm, and where our greenhouse is, and where our aquaculture ponds are, fruit orchard, coconut orchard, and our main garden field.

So that concern about activities on the 14.8 acres, bleeding over and extending to the other portion of our land really is a nonissue. We have agreed to confine the church services to the building itself.

And then we're hoping to get more volunteer help on the farm from people who are interested in learning to grow food sustainably. And that kind of activity will be in the vicinity of this agricultural building, hopefully soon to be church building. But it would certainly not displace or interfere with agriculture in any way. In fact, it will allow us to expand.

we have had the problem of not having enough money to hire farm help to weed and feed and harvest and bring it to market. And so we're hoping that as more and more people take an interest, we'll have people like Romy, who testified earlier, that recognized what we are doing, offered to volunteer and help us with our agricultural activities.

We have been holding every Wednesday from 9:00 to 1:00, open volunteer farm workday where we've done education about sustainable regenerative agriculture, and where I get to invite people, many times the young folks, to come out and I put them to work in the garden, and also show them some of the permaculture design elements, and then make a vegetarian lunch for them.

And I'm hoping we will get more help from people as they learn more about it.

So that issue of it displacing or taking away agriculture really doesn't apply, because our ministry is an earth-based spirituality where learning to grow food without polluting the earth is essential for passing on healthy planet for future generations.

I've been very attentive to making sure we always stop our gatherings at a reasonable hour, and I was very surprised to hear this reoccurring theme of drumming all night long. That does not conform to my experience in any way. Whenever we have had like Thanksgiving, potlucks, we always make sure to stop any amplified music by 9:30, and 10:00 is when we end the gathering.

The only exception is on New Year's we have had annual New Year's Eve celebrations. It has involved a celebration with music and so on, but we stop at 11:30 and go into a more of a sacred space, prayerful mode.

Reverend Kedar St. John brings the peace flame from the Temple of Peace. And we have the ceremony for praying for peace in the world. We light the sacred peace flame, and we have a prayerful moment. And that's been something that I've gotten a lot of feedback about, that people, many of whom are

elders who come to our place, I'm 59, and it's not like a wild party house like it was being described by Ms. Drewyer.

We have many mature elders. In fact, I think there's 17 letters of support in the record from people over 65. And so I wanted to set the record straight in terms of the nature of what we are doing.

And I have been very conscientious about making sure we do, and I've made other efforts to appease Michelle Drewyer. She was concerned about the cars coming onto our property and driving onto a portion of loop road that went across her viewplane. And in response to that -- actually within two days I happened to have a bulldozer on the property -- we created a large berme that made it so that as cars exit our land, the lights do not shine into her property.

But that actually wasn't sufficient for her. She just didn't like to have cars driving across her viewplane, even though it was on our property. And so we ended up setting aside maybe three acres of land adjacent to her property that we have left as an unused no man's land to create a buffer for her.

It's important to note too that her house is 1500 feet from the site of the proposed church, and she's told me many times that she cannot see or hear anything that happens in that building. She's mainly concerned about the cars turning off of the Hana Highway and going on our shared driveway for about 100 feet before they disappear onto our property.

And she has made some mention also of our dogs barking. We have done our best to keep them quiet when we have people come, they're watch dogs, they do bark for a minute, but it's not incessant nuisance barking. And my wife is home almost all the time, and she quiets them.

It's important to know we are not the only ones with dogs in the neighborhood. Michelle has three dogs. Freddy next door has two dogs. And sometimes the dogs will trigger each and they'll start howling and barking, but we do our best to close them down.

I want to point out on agricultural land animal sounds are part of it and allowed, so I really don't think that should be a reason to withhold our ability to have church on our land.

And I want to mention about Manawai. Just

recently I understood that there was an email chain sent out to the neighbors of the Manawai Home

Association. That's a street that's at least three quarters of a mile. It shows up in some of these pictures. It's quite far from our property.

And the only person I know on Manawai is

Ram Dass, the spiritual teacher who is among the

people who submitted letters of support. And I

believe the only letters that are contained in your

record that were submitted on time when testimony was

opened from people on Manawai is the letter from

Richard Albert or Ram Dass, who has been to our

property on a number of cases.

In fact, we built a disability ramp so that he could have access with his wheelchair. He had a stroke, so he needs to be able to bring his wheelchair into our property. So we are set up with ADA disability access.

I guess it is -- from the testimony of the folks from Manawai, I guess they can hear some music playing from our place across the gulch and across the half mile they live before their street comes. I cannot believe that it would be that disturbing, or how it could be very loud. Maybe they can hear some music in the distance.

And as they also testified, those louder gatherings haven't happened since 2015. And part of that is related to my sons. We have two sons that are 25 and 31 years old now, and they do have a musical band called Wolf Child. They have records and they're on You Tube and so on. They used to be living with us. And they would practice music in their teenage years. And they went through a period where they played electric guitar quite loud and so on.

But I would always make sure they would stop by 10:00 o'clock even when they were practicing. But it's been some years since they lived on our property. They live mostly in Seattle now and are on tour. So I think perhaps some of the louder disturbances that people are referring to are not reflective of our current situation, but are really reflective of a time five or six years in the past.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Dr. Abrams, I'm not trying to stop you, just marking that it's been about 15 minutes.

THE WITNESS: So I've made accommodation, we have made accommodations. We actually rerouted the access point to the lower portion of our farm to direct traffic away from Michelle Drewyer's

viewplane.

We've cut down some trees that had grown up into her viewplane, as soon as she expressed concern about that. I've really done my best to try to work with her, and it has been quite challenging.

The conditions that have been suggested by the Maui Planning Commission, and that were passed, are things that we feel that we can live within.

I was concerned about them stipulating exactly which days we can meet, that one of the Maui Planning Commissioners said, well, we got to give at least one weekend day to the neighbors where they can count on there not being gatherings. So we ended up, the condition that was imposed to have Saturdays services only six times of the year, and even though I asked for a curfew of 10:00 o'clock to end our services, they imposed the condition of having any amplified music end by 9:00 p.m.

And the numbers were set for our regular weekly services up to 40 people; and then for holiday celebrations, up to 100 people, depending on the occupancy of this building.

So we're in the process of installing, getting designed and installing a fire sprinkler system that will then allow us to have a certificate

of occupancy. Up until now an agricultural workshop hasn't required that, but in order to have the permission to hold public gatherings as a church, we need to increase the fire protection for this building, even though it already has a fire stand that has amazing pressure, we are still being asked to incur quite a bit of an expense to put in this fire sprinkler system.

We are in that process getting it designed, and hopefully we will be doing a fund raiser to hope -- to be able to afford that.

But the Special Use Permit that was granted from the County goes into effect after the certificate of occupancy is granted, which comes after the fire sprinkler system has been installed and inspected by the fire marshal.

So that's when we hope to begin regular weekly church services. What we have been doing up until now for more informal gatherings of friends, community potlucks, birthday celebrations with the spiritual value. I do try to open our gatherings with prayer, a universal interfaith prayer, but it hasn't been a formal regular church service, which is in part where we're asking for you all to endure, so that we can have a regular gathering.

I am committed to honoring any concerns
that are raised by the neighbors. I've only gotten,
I think, one or two calls from any neighbor other
than Michelle Drewyer, and whenever anyone has
expressed a concern, I'm very willing to turn down
the music, close up the building, close the doors and
windows to keep the sound contained.

It's not like I've been flagrantly ignoring the complaints of my neighbors. And it's important to know that the property next to us owned by Jerome Labat, who is not here today, but he did submit a letter. His main residence is in California. Here's rarely on the property, maybe five or ten -- I don't know exactly -- but very few days a year is he actually present.

Then also Ms. Drewyer sends us a request to endorse her request to turn her place into a short-term vacation rental. And she has moved into town. Most of the times I see her dogs are not there a lot of the time, and I believe she is intending to turn her place into a short-term rental, so she will not be present as much as she has in the past.

If you look at the situation on the map and so on, we did choose the furthest most spot on our property. It's on the plateau surrounded by gulch on

three sides. That gulch is 150 feet deep and maybe a quarter or half a mile at places of untamed jungle.

3 It's almost like we have a mote and natural

protection around this building that we are proposing for church. And there no neighbors right there. The

6 closest neighbor is more than 1000 feet away.

And we also planted bamboo in such away to create a sound and visual barrier. We have a semi-circle to do our best to contain what we do in that building, another accommodation we made to the neighbors.

I saw just in the last couple of days there was a letter submitted by a former neighbor, John Cahill. I don't know if it is formally allowed into the record. It just came into the record a couple days ago. But I was really surprised because he said that he has asked that, you know, he was expressing concern about us building the temple building in his viewplane, and that we flagrantly ignored that.

And said we -- you know, he just mischaracterized what happened, because when we were laying out the area for the temple, he came over and said, this building is going to be in my viewplane. Can you put this somewhere else?

I said there's one more site out on the

point. So we agreed and did move the building to accommodate his request, yet he submitted the letter to the contrary.

And similarly, we rerouted the visitors coming into our property to avoid Ms. Drewyers' point of view, and he framed it that we did it to keep cars away from our own homes, which is absolutely opposite of the case, because it routed the cars right by our home.

So there are some misrepresentations and inaccuracies and exaggerations, I believe, of how much impact would our activities have had in the past and may have in the future.

And I'm committing to honoring whatever conditions you all set, or that have been set by the Maui Planning Commission. And I do think it's an important part of the service that we provide in addition to inspiring people of all ages to grow food in a natural way.

This earth-based interfaith spirituality is very inclusive, and so we're inviting people of any religious bent who share the value of honoring the earth and who see human beings as stewards of the planet for future generations to affirm our common heritage.

We are all children of one planet and we all want to have grandchildren that have fresh water to drink and good food to eat. So it's the great common denominator that allows people of different beliefs to find some union and solidarity around growing food, generating energy, and protecting our planet for the future generations.

In that sense it is a welcoming circle for people of any age, any belief system, and hopefully will inspire and become a demonstration project for people who want to learn more about growing food.

And hopefully addressing the food sovereignty issue on this island. You know, we import about 85, 90 percent of the food here. And there is a lot of depleted land there in the sugarcane areas and the old pineapple areas that have had a lot of abuse.

And we're demonstrating that it is possible to regenerate the soil by introducing microorganisms, worms and using fishponds, where the nutrient waters from the ponds helps to irrigate and fertilize the surrounding area.

So we are providing an example that hopefully will be part of the solution that this island needs.

1 While inviting people to come together, and
2 in a shared celebration of life. So the ministry
3 invites people to come together to share locally
4 grown food, to celebrate holidays, like we've had our

Sometimes we have maybe 50, 75 people that turn up. We have this amazing feast without needing to kill any animals, and a beautiful time with the children.

annual Thanksqiving vegetarian potluck for 30 years.

sharing locally grown food, and we also do rights of passage for community members. Like it was mentioned, we had a number of birthday celebrations. We had a friend who had ALS who was dying of Lou Gehrig's disease, and she got to have her celebration while she was still alive. And her three ex-husbands, and all her grandkids were there.

We just recently held a memorial for Aunty
Pua Mahoi, local kanaka maoli elder who really was a
dear friend, and her whole extended family came out.
We offered that as a free offering to the community.

We've hosted some of the organizing meetings that took on Monsanto, GMO problems, and so on.

So we are asking for your support and

recognition that we're doing something positive and worthwhile on this island, and any concerns about the neighbors I'm very willing to abide by the conditions that are imposed.

I ask for you to support what we're doing and let us leave today with a Special Use Permit.

It's been -- we went through three hearings before the Maui County Planning Commission. I submitted the initial application more than two years ago, and it's been quite a journey. And I'm really optimistic that we'll be able to work out something here with you all today. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioner Wong?

COMMISSIONER WONG: We've gone been going for more than an hour. The court reporter needs a break, but also I would like to also consult with the board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the board's powers, duties, privileges and liabilities, so I was wondering if we could --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Lunch break as well as executive session, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER WONG: This is regarding the public witness' testimony today, and what is record and what is not considered record.

1 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Second. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. 3 So the motion has been made by Commissioner 4 Wong, seconded by Commissioner Ohigashi to consult 5 with the board's counsel regarding, under HRS 92-4, 6 and particularly it talks about the nature of public 7 testimony and a hearing on a Special Use Permit. 8 If we go into executive session, we will 9 combine this with a lunch period for the 10 Commissioners. 11 Mr. Hakoda, when will lunch be available to 12 us? 13 CHIEF CLERK: I can make a run to pick it 14 up. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So about 15 minutes 16 or so? Does it work for the parties if we reconvene 17 back here at 1:00? 18 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there discussion on the motion before us? There was a second, 20 21 Commissioner Ohigashi seconded it. Thank you 22 Commissioners. 23 Any discussion on the motion? If not, all 24 in favor say "aye". Anybody opposed? The motion 25 carries. The Commission will go into executive

1 session. 2 We will lead the executive session at some 3 point during lunch, and then we will reconvene in 4 public session at 1:00 o'clock. 5 (Executive session and noon recess.) 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aloha, it's 1:01 and 7 we're back on the record. When we left for executive session and our 8 9 break, Dr. Abrams had concluded his testimony, and 10 then a motion was made by Commissioner Wong to go into executive session. 11 12 Are there questions before we proceed with 13 Commission questions? Any questions from the County? 14 15 MR. HOPPER: No, Mr. Chair. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Office of Planning? 17 MS. APUNA: Yes, actually I did have a 18 couple of questions. 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION 20 BY MS. APUNA: 2.1 Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Abrams. 22 When we look at Exhibit A, which is the 23 map, we understand it's broken into three parts, A, B and C. 2.4

No. So this is Lew Abrams responding.

25

Α

1 The map was originally drawn up when we 2 thought about condominimizing, but we never did that. 3 So those are residue labeling on the map, but that is 4 not the case. 5 But for purposes of this Special Permit, I 6 think there is a section A, section B and section 7 C -- or Section A that part of parcel closest to the 8 highway --9 A Right, that's where our home is. 10 Q Part B is where the farm is, is that 11 correct? 12 Α B and C together have farming activities. 13 And the Special Permit from what you 14 understand covers parcel B and C; is that correct? 15 It depends on which map you choose to 16 But, yes, it's predominantly B and C. accept. 17 So B includes the farm, is that correct? 18 As well as C has farming as well, but 19 there's a lot of farming activity on B, yes. 20 And so my question is why does B, which is 21 a farm, require a Special Permit? 22 Isn't it just agricultural use? So do you 23 need a Special Permit for that area? 24 It's true. The primary focus of our Α

Special Use Permit is the agricultural building

25

that's out on the point. That would be under the part C, but because we're inviting people to participate in learning about farming and regenerative farming, we included 14.8 acres around that building. But the activities that people will be involved in will be agricultural. Yes.

So it's not essential, but it's the area where we'll let people get their hands in the soil and learn.

Q So there will be agricultural activities, but are there other nonagricultural activities on the farm that justify this Special Permit including that area?

A Predominantly it's all agricultural activities on -- it looks -- it would be parcel C. We did build a medicine wheel that's out in the field, which is a stone ring where prayers would be -- could be made. That would be more church-related activity.

But, no, there's nothing that congregants would participate in outside the building that would not be related to agriculture.

Q But it's not solely agricultural uses on the farm? I'm just trying to understand what justifies this Special Permit to extend upon the farm

area, which is, from what I'm hearing, mostly agricultural uses.

A Right. Well, it's integrated in that the earth-based spirituality that we're encouraging people to embrace, involves learning how to grow food naturally.

So we included the farm area so that people can participate. But we also have a business that isn't the ministry that is a farm called the Ahimsa Sanctuary Farms LLC. And we, you know, have orchards and such, and harvest and bring stuff to market.

Q Right. So those are the agricultural uses.

But are you saying that the spiritual practices are not agricultural uses, and therefore, that is why you require a special permit for that farm area?

A No, it's all integrated. So the actual services, like prayer ceremonies, will happen in the building. That was what got established at county level.

- Q Which is in C?
- A Labelled C, yes.
- Q Is it not possible to just get this Special Permit for lot C, and not have it for lot B? Because lot B does not seem to have any nonagricultural uses

1 | that would require a Special Permit.

A It could have been possible to go for that, but we decided to go up to what was allowed of the just under 15 acres.

There are some outbuildings, farm workshops and stuff that are included in B and C, and the future ohana that we're applying for. And at some point, as was questioned about visiting teachers and stuff, it would be nice to be able to have a place to offer a visiting teacher to stay.

Right now when some people like that come through, we put them up in our home.

Q So it might be that some of the nonagricultural uses may spill into lot B; that's not even necessarily a true statement.

A Lot B has predominantly agriculture on it, that's where the fishponds are.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may, when you're referring to lots, these are not lots of record, correct, you're referring to?

THE WITNESS: No.

MS. APUNA: I think it was an earlier -- I guess the Applicant can explain, but it was for a different use --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: In your questioning,

it might be slightly confusing when reading the 1 2 transcript that you're referring to them as lots. 3 Q (By Ms. Apuna): Elements, element A, B and 4 С. 5 Right. We use this map, which was surveyed 6 and laid out for condominumization, so they are 7 labeled as A, B, and C, but they're not formally subdivided. 8 9 But it helps for us to reference what is Q 10 going on in the Special Permit? 11 Α Yes. 12 Q Thank you. No further questions. 13 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners, 14 questions for Dr. Abrams? 15 Commissioner Chang. 16 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much 17 for being here this afternoon. I just have a couple 18 of questions. 19 One, is your -- is everything that you told 20 us here today part of the testimony that you provided 21 to the Planning Commission? 22 THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe so. 23 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So is it your -- is it

also your position that the application for your

Special Use Permit of 14.8 acres is accurate?

24

25

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So you are not

3 proposing to use more than 14.8 acres?

4 THE WITNESS: Definitely not.

5 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Was your determination

intentional in keeping it under 15 acres?

THE WITNESS: Yes, to avoid being before

8 the State Land Use Commission.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: That's a really good point. Did your counsel raise that question, or you raise that question before the Planning Commission?

THE WITNESS: We did. We challenged the whole referral to the State Land Use Commission because it seemed to be based on the letter exchange between Ms. McLean and the head of the State Land Use Commission based on a hypothetical description of our case, which was not accurate; and the factors that were delineated in that letter that would warrant a referral to the Land Use Commission, were if our special use activities would replace or displace agriculture, which clearly they do not; or if the activities would spill over beyond the 14.8 acres, which there's no reason that they would.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: So you are -- it is your consistent testimony that your application is

accurate at 14.8 acres, that is the area that you are including for this Special Use Permit?

beginning, two, three years ago when we submitted our original application. The only thing that has changed, it's still 14.8 acres, but some adjustment of whether or not to include the driveway leading down to that farm area, so to address that, we submitted a second map that sliced off a little of the land that's down in the gulch, inaccessible 200 feet down in a jungly gulch and added that same amount to accommodate the driveway.

So we submitted two maps either way, if you wanted to include the driveway, we can go with the map that does that or not.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Is your property within the Special Management Area?

THE WITNESS: It is.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: And are the buildings, the structures that you have on the property right now, have they all been permitted?

THE WITNESS: Yes. We went through that SMA project, submitted plans for every single little shed and outbuilding.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: I'm also hearing from

1 | you that --

THE WITNESS: Could I add one thing?

The agricultural building that is currently built as an agricultural workshop, we did submit that through the SMA process asking for approval to making it a church, and that was approved and is on our SMA plan.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you for that clarification.

Is it also your testimony that the land that's being proposed, this 14.8 acres that is being proposed for this church use, is it also suitable for agricultural use as well?

THE WITNESS: It is. We're regenerating the depleted pineapple soil. It was rated like C or D which is not best. But we are growing food on that. We brought in a lot of amendments and we're working on it. The first five years it hardly produced anything. It was all about regenerating the soil.

And still many of our trees are still keikis and not really producing -- you know, in another ten years we will have bumper crops of citrus, coconuts.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Let me ask you a

- 1 procedural question.
- There were some of your neighbors who said
- 3 | they didn't know about the Planning Commission
- 4 hearings. Did you notify any of your neighbors of
- 5 | the meeting?
- THE WITNESS: We sent out registered letter
- 7 | for every neighbor within 500 feet.
- 8 COMMISSIONER CHANG: Are the neighbors that
- 9 were here today, are they within 500 feet?
- 10 THE WITNESS: Michelle is. The folks from
- 11 Manawai are about three quarters of a mile away, so
- 12 they didn't appear on that radius of what we needed
- 13 to notify.
- 14 COMMISSIONER CHANG: So Michelle Drewyer,
- she did receive notification from you of the Planning
- 16 Commission hearings?
- 17 THE WITNESS: I believe so. We sent it
- 18 out, yes.
- 19 COMMISSIONER CHANG: All right. Thank you
- 20 very much. I appreciate your testimony.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
- 22 Commissioner Chang.
- Commissioner Ohigashi.
- COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: SMA Permit process,
- 25 you said you identified it as a church use, is that

1 right?

THE WITNESS: Proposed future church use.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was there an indication at that time whether or not the permit was issued with that, doing an analysis, environmental analysis, SMA analysis as a proposed church?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. That was part of our SMA Application. We worked with Keith Scott. Met with him several times and told them what we hoped to accomplish and submitted revised maps and got every little shed and outbuilding. Yeah, it was all part of that.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is that part of the record today?

THE WITNESS: Is our SMA plan part of the record? I know that I testified in the County

Planning to the degree that we have Special

Management Area approval. I don't know -- I don't recall seeing the actual paperwork in there.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Now, the other thing I wanted to ask you about was: Technically, these boundaries that you're indicating, those are files -- sorry, I will endeavor to speak loudly, all in caps.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I hear you.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: In your original
2
      filing you indicated -- and that's part of the
 3
      Planning Commission or the Planning Department's
 4
      first report, the first thing in the report.
5
                There was a map indicated that the Planning
 6
      Department had relied upon to determine the uses as
7
     part of the application; is that right?
                THE WITNESS: I believe so.
8
9
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And if I remember
10
      correctly, reading the record, it appeared that
11
      somewhere in either August, at the August meeting,
12
     that you submitted another map?
13
                THE WITNESS: Yes, a revised map.
14
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And do we know if
15
     that map is part of the record?
16
                THE WITNESS: The revised map is definitely
17
     part of the record.
18
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: How do we know
19
     that?
20
                THE WITNESS. There's two of them.
21
                Because I handed them out to the
22
     Commission, both of those maps.
23
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was there a ruling
24
     by the Commission to accept it as part of the record?
25
                THE WITNESS: I believe so. It appeared
```

1 that it was accepted, yeah. 2 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's your 3 recollection? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: If your counsel can 6 point me to a point in the record, I would be glad to 7 figure out later on. And in that submittal, what you did was 8 9 included the roadway, the second submittal, you 10 included the roadway into the calculations. 11 Is that right? 12 THE WITNESS: Right, because that issue --13 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Wait, wait. 14 You included that, and you trimmed off some 15 of the, I guess, parts of the gulch so it still remained 14.8? 16 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Do you -- I 19 couldn't find any kind of finding that the Planning 20 Commission did in order to make that determination 21 that it was 14.8 acres. 22 Are you familiar with any part of the 23 record or any findings that they issued concerning

THE WITNESS: Well, the initial map that I

24

that?

had presented was --

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not asking you about your maps. I'm just asking, do you recall in the record there was a finding by the Commission that the second map constituted 14.8 acres?

THE WITNESS: I believe we left it open to the Commission which way they wanted to go, because there was some ambiguity about whether or not the driveway should be included.

So we gave them both options. If they did want to include the driveway, we got a version of the map that is 14.8 acres. And that calculated by our architectural drawing, using his computer to figure out where the 14.8 acres would fall if we were to include the driveway.

And so I know that both options were offered to the Planning Commission. I seem to recall that our attorney asked them to make a finding and accept which map, but there was some uncertainty about whether driveways, traditionally, apparently, at least at County level, driveways have not been included.

And there was testimony by the Assistant Director of Planning to that degree. And so I believe we offered, whichever one was going to work

basically. But they're both 14.8 acres according to
the software program that our architectural drawer
who worked with this map determined.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I was interested in OP's, Office of Planning's questioning of you concerning the different sections.

And it sounds like what you're saying is that the agricultural pursuits on B is related to church uses on C.

THE WITNESS: There is agricultural uses on B and C. We have coconut orchards --

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand. I'm asking a specific question.

The reason why you asked to extend this beyond the C portion, is that on that B portion you're conducting agricultural uses and those agricultural uses are integral to your church; is that the reason?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think so. Also just for future possibilities down the line.

At some point we're thinking about maybe offering training, administerial training in Sacred Earth Assembly. We would like to be able to possibly have land that we can bring in some future ministers.

It was just to maximize the options as this

church develops over time, we have sons that are 1 2 going to carry this into the future. And so we 3 wanted to get the largest range of possibilities 4 staying under the 15 acres. 5 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I see. 6 And so then is it your plan to extend 7 construction within the C area? THE WITNESS: Not at this time. 8 9 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand. But 10 is it your --11 THE WITNESS: Actually where we would 12 imagine putting a seminary would be actually in the 13 area near where the church is, so that is C. But we 14 don't have any plans drawn up for that, nor do we 15 have a budget. We have no budget to build anything. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: What about the B 16 17 section? THE WITNESS: B section. No, we have Act 18 19 203 building there that we've asked to be accepted as 20 an ohana, so we have a permit about that, but that's 2.1 not related to the church at this time. 22 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: You mentioned this 23 that your sons will be taking over. So is this use 24 going to extend?

THE WITNESS: I hope so. We had asked for

25

five years of approval, but the Maui County Planning
Commission would only grant us one.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is it your intent to have the church there permanently?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I built that church to last with stucco, and major foundation, footings with board cement. That thing is going to last at least 100 years.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: As such, would you be considering a boundary amendment rather than Special Use Permit, so that it would be under the control of the County as an Urban District permitting a church?

THE WITNESS: No, I never asked that.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Your lawyer is shaking his head no.

THE WITNESS: When we read the agricultural rules that church use is allowed with a Special Use Permit, so I didn't think there was any reason to change the boundary -- I didn't even know about that.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: There are pursuits you can do, right? You can get a permit that is inherently or maybe temporary use, and has to be renewed every so often. And there is a boundary amendment that would be permanent and allow you the

existing use.

2.1

My question to you then is that which appears to be the least restrictive mechanism of permitting a church to be built?

THE WITNESS: I guess I would have to learn more about the boundary issue. I'm not familiar with that.

I was concerned that we were limited to only one year, even though the County Planning

Department recommended approval for five years which allows for fundraising and planning and so on, and it's been two-and-a-half years since we submitted the application, so I would prefer to have a longer period that the Special Use is granted for.

And if there are some advantages to revise the boundary -- oh, I know what that might be about. Our parcel of 25 acres is not allowed to have any further subdivision, because it was spun off from an original 75 acres, and we got the largest parcel of that subgrouping, and written into our deed is that it can't be subdivided and sold.

That's one of the reasons we looked in the condominimization issue, but we decided not to do that.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I have no

1 questions.

- 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
- 3 Commissioner Ohigashi.

training live?

- VICE CHAIR CABRAL: You just based a comment that in the future you would like to build another house, or you got plans for an ohana house under ohana permitting, I guess, to build a second house that might be for ministers or people in
- 10 THE WITNESS: Currently just as a second
 11 farm-worker's dwelling.
- VICE CHAIR CABRAL: That is the correct lingo, I think.
 - So then you just also just now mentioned you would like to build maybe a building, a seminary for multiple people to be able to get training.
 - So I'm trying to get a vision of your bigger plan is to have a church so that you would have more church buildings and more church services, and more church, you know, a rather large campus.
 - THE WITNESS: I would hope it would grow possibly, but we have no immediate plan or budget to do any of that.
- VICE CHAIR CABRAL: The concern I have is that once you get the zoning or the permits to do it,

```
then the door is starting to open in that regard.
1
2
                I'm just trying to figure out what your
 3
     vision and your plans are. Thank you very much.
 4
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
     Commissioner Cabral.
5
 6
                Commissioners? No further questions,
7
     Commissioners? If I may.
                So I understand correctly, based on the
8
9
      information you provided to us and transmitted to us
10
     by the County that this property is less than fully
11
     developed; is that correct?
12
                There is ag, but there is not like
13
     buildings all over or roads all over?
14
                THE WITNESS: It's 25 acres, 8 of it is
15
     down in the gulches where it's really hard to get to.
16
     And there's open pasture lands that we haven't
17
     planted out fully with orchards, but we do have
18
     orchards and gardens and fishponds and greenhouse
19
     already up.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I didn't see it in
20
21
     all of what was transmitted to us.
22
                Was there any examination of existence of
23
      any historic trails or other kinds of --
```

THE WITNESS: When we originally got the

permit to put up the agricultural building that we

24

25

are asking to be approved for church use, there was a study about Hawaiian burial and bones and the Anthropological Society, we had to get someone out there and they reviewed it and concluded that there was nothing that would preclude us using the parcel in part because it had been used for 20 or 30 years for commercial pineapple, and they tilled it already.

So there was nothing that we were going to do that was going to affect that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So is that study is part of the documents in front of us?

THE WITNESS: I belief there is a sheet in there from that office saying that they had no concerns and we could go forward.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So maybe you or your counsel can point to that study.

So there's a duty this Commission has.

Actually other boards and commissions have in a court case called Ka Pa'akai o ka aina. Are you familiar?

THE WITNESS: I'm not.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So we have to make specific findings as to the scope and identity of any traditional and customary native Hawaiian practices that may exist in the area that we are making a decision on.

If any exist, the impact of any proposed use on them, and if there is the impact, the actions that may be taken if there is such an impact.

And it is possible in areas that are historically heavily used for other purposes, such as agriculture, that those practices and resources no longer exist on the property. But we are required under this court decision to make documentation of that fact in our decisionmaking.

So I'm trying to understand on the record as presented to us whether there is any specific, what are often referred to as Ka Pa'akai findings.

THE WITNESS: I believe down in the gulches there was like old Hawaiian, evidence of lo'is. And so we're hoping to restore that some day and get to grow taro when the water is restored.

Right now the East Maui Irrigation Ditch basically steals the water that would be coming down the two gulches on either side of the main plateau where our land is, and takes it around to the dry side of the island.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The Haiku Ditch is adjacent to the property?

THE WITNESS: It actually is in a tunnel right under it. And daylights in the gulch. There's

like avocado trees and things down in there that
makes one think that it could be a useful
agricultural zone.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So you are aware that there is stuff in the ditch that is possibly traditional lo'i kalo terraces?

THE WITNESS: Really not terraces. There's a streambed that has been impinged upon by the ditch that takes the water, instead of letting it flow to the sea, it gets caught in this cement pipe basically, and taken around. And our hope is to restore that flow.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: So there is this finding in the record that my attorney is just -- it's page 12 archaeological, historic and cultural resources.

Should I read it?

It should be noted that there is no construction associated with the proposed church use, hence, the application was not transmitted to the Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division for review and comment. Because the property is located within the Special Management Area SHPD has reviewed applications transmitted previously.

In a comment letter dated December 3rd, 2009, which is when we began construction on that building, SHPD noted that an archeological inventory survey was conducted by Scientific Consultant Services in 1996. Three historic sites were identified, but the two closest to the project area are the discontinuous road segments and the Haiku Ditch. A plantation era irrigation ditch that is still utilized and recommended for preservation through avoidance and protection. It was also determined that there would be

It was also determined that there would be no effect on historic resources. Previous correspondence that SHPD has provided is attached as Exhibit 22.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So, Mr. Iczkovitz, maybe you can point to exactly where in our materials that is.

THE WITNESS: It says page 12.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Page 12 from Ms. McLean,
Department of Planning report.

THE WITNESS: It is in the report.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Dr. Abrams, just read from page 12 of the Maui Planning Commission report submitted on Docket No. SUP2 2017/0011. That's page 12 of that report submitted by Ms. McLean.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Okay. Thank you.

Last thing I'll just say in reference to something you said, from the benefit of serving three years on the Oahu Island Burial Council, I understand that it sometimes -- often is said, oh, this area was in ag, it was plowed, never going to find anything. We found burials on Oahu beneath sugarcane fields that were cultivated for over a century, beneath sidewalks in Urban Honolulu, beneath buildings in Urban Honolulu.

It is absolutely not the case that just because something has been used agriculturally that there is not a chance of finding something.

THE WITNESS: I can just say that in the various trenching and things of digging holes and planting trees we have never come across anything.

And if we did, we would treat it with the utmost respect and call in the archaeologist. I would want to honor the host culture.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Anything else, Commissioners? If not, Mr. Iczkovitz, you can proceed with your argument.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Appreciate the time.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: At this time we are asking

the Land use Commission to approve the Special Use
Application for the Abrams to operate their Sacred

3 Assembly Church, 14.8 acres of their 25 acre --

2.1

COURT REPORTER: You need to slow down and speak really clearly.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: This request is based upon the record that was developed before the Maui Planning Commission over three hearings, after multi-year process.

The Maui Planning Department has recommended approval with the restrictions and conditions specified at the August 13th Maui Planning Commission meeting to address any potential adverse effect upon the neighbors. They added these conditions, that was the purpose for that.

State Office of Planning is also recommending approval with the same conditions including there will be no adverse effect upon the neighbors.

And as Dr. Abrams said, this is an interfaith church that treats the aina as sacred.

And the more church use, the more church goers, will increase the agricultural activity.

With regard to the public comments that were submitted by some of the neighbors the last few

days, we believe that all these comments relate and their allegations are not relevant, but many are untrue, and the fact is that there have been conclusions that were included, but there are no specific facts.

The letters that were sent from the people in Manawai was sent after the hearing was closed on May 28, sent to the Maui Planning Commission. The Maui Planning Commission did not accept these letters in their record, and there is no reason for this Commission, we submit, to accept these letters, because again, these are just conclusions, not citing facts.

And we would note that the last time they had a problem was New Year's Eve five years ago.

And I want to note that the only document in the record of Manawai is from Ram Dass who is a spiritual teacher to millions of people around the world. And his letter is strongly in favor of the Special Use Permit, and talks about all of the wonderful things that Dr. Abrams and his wife have done for this community.

And I submit, if you read the record, the 41 letters of support from community records, the dozens of people who show up to testify or sign

petitions in favor. But the concerns raised by the neighbors are fear-based exaggerations of what might occur in the future.

But the Abrams have considered the neighbors, and always ending the gathering by 10:00 p.m. That's the testimony. The fears expressed are not based on reality.

And no one has tried to cite a single fact that any evidence of any events that may have violated zoning within the last four or five years.

MR. ABRAMS: Can I interrupt just for a second. There are 27 letters, not 41.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Total of 41 if we add them all.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Procedurally we can't really take in comments from the back. You are certainly welcome to lean over and try and get the attention of your counsel and have him say something.

MR. ABRAMS: All right. Thank you.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: The record before this shows the testimony of the people who showed up, shows all the letters that were submitted before the May 28th hearing, at the May 28th hearing, and at the August 13th hearing. And the support from the community is overwhelming.

We believe that he has all the
qualifications necessary to get a Special Use Permit.

The findings have been that there will be no adverse

effect on the neighbors.

And with regard to the -- I don't know if I should address the issue now about the other driveway. What happened on June 25th is that discussion -- I can cite pages -- discussion was held as to whether or not the Maui Planning Commission had jurisdiction over this matter. And after discussing at length the Commission decided that they're the ones that had jurisdiction.

Then at the August 13th hearing, after the interchange between Ms. McLean's letter, and Mr. Orodenker's, there was an indication that the Commission is now, even though at the June 25th, Mr. Hart, the Maui Planning Commission, specifically said in the past the driveway -- the access has never been used as part of -- considered to be part of the Special Use.

Based upon that, Maui Planning Commission said we have jurisdiction. After the interchange of letters back and forth, it appears that the Land Use Commission may be changing their policy and requiring the access road to be part of Special Use, be

considered part of the acreage to keep it under 14.8 acres.

So the record has clearly delineated the map submitted on June 25th is the 14.8 acres as determined by the architect precisely, that does not include the driveway.

The map that was submitted and discussed specifically on August 13th, said if you want it, if the Commission has a new policy that includes the driveways as part of the Special Use, here is 14.8 acres that includes the driveway.

So it's really up to the Commission. This is really a good opportunity to clear up perhaps for the County, if you include the access road, which you now said is your policy, because it hasn't been in the past, then please use the map we submitted on August 13th, because that includes 14.8 acres including the driveway with no evidence whatsoever in the record that the use, that the church use will expand beyond 14.8 acres. No evidence in the record to suggest that.

So we believe that the -- and even if you wanted to go beyond the 14.8 acres, if you make that finding, we are in front of the Land Use Commission, that if you still approve based upon what is in front

of it. But we don't believe there is anything in the record to find that because there is no findings made by the Maui Planning Commission or anywhere else that indicates the church use will expand beyond the 14.8 acres.

Without such a finding, we submit definitely our map that includes the driveway addresses what the Maui Planning Commission is concerned about and what the Land Use Commission possibly be concerned about.

And based upon that, we submit that we ask that the Land Use Commission approve this Application with the Special Conditions as provided and specified by Maui Planning Commission.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.

Commissioners? Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Iczkovitz, good to see you after 30 years. You probably don't remember me.

Anyway, part of the problem I personally am having with this case, there's really no delineated specific Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. In other words, we haven't been presented with a decision or proposed decision or anything from the Maui Planning Commission that clearly spells out

these are the specific findings, these are the
references to the record where these findings are
found; these are the conclusions of law with citation
to specific authority.

So a lot of the things we're trying to search and guess. And me personally, I'm getting a fear that, you know, under those circumstances, we might make a mistake, not only to the detriment of your client, but to the detriment of other people in the community.

For example, everyone seems to agree we're dealing with a church here, correct?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: A private church.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: A religious

institution.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Well, it's a building that's been used for private gatherings, community gatherings, and the intention has always been with a Special Permit to be able to legally have a public church.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Where essentially nondenominational religious activities will be taking place as described in the record, correct?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Correct.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Is there anything in

2.1

the record which indicates what standard of review the Maui Planning Commission applied when it was reviewing your, your and your client's Application for a Special Permit?

When I say "standard of review", I mean whether it's the regular standard that's normally applied by administrative agencies, or whether it was what the courts call strict scrutiny. In fact, let's stop right there so we're all talking about the same thing.

You've heard of the term "strict scrutiny", correct?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Absolutely, especially in relationship to --

COURT REPORTER: Relation to what?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: The Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, which Commissioner previously referred to.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: That Act essentially cites what the general constitutional standard is under the First Amendment of the Constitution and as it applies to the State's Fourteenth Amendment, that statute really just recites or repeats what the general standard is under a whole line of United States Supreme Court cases; correct?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Basically, yes. I think
the law was passed specifically to clarify that
governments -- if governments want to regulate
churches and prevent the people from practicing their
religion, then they passed the law called RLUIPA that
requires the governmental agency to do strict
scrutiny. And they have to make sure that they
cannot impose a compelling -- I mean, cannot impose a
substantial burden on the practice of religion,
unless there is a finding that there is a compelling
governmental interest to do so.

And then if they find such an interest, the requirement under the law and the conclusion is that the restrictions be the least restrictive means as possible.

The way Maui County addressed that, and this is specified in Ms. McLean's report and throughout, is that by the Maui Planning Commission addressed -- the only issue is, quote, possible adverse effect on neighbors, because neighbors complained.

So the Maui Planning Commission considered all the evidence, and they decided that in order to minimize the effect on neighbors, they were going to make the restrictions that they imposed.

So instead of 10:00 o'clock, they imposed 9:00 o'clock; instead of five years, they said one one year. Because reality is, what they said is, we're going to give you a shot. We're going to give you one year. And if you do well, then you come back

and possibly have fewer restrictions.

Chairman Carnicelli specifically said that.

We're doing you a favor. You do it for one year, you do it right, and then you can do more. But we just want to give you an opportunity which is what we want.

We will show -- it's a requirement of the permit that we have to submit reports of compliance with the conditions which we will do. We will comply with all the conditions. Maui County Planning Commission has already made by decision that there will be no adverse effect on the neighbors by making those changes.

As far as requirements of Findings of Fact,

Conclusions of Law, I don't know that -- I don't

think -- whenever they pass, approve a Special Use

Permit and Maui Planning Commission, I could be

wrong, but I don't think Findings of Fact,

Conclusions of Law are a part of that unless there is

a contested case hearing and issues in dispute in

which case those issues in dispute have to be to determined by the Commission.

2.1

Since there weren't issues in dispute because the neighbors did not show up at the last hearing when they were invited to, and the information they submitted about alleged violations, all of them were excluded because you have no information in the record.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I don't mean to cut you off. And I'm not trying to represent your client, okay. And I can understand that for whatever reason it might include compromise, trying to be a good neighbor, trying to work with the neighbors, you and your client agreed to these conditions.

My question is: Is there anything in the record that indicates -- first of all, let me ask you this.

Do you believe that the standard that should have been applied in this case should be strict scrutiny?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Only if they are going to deny the application. By granting the application, if they are going to deny it or severely restrict it, then they would have to get (indecipherable).

But because it wasn't raised, and because

we could live with the restrictions that were imposed, we're saying these restrictions we think are a little onerous, but we believe the Maui Planning Commission has the authority to submit that, they believe that's fair and appropriate to protect the neighbors, and we will live by that.

So the need for strict scrutiny would only apply if there was denial, and then they would ask for more fact finding and something for the record so that a court or something could look at it, because if they tried to deny this, then there would be no question it would violate RLUIPA.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Because the Maui

Planning Commission agreed basically with a structure

or a form of the order or a formal permit which you

and your clients could live with, you basically were

waiving any argument or requirement that strict

scrutiny be applied.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Right. We have a right to say you don't have the right to limit us to one year and we want to appeal that. Do we have a right to do that? Sure. We are never going to -- we chose not to do that because Dr. Abrams and Mrs. Abrams are the most conflict reverse people. They want to get along with their neighbors. They want to get along with

everybody. Their intent has always been solid and from the heart.

So we're not asking for strict scrutiny.

We are not asking for reduction of the restrictions.

We are not asking to take away the Saturday

restrictions. These restrictions we will abided by

them.

Maui County spent three sessions. We spent five hours, six hours with Maui Planning Commission going through everything. And everybody had an opportunity to testify. And based upon this record, and this record which I believe the State Land Use Commission has to make its decision based upon.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER OKUDA:} \quad \mbox{Let me ask you one} \\ \mbox{more question then.}$

Based on the record, were there -- was there any discussion in the record? Because I read all the transcripts and read all the pages, but I couldn't see anything there. So maybe you can point to where in the record there was any discussion by the government entity, or anyone else, about least or more or lesser restrictive means to deal with the complaints that the neighbors were raising?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Well, the history of what happened here is that the -- May 28th hearing --

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I'm just asking you to point to the record where -- and it might not, there might not be anything in the record where there was a discussion about lesser restrictive alternatives, than the conditions that were imposed?

And by the way, I understand your position that you would like to just get this thing done, okay. And I'm not trying to create a theoretical thing.

But the reason why I'm asking these questions, without prejudging any of the outcome here is, I personally believe the First Amendment, you know, the right of people to practice their religion is fundamental to this country. People have died for those rights.

So that's why I'm trying to ask the questions which the supreme court, including the Hawai'i Supreme Court in this case, called State versus Armitage, that says we have to look at. You have a right to waive it, and if you waive it, maybe it doesn't apply in this case.

So where in the record was there any discussions by anybody about lesser restrictive alternatives?

If the answer is, there's nothing there,

1 | that's fine too.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: So what happened was this.

At the June 25th hearing, Maui Planning
Commission went through Ms. McLean's recommendations
for the permit. And they went through it and changed
almost every one. They changed it from five years to
one year. They changed it from 10:00 o'clock to
9:00 o'clock, and made other more restrictive things.

And we thought, okay, they went around it and said these are really restrictive. They were quite burdensome. They asked Dr. Abrams, are agreeable with these?

He said these are really strict, but if this is what it takes to get the permit today, we agree with it.

Then the Maui Planning Commission voted four to two to deny it completely. No discussion about strict scrutiny. No discussion about RLUIPA, even though I had mentioned RLUIPA. There was no discussion about that.

Then one of the Commissioners moved to deny the permit completely. Again, no discussion about strict scrutiny, no discussion about compelling interest. None of that discussion was raised.

At that point I went up and said, excuse

me, I need to remind the Commission about the First

Amendment of the Constitution, and about the

Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act,

because the last time that Maui County Planning

Commission denied a Special Use Permit for a church,

they did that because the neighbors complained. That

happened in 19 -- I mean, 2004. It was the Hale o

Kaula case. And Maui County lost that case in the

federal district court and was ordered to pay the

church attorneys over \$700,000 in legal fees.

and, you know, there is a law that you have to apply, that you have to consider. At that point, exactly what happened, there was a little more discussion for about five more minutes. And then one of the Commissioners moved to go into executive session.

Executive session happened. Ms. McLean was brought into the meeting. They talked for 45 minutes to an hour. What came back then was, as soon it was reopened. The person who had moved to deny the permit, withdrew the motion. The permit was denied.

I was then told that before any of the 104 pages that were submitted by neighbors by email after the close of testimony, before that would be submitted to the record, I would have the right to

cross-examine those neighbors regarding those documents. And the neighbors were all there, including Ms. Drewyer, and they asked for two-month's time to prepare for the cross-examination. chose not to show up for that August 13th meeting, and the documents they submitted were excluded as a result, because they were just -- there was no reason to talk to them because they're not in the record.

So then what happened over the next few hours, they went through -- again, went through the conditions and decided, and they discussed back and forth, you know, 9:00 o'clock, you know, how many days, whatever else.

So, again, there was extensive discussion throughout the record regarding what conditions should be applied to address the neighbors' complaints as far as the church activity.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, counsel.

Let me just acknowledge my fellow

Commissioner Ohigashi, who's a Maui Commissioner, for

pointing out to me the Hale, H-A-L-E, Kaula,

K-A-U-L-A, Church versus Maui Planning Commission

found at 229 fed sub 2d, 1050 a 2002 case.

Thank you very much. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,

1 | Commissioner Okuda.

2.1

2 Commissioner Chang.

3 COMMISSIONER CHANG: I have a few 4 essentially legal questions.

Is it your legal position that the Land Use Commission does not have jurisdiction over this Special Use Permit because the application is for land under 15 acres?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Our position is whatever the Land Use Commission wants to do with this application, we're good with. If you want to say you have jurisdiction based upon the record, we're still asking you to approve the Application based upon it.

We're saying there is room for you not to do so because there is no findings in the record from Maui Planning Commission, and indicate that they will go beyond 14.8 acres or that the church use will expand upon 14.8 acres.

Mr. Orodenker's letter of August 1st I thought was very clear and very well written in that it said that if Maui Planning Commission finds that the church use will go beyond 14.8 acres, then, yes, you have to send it to Land Use Commission.

And I can point to the record specifically, me asking the Commission to please make these

findings that was requested by Mr. Orodenker one way or another.

And the inquiry was made by Mr. Galazin,
Deputy Corp Counsel, Dr. Abrams, how is church use
going to affect agriculture?

I can quote you that page as well. And he gives a very long detailed description that it will not, it will only expand agriculture. That more church will mean more agricultural use.

So based upon that record we submit it was not possible for anybody from Maui Planning

Commission or anybody else, to make a finding that it would impact upon agricultural use.

And there was no findings possible to go beyond the 14.8 acres. But I do not believe that there's any controversy over whether or not the map that is presented to you, includes the driveway, which includes 14.8 acres. And there is nothing in the record to submit that anything is going above 14.8 acres.

But be that as it may, the one thing we don't want is for this Commission to delay this any further because there's no controversy before this body.

The issue is, have we met the

qualifications for Special Use Permit? Everyone,

County and State has recommended approval. The

record is very clear. And we believe that we're

entitled to a Special Use Permit based upon the

record.

2.1

your legal position is that -- so given what Mr.

Orodenker's letter said, that if you're going to go
beyond, and starts these possible scenarios, that the
Planning Commission, through the guidance of the
Corporation Counsel, addressed those specific issues?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: Addressing those issues, it was still within less than 15 acres and it's satisfied?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: But it is still your position, your legal position that it doesn't matter, it's up to the Land Use Commission whether they want to exercise jurisdiction or not?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Right. I think it's a good time for Land Use Commission to (A) let the Counties know does the access road, does it have to be included within the Special Use, because right now there is a lot of confusion in the County level.

```
COMMISSIONER CHANG: Where in the law -- I
1
2
     mean, where in the rules or law does it refer to the
3
     access road? As I read the rules, it just says
 4
      15 acres.
5
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: I can quote the June 25th
 6
     hearing. Mr. Hart, I can quote you --
7
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: No, that's okay.
8
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: My memory is, Mr. Hart
9
      stated that we've never considered in the past the
10
     access road to be part of the Special Use.
11
                So that was on June 25th on page --
12
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: I'll defer to you on
13
     that one.
14
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: That was page 37.
15
                Then also Mr. Galazin said it was not
16
     uncommon for the County to deal with parcels greater
17
     than 15 acres, but the special use only uses less
     than 15. This is not an unusual thing.
18
19
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: So you've answered my
20
     question.
21
                My next legal question. I'm hearing you
22
      say it's up to the Land Use Commission,
23
      notwithstanding what the rule say or what the statute
24
      says, anything less than 15 acres, it's up to the
```

Commission whether they what to exercise jurisdiction

25

or not. Yes or no?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: With respect to the testimony we heard today, the public comments, including from Dr. Abrams as well.

Do you believe that those are -- those should be considered by the Land Use Commission in its deliberation on the SUP that came up from the Maui County Planning Commission?

Do you believe that the public comments that we heard today should be considered in our deliberation?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I believe that the comments from the Manawai Association should not be considered, because they had opportunity to submit it before May 28th. They did try to submit before the August 13th hearing, and the Maui Planning Commission chose not to reopen to allow it in.

So, yes. I do not believe that they should be considered. I believe a positive testimony, of course (indecipherable). We're here because we knew that there would be some opposition. And some people said, would you like us to come, and they came to support.

If you want to ignore all of it, that's

okay too. We want the Commission to rely upon the record from the Maui Planning Commission. That's what we're going with -- we believe it's complete. Map is complete. There are no uncertain issues for the Land Use Commission that has to find any more fact finding or anything else. We believe it's complete.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: You say you want the Land Use Commission. Do you believe we have the discretion to consider testimony outside the record that was sent up by the Planning Commission?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: You have to push your -Administrative Procedures Act allows you to take
public testimony which you just did. And you can
consider it. But I believe that the only testimony
that is valid is speaking to the record.

I do not believe they have any legal justification to add to the record. They can speak to it. They can talk about the record says X, Y, Z.

But efforts to come up with more evidence of violation, alleged violation, no. None of those are proper, because it's too late. The record is gone for that.

COMMISSIONER CHANG: One last question.

Can you confirm that the neighbors received

```
1
     notification of the Planning Commission hearing?
2
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes. All the neighbors
 3
      that were legally required to receive notice received
 4
     notice.
5
                But I will also add that Mrs. Drewyer's
 6
     boyfriend, Joel Katz, who is a member of the Manawai
7
     Association, Ms. Drewyer always knew about this
8
     hearing. Her boyfriend must have known about this
9
     hearing. And through her boyfriend, the Manawai
10
     Association must have known about before the May
      28 --
11
12
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: What I'm asking, it's
13
     not the Land Use Commission hearing, it's the
14
      Planning Commission hearings. I want to get a
15
      confirmation from you that all of the neighbors that
      adjoin this property received notification of the
16
17
     Maui Planning Commission hearings on this matter?
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.
18
                COMMISSIONER CHANG: Thank you very much.
19
20
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
21
      commissioner Chang.
22
                Commissioner Ohigashi.
23
                How's our court reporter doing?
24
                COURT REPORTER: I'm doing okay.
25
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We will have to take
```

1 a break. We will lose the presence for the rest of 2 the day of Commissioner Chang. 3 Commissioner Ohigashi. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I just have a few 4 5 questions. 6 So I took a look at Exhibit 22 that was 7 referred to in Michelle -- Department of Planning's 8 statement. And the DLNR letter that you're relying 9 upon, or was relied upon, April 24th, 2009, 10 referencing a 1996 survey done in response to a 11 question about wind turbines and solar storage 12 containers on the property. 13 So my questions to you: Has there been a 14 recent review by DLNR that would support this letter 15 as part of the record? 16 (Commissioner Chang leaves.) 17 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I don't believe so. I 18 don't believe that the Maui Planning Department has 19 not asked for one, and no one has asked for one, so the answer is no. 20 21 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just asking if 22 there was one. 23 MR. ICZKOVITZ: No, not that we know of.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: In fact, it would appear that that's the only reference that we can

24

25

find in the record, is that right, the 2009 letter? 1 2 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I cannot say I know the 3 record well enough with regard to this particular 4 issue, since this issue has never come up. I've not particularly looked for this. 5 6 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Well, you seem to 7 be well versed in the record with regard to what is in it and what is not. So I'm asking you, is that 8 9 the only thing we're relying on? 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Hold on. One moment, 11 Commissioner Ohigashi. 12 This is an interchange between you and your 13 counsel for the Applicant, correct? 14 So if you're not speaking into the 15 microphone, and you're not currently called as a 16 witness, I understand you have things to say, but you 17 need to tell your counsel and have him say it. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is that the only 18 19 thing in the record at this time? 20 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I believe so, yes. That 21 was what we were asked for, and that's what we did. 22 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm a little 23 confused.

24 First you say that the roadway was not 25 included as part of the original submission, is that 1 right?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: We are saying 14.8 acres did not include the driveway because we were told that the access road does not -- wasn't included within the Special Use that has been the policy of Maui County always.

7 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is this policy 8 written?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: You would have to ask Ms.

McLean. I do not know if it is written. I just know they stated that on the record at the Maui Planning Commission multiple times.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And you relied on Mr. Hart?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I relied on Ms. McLean, because she did not specify anything with regard to that original recommendation. And then when the issue was fully discussed at Maui Planning Commission on June 25th, Mr. Hart spoke to that directly.

After he spoke to that directly, Maui
Planning Commission accepted that explanation and
decided, yes, jurisdiction is proper here at Maui
Planning Commission. Did not have to go to Land Use
Commission. That was the decision they made.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So there's no

specific rule or regulation that you can come up with that establishes your interpretation in regard to 3 Maui Planning Commission?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ICZKOVITZ: No. I just know based upon how the County has interpreted it, and now how the Land Use Commission Chairman (indecipherable) -indication that the policy may be changing. We are good with it either way, and maps either way.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: You do agree that the roadway is used for activities that had occurred on the property?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: The road is used to get to the activities, but there's no dancing or music played on the driveway.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand that.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: And, again, no agricultural growing on the driveway.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So August 13, 2019, page 61, I pulled this up, and it said, Mr. Abrams, Dr. Abrams answered a question saying:

I need to look at the picture. There is near the church building there's ample room for 50 or 60 cars on either side of the road that approaches the temple building and goes around the turn to the far north, northern most -- most northwestern section and we have a dedicated parking lot there that can take about 30 cars, and then along the edge of the road approaching the temple building from the ponds to the church building there's room for probably another 75 cars right there; right?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So this road is used for activities, for parking purposes?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: So the road that goes down to the temple is a road, a driveway that's owned by Dr. Abrams. The places where people park is fully on Dr. Abrams' farm, the property.

So there's not -- nothing was changed or added to increase that parking. There's plenty of parking on the Abrams' property.

I think the report says room for 50 or 60 cars right by the building.

position and how you might -- but maybe you should be -- we should clarify the record and add this portion that your client seems to be wanting to testify in the record, and the only way I get to open this thing up, to add what your explanation is, is to put it in the record.

As I told the Commissioners before, the

- problem with these cases is that you live and die by
 the record. And if you're saying that this is not
 used for purposes and it was in the original
 application, and there's no indication in the record
 that shows that the second map that you had drawn has
 been accepted as part of the record, or even findings
 that it was accepted as part of the record. I'm at a
 - MR. ICZKOVITZ: If I could just raise something, the issue that's been talked about by the neighbors with regard to the driveway.
 - COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not talking about that.
- MR. ICZKOVITZ: A shared driveway at the top of the cul-de-sac.

loss.

- COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chair, that's not my question.
- MR. ICZKOVITZ: I'm still trying to answer your question.
 - What we are saying is that the map that was submitted for June 25th includes 14.8 acres and parking, and does not include the driveway. The map that we submitted on August 13th, includes 14.8 acres that does include the driveway.
- So the Commission is now saying the

driveway must be included as part of the Special Use, 1 2 the map that we submitted on August 13th, was 3 submitted and fully discussed in front of Maui 4 Planning Commission, is the map that is the right map 5 to go with. 6 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So which part of 7 the record is the map? CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: If I may. 8 9 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chair, break? 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We're going to take a ten-minute recess until 2:25. 11 12 (Recess taken.) MR. ICZKOVITZ: While corp counsel is 13 14 speaking, can we circulate the two maps that are the 15 June 25th map and August 13th map? CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes, that's fine. 16 17 were continuing with questioning by the Commission. Questions, Commissioner Ohigashi? 18 19 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So I'm kind of 20 moving off of that last question that I have. 21 I noticed in the Department of Planning's 22 initial submission that there were no comments 23 provided by the Department of Transportation. 24 Was the Department of Transportation asked 25 for any kind of information and provided any increase of counts or increase of traffic use in the area regarding this church?

2.4

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I cannot speak from firsthand knowledge. Dr. Abrams can. But my understanding is that it was submitted to the Department of Transportation and they chose not to make any comments on it.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is there any kind of letter or transmittal in the record that establishes that that was --

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I believe that if you give me ten minutes, I could find it.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I could not find anything in the record transmitted to us concerning any DOT response except saying there's no comment.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: We are asking Tara

Furukawa, who works for the Planning Department, who helped Dr. Abrams with this application. She's the one -- could I read it?

I believe the understanding is Department of Transportation was given the opportunity to, and they did not choose to make any comment because they didn't find any problems with clearance on both sides.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just asking

what is in the record or not that was transmitted to us, and I have not found in the record itself that was transmitted specific comments from the DOT, so if you do have one, I would like to know.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Exhibit 16 from Joseph
Krueger to Evelyn Akau of Maui County. Hi, Evelyn,
we reviewed the SUP application, offer one comment.
The Applicant shall obtain a permit for any
construction or signage within the State
right-of-way -- so the answer is, this confirms that
it was submitted to them, and it confirms that the
only comments they had was related to needing a
permit for sign.

analysis, traffic analysis done with regard to this permit concerning the increase of traffic use? One of the, I guess, one of the concerns that the neighbors raised.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I think that there's -- as

I sat through a trial, I believe that there are

certain -- if you have viewplanes from the driveway

that that's really important, and the viewplanes from

the driveway was so wide that the Department of

Transportation did not feel that it was an issue.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was there a traffic

- 1 analysis done concerning any additional -- that's all
 2 I'm asking.
- 3 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I cannot speak to that 4 because Ms. Furukawa --

2.1

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Normally the planner doesn't do the traffic analysis. Normally it's the Applicant who does the traffic analysis and provides that information. I'm just curious.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: According to page 13 of Ms. McLean's report, access to the project site is a driveway on Hana Highway. There is more than 90 feet of road frontage, so there's adequate visibility for safe turn onto the property from either direction. The Driveway is owned by Ahimsa Sanctuary Farm. (Indecipherable).

This was their conclusion. There should be no adverse impacts associated with the proposed request, State Department of Transportation for the comment, the Applicant should apply for a permit for any any signage (indecipherable).

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is that the Department of Planning's conclusion?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: The question I have is not that. Was there a traffic analysis done

- concerning this? 1 2 MR. ICZKOVITZ: They were given the 3 opportunity to do an analysis. They declined. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Who? 4 5 MR. ICZKOVITZ: State Department of 6 Transportation. They normally, if they have an 7 issue, they will do an analysis. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not sure, but 8 9 all the applications that have come before me, 10 normally it's the developer that commissions the 11 traffic analysis, whether it be an expensive one or 12 minimum one. I'm just asking if a traffic analysis 13 was done. MR. ICZKOVITZ: And it was determined that 14 15 it wasn't necessary. 16 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: It wasn't done, 17 that's all I'm asking. 18 MR. ICZKOVITZ: It wasn't done. It wasn't 19 done. 20 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: There was 21 testimony, I think in the record, that this is a
 - water system that is on an association water system.

 MR. ICZKOVITZ: It's a private water

 agreement.

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Agreement between

1 several parties, is that right?

2 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was this agreement submitted to the Department of Planning for their review?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I believe that water -- the decision made on the private water, because -- and I would have look --

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's not my question. My question, was that agreement given to the Department of planning by your client?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I do not believe it was requested. I don't think. I believe the Maui Planning Department did conclude, because it was a private water agreement, they have no problem, that the water issue is not for the Maui Planning --

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just asking -was there any analysis done by any private engineer
or person acting on your client's behalf or
commission to do a determination of whether or not
that water system was adequate to meet the necessary
needs? I'm just asking that.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: We do know that Maui County confirmed that it sits on top of an aquifer that can supply 25 --

1 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not asking 2 that. You keep not answering my question. 3 My question is simple. Was a study done 4 concerning what would be the shared impact on the 5 water system upon approval of the parties? Was it 6 done? I'm just asking. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I would like to echo 8 9 my fellow Commissioner. I think the answer to his 10 question is either yes, no, or I don't know. MR. ICZKOVITZ: If I could allow Dr. Abrams 11 12 to respond on this, it would be --13 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: He had his turn. 14 MR. ICZKOVITZ: What we're saying is that 15 there was an analysis for the wastewater system that 16 was done at length, and involving the septic. And 17 yes, we can point to the issue regarding how that was 18 addressed for the --19 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand that. 20 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Beyond that, I don't know. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It is okay to say "I don't know". 22 23 MR. ICZKOVITZ: I just don't know. But if 24 you have any questions, if I need to further

25

research, I will.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just asking
2
     that, just trying to get what's going on.
 3
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
 4
      Ohigashi, make sure that you're speaking right into
     the microphone.
5
 6
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Again, I'll try to
7
      speak in caps and into the mic.
                I read in the transcripts and everything
8
9
      like that is that -- let me put it -- that property,
10
     one, was the subject of several notices of
11
     violations; is that right?
12
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: There were several RFSs
13
     that where issued for the property. All of them were
14
     resolved.
15
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand that.
16
     And they were resolved by Dr. Abrams and whoever owns
17
     that property, paying for the fines or making the
18
     corrections necessary; is that right?
19
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: I believe so, yes.
20
                I just want to point out that the
21
     accusation of $528,000 was not accurate, made by Ms.
22
      Drewyer. There was one fine that was resolved $1,500
23
     and it was not related to any activities on the
24
     property.
```

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is the recitation

25

```
contained in the Department of Planning's 513, I

think it was, the first document in our records, is

that correct? The recitation of violations?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I would have to go over

them one by one with Dr. Abrams, but I don't believ
```

them one by one with Dr. Abrams, but I don't believe
there was anything that is seriously incorrect and
all of them were resolved.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was there any portion of the record that dealt with the effect of these violations upon the Decision and Order issued by the Maui Planning Department?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: All the issues were resolved. There was nothing that impacted the decision.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So there is none, right?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: None.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: And the last thing got to say is more of a comment.

I don't think your recitation of Hale o Kaula is quite correct.

If I recall, and I read the case, it seems to me, yes, Judge King decided we are going to apply the strict scrutiny request, but dismissed personal places out of it, and that's the County of Maui. And

```
1
      I understand from my recollection and articles around
2
     that era that it was a settlement between the County
3
     of Maui, and it wasn't they were ordered to pay
     attorney's fees and cost, it was a settlement.
 4
5
                So I'm just pointing out that that is my
 6
      recollection, that is my reading of it. You don't
7
     have to answer that.
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: That is correct. But it
8
9
     was settlement that was made under duress by the
10
     County.
11
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: You weren't there,
12
      right? You don't know?
13
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: He was part of that church.
14
               COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That doesn't
15
     matter. You're here to testify.
16
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Hold on, hold on.
17
               COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm sorry, Mr.
18
     Chair. I'm just saying that your characterization of
19
     how that case was resolved is not correct.
20
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Wong.
21
                COMMISSIONER WONG: Just a point of
22
     personal privilege. Just a local boy, don't know
23
     much. I was taught whenever I went in front of my dad
24
     to not get slapped, just say, yes, dad, I know it;
```

25

no, dad, or I don't know.

```
1
                What happened with your conversation with
2
      Commissioner Ohigashi, I think he was getting a
3
      little upset. So if you don't know, just say "I
 4
     don't know".
5
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: Thank you.
 6
                I don't mean any disrespect. I'm just
7
     trying to answer the questions.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioners?
8
9
     may. Two main things.
10
                Mr. Iczkovitz, there are certain guidelines
11
     that we're supposed to consider on the issue of a
12
      Special Use Permit for the Agricultural District or
13
     Rural District; is that correct?
14
                Five guidelines in Hawai'i Administrative
15
      rules that govern whether or not a Special Use Permit
      should be issued.
16
17
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes, that's correct.
18
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Do any of those go to
19
     the virtousness or nonvirtuosness of the activity
20
     proposed?
21
                MR. ICZKOVITZ: I do not believe so. I
22
     believe that the issue is one, if it's a church, the
23
     question is the only question is do any of those --
24
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Again, let's try --
25
                MR. ICZKOVITZ:
                                No.
```

Work in front of the State Water Commission, and one of the considerations that they have an issue in certain issuing permits is they use reasonable and beneficial. Here is there the consideration of the proposed use or existing use is somehow in line with county plans, and otherwise beneficial to the communities. But we don't have that standard in here whatsoever.

So don't you think that when we make our decisions whether or not we believe, or aligned with the religious practices of the Applicant, or if we disbelieve in them, whether we think that it's great that they've been of tremendous service to the community or whether or not -- all of these are beyond our consideration; correct?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I'm not sure they're beyond the consideration. I believe that the nature of the use, and where it's clearly defined as a church use, and clearly supported by the community elders and religious leaders across the island, I believe that's something that the Land Use Commission should take into account.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And why should we -- what law or rule guides us in taking into account

that there's other -- that has the support, for instance, of other religious leaders, as you said?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: First Amendment would be one.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think we can not disregard or make a special ruling for or against any particular religion, but whether or not this is a church of five people or 5,000 people, per se, in terms of its supporters is not something that we're supposed to take into account when we make a decision, correct?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: We submitted a record I believe that has hundreds of people's support. So I believe that when Maui Planning Commission took testimony -- that they wanted to know what the community believed about this special use.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: But is there any where in the law that that is part of what the Planning Commission or this Land Use Commission should consider?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I would --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I mean, I read all the materials delivered to us. I read the petitions. I reviewed all the signatures, but I don't know that that's anything that has any bearing -- I personally

believe the testimony that Dr. Abrams and his wife
has done a lot of good for the community, but I don't
see where it's anywhere in the record that that's
part of our decisionmaking.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: First of all, in order to be recommended, findings were made by the Maui Planning Department that we met all the plans, all the guidelines for the special management -- everything that we needed to address for the County plan, any kind of plan, those findings were made that we are supportive, that we do that.

I can quote you for that, if you give me a few moments to go through it.

So is there any legal requirement that you take into account? Well, is it a factor in the adverse effect in the community if you have hundreds of people saying we want it? And we disagree with their testimony that the impact is major and there's only a couple of people that say it. I think that the volume and testimony is something that the Commission can take into effect.

Is there any law that specifically says what you can consider and what you can't? Not that I'm aware of.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We know there is HAR

- 1 | 15-15-95. There are five guidelines.
- 2 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Right.
- CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It shouldn't be contrary to the objectives sought by Chapter 205 and

5 205A.

6 MR. ICZKOVITZ: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: But also the desired use would not adversely effect surrounding properties. Use should not be an unreasonable burden on public agencies to provide roads and streets, sewers, water drainage and school improvements and police and fire protection.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Unusual conditions, trends, and needs have arisen since the district boundaries and rules were established; and (5) The land upon which the proposed use is sought is unsuited for the uses permitted within the district. That's it, right?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: CORRECT.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So when we go into deliberation, for me, the fact that there's been this voluminous testimony talking about how great the operations are and how great the contribution to the community is actually something that we are not

really allowed to consider. It's not part of our determination. We're limited to what the law asks us to consider.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I have to ask then are you allowed to consider the negative comments from neighbors as well if we disagree with them? I'm not sure what you're saying you can and cannot consider as a body, when you're inviting testimony, you're listening to it --

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:} \ \mbox{We are required to} \\ \ \mbox{hold testimony under HAR.}$

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Are you able to take anything and add it to the record --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I think we may consider what has been provided in testimony if it is relevant to the decision that we have to make.

So my first question which I think you've answered in the affirmative is, we are narrowed down to what the legal guidance in front of us.

The second sort of things I have to ask you is, I guess I'm just -- this is partly what came out during Commissioner Ohigashi's questions. I'm a little bit unclear on what -- some of what has been presented in the record as it comes to us. I know we have discussed this extensively.

```
1
                There's two different maps in the record.
2
     You've handed those out to us. Thank you very much.
3
                Is there anywhere in the record that says
 4
     this map applies, this map doesn't apply?
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: We submitted the map. We
5
      said what it was for. We asked for it --
6
7
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there anywhere in
     the record that says which of the maps is governing?
8
9
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: Specifically --
10
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's a yes or no.
11
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: Nothing specific as it
12
      relates to, but when they approved the application,
13
      they did that with that map as the only map in the
14
      record in front of them.
15
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There are two maps in
     the record.
16
17
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: Two maps, and we said pick
18
     which one. We submitted two maps.
19
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm begging you.
20
      It's a yes or no question.
21
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: No, there's nothing
22
      specific by the Maui Planning Commission that they
23
     accepted.
24
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you.
25
               MR. ICZKOVITZ: The third map --
```

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you. Stop at 2 no.

The other part is, I understand to the degree I'm able to understand the nature of the church and religious practice that it is very integrated to the agricultural activities and the activities within the proposed -- existing building which is proposed for church use; is that correct?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So on a practical level, given the nature of this property, how does a body like us determine, based on whatever map, that those uses and church uses will be confined within 14.8 acres?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Because all of the testimony in front of the Maui Planning Commission states that. There is not one word of testimony or evidence that it will go beyond that 14.8 acres.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there anything that states how worshipers or congregants will stay within that area? For instance, fences or hedges or signs?

MR. ICZKOVITZ: As stated in the Application, and in Ms. McLean's report and in the Office of Planning's letter it confirms that

religious activities will take place inside the building.

2.1

And Dr. Abrams has testified, as in the record, that there will be agricultural activities that take place with the church goers in the areas next to the building.

So the 14.8 acres, to go beyond, for the church use to go beyond the 14.8 acres is -- no one has suggested it, there's no evidence of it, and there's no place --

I'm saying. I listened very carefully to Dr. Abrams who spoke to the integrated nature of the agricultural activities with the religious activities on the property. And I believe him when he says that. It makes sense to me. But I don't see -- it talks about the agricultural activities extending over the vast majority of the property.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: Well, if I can just quote from one page of the June 25th meeting when Mr. Galazin asked:

So thank you and, Tara, do you want to explain to the commission how the department assesses the portion that will be used for any SUP application talking about ag land on 15 acres.

Ms. Furukawa, yeah, typically, actually we don't require a survey when somebody comes in for a SUP, they just delineate where the church, where the use will occur.

So that basically means that the exact finite boundary does not appear to be something that Maui Planning Commission has ever been concerned about, because they told us on the record that it doesn't need a survey. You can draw it.

So if the impact -- the question is will the church activities negatively impact agricultural activity in order to that --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: That's not my question.

My question is really a policy level question that this body will have to wrestle with, right?

If the property was 14.8 acres and the landowner and Applicant did not even own beyond that property, we could say with great assuredness that the permitted use will not extend beyond the edges of the property.

However, this is the case where the property itself is much larger, and indeed the nature of the use by the Applicant's own statement, very

diffuse. So I'm wrestling with how, as a Land Use Commissioner, regardless -- I personally believe the activity is virtuous, but that's not what I get to rule on, right? I get to rule on the narrow constraints of what the statute gives us.

And the amorphous and encompassing nature of the use seems to me to point towards, while 14.8 acres was chosen specifically as Dr. Abrams says, to avoid jurisdiction of this Commission, I believe the transcript will show that he said that, that the actual activities go beyond 14.8 acres.

MR. ICZKOVITZ: So to repeat. The church use is taking place inside the building. The activities outside the building will be agricultural uses. So if the question is will the church use expand beyond 14.8 acres, I'm submitting that there's no possibility of that happening. There's no evidence of that happening, and no finding of that happening, and no allegation made by anybody of that happening.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I'm just going to state that the earlier testimony of Dr. Abrams was that the agricultural uses were tightly integrated into the religious uses, and that, in fact, it was stated on the record that as an agricultural

operation alone, the agricultural operation is a standalone activity, not economically self-supporting, but was intended as part of the religious --

MR. ICZKOVITZ: I do not believe that's an accurate characterization of Dr. Abrams' testimony.

Because the fact of the matter is that, you know, the farm is a -- one thing that was not raised is that we have a fully implemented farm plan. The finding has been more than 50 percent of the land is currently being used for agriculture. Certification for organic was just renewed. And Dr. Abrams has done everything right as far as building and expanding the ag farm, which is what this Commission wants to make sure that we want to support the agricultural uses, which is what they have been doing.

If the concern is using a church to limit or deny agricultural use on agricultural land, the record does not support that in any way. And we believe that the findings made by the Maui Planning Department, decision made by Maui Planning Commission, the recommendation made by the Office of Planning are all in agreement, you don't adversely effect. We're staying within the 14.8 acres. And we believe that the record is very, very clear. You

don't have to go beyond the record in order to make the decision that 14.8 acres is delineated in the map.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I have nothing further. Commissioners? If not, Maui County.

MR. HOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will try to address a lot of these issues that are coming out but I anticipate there will be questions, and hopefully we can try to clarify.

As this is an ongoing process, I think this is not going to be the last permit where this issue comes up, because frequently this close to a 15-acre area is an on-going issue. We can have additional clarification there.

On this particular permit, County of Maui does recommend approval subject to the conditions imposed by the Maui Planning Commission, as well as any other conditions that the Land Use Commission believes would be appropriate.

We do believe the Commission's decision represents the application of HRS 205-6 as required, and an effort also to mitigate the impacts of the project. As you've seen from some testimony and obviously from the record, there were concerns about noise and traffic, and impacts on the property. And

I do belief that the Commission conditions were acceptable conditions to mitigate those impacts.

As a starting point, and I understand this has been an issue of confusion, the County of Maui believes the appropriate map to use in this case is a map that was submitted on June 12th, 2019 to the Planning Commission. That was submitted. After its first hearing the Planning Commission had questions on what are the precise -- where is the use going to be located.

And in response the Applicant submitted CPR map that wasn't actually used to CPR, but at least contained a clearly delineated area of where the uses would be allowed. And they stated the common elements B and C would be part of that, and the total is roughly 14.8 acres.

In addition to this, however, subsequent to receiving that map on June 12th, the County did receive a response to the letter from the Executive Officer of Land Use Commission. And in that letter I understand that not necessarily all of the hypotheticals may have been correct in that case. But as one part of that letter, the Executive Officer said, in addition, it says, in addition the combined nonagricultural uses described clearly exceed

15 acres if the access road is included, which it should be, as it is essential for the use delineated in the SP application.

So with this, on this map, the driveway is an extra .78 acres, which would bring the property over 15 acres.

Subsequent to this, there was a map submitted on August 13th by the Applicant. I think it was submitted the day of the meeting. This map -- I don't know if you all had a chance to look at it -- I don't think that the Commission can rely on this map, or the Land Use Commission or the Maui Planning Commission. It's a hand-drawn map. There is really no way to determine if this is 14.8 acres or different. And we don't believe -- while the Commission did accept this along with the other evidence submitted that day, we do believe that the map that was submitted in response to the Commission's inquiry from the Planning Department on June 12th, this is a more accurate map with the driveway added. We believe that's the map.

So because that went over 15 acres, that was one of the reasons the Planning staff transmitted this to you.

Another reason is, I think as the Chair

sort of mentioned and was discussed in the letter, it was a bit difficult to determine the actual boundaries of the use. We do see that there is testimony on this issue of the use, of the agricultural use being commingled with the church use which is part of the church.

2.1

this is on Mr. Iczkovitz' letter. It's quoting the minutes of one of the August 13th meeting. It does say: Any activity -- this is from Mr. Abrams -- any activity of the church goers on the land outside the temple would also be agricultural in nature, and an important point that I would get more help on the farm with volunteers and be able to educate our congregants about earth-based spirituality, which is part of the underpinning of our ministry since it's in honoring the earth and being stewards for future generations.

This was another issue the Commission looked at, and planning staff wanted this forwarded to the Land Use Commission because of that ongoing issue as well.

So we do believe in this case Maui County Planning Commission acted to approve the permit on the area map plus the .7-acre driveway.

Now, whether or not the Planning Commission

-- the Planning Commission voted to approve as

recommended, and one of the conditions was to approve

4 based on representations made.

The Commission did not say, for example, the use shall take place on the map attached as Exhibit A. That was not done. That's not typically done for a special permit, but it's also not typical to have multiple maps submitted. But we do believe, based on the record, that the map on the 12th was what the Commission relied on, because the map sent on the 13th is not a -- there's no way to tell what the acreage is of that map, and it's simply a hand-drawn line.

So that's the County's position as far as what the Commission had adopted in this case and why this is before you.

Going on with other issues.

With respect to RLUIPA, and we can get into this in more detail -- by the way, I believe

Commissioner Ohigashi was correct about the previous case mentioned. The County is also in litigation right now in federal court with another special permit that it denied for church use, and has been successful in that litigation so far, including a

jury verdict in its favor, though there are appeals pending.

The County's perspective with respect to RLUIPA is that the statutory scheme of HRS 205-6 is still applicable and Land Use Commission rules are still applicable. And the standard of approval of preponderance of the evidence, under HRS 91 for any contested case, is still the applicable standard, that also applies.

If a court, after a denial, would review, then they would use strict scrutiny to review the county's action. One of the major issues in the court case that the County is with now is essentially whether or not the County Planning Commission treated that applicant differently than it treated other similarly situated applicants.

And we do believe that's a relevant consideration and can be, but we don't believe -- RLUIPA certainly applies if there is a church use involved and a religious use involved, but we don't believe that alters the fundamental statutory scheme that you have for the Planning Commission and the Land Use Commission and LUC rules.

So I think assessing those impacts, and looking over that as you would a nonchurch use is

something you can do to assess those impacts, and determine if the permit can be granted.

In this case I think the Maui Planning

Commission did that, and did impose conditions to

mitigate impacts over the course of three meetings,

after hearing a substantial amount of testimony about

what the potential impacts could be.

And I think you've heard that today, and in the record you've heard that as well.

The other issue is whether it's the Planning Commission's determination of whether or not the Land Use Commission gets to review the permit. I think the Commission was a bit hesitant to make a unilateral determination that, yes, it does or does not have to go to the Land Use Commission.

If the Commission would, for example, make the determination this doesn't have to go to Land Use Commission, especially after receiving the letter from the Executive Director, we didn't want to be seen as cutting the State Land Use Commission out of these decisions, because we believe under the statute it's statutory.

So if the land is for use over 15 acres, the Land Use Commission has concurrent decisionmaking power with the Planning Commission, and so we wanted

to make sure that the Land Use Commission would review this.

And if the Land Use Commission wishes to determine, based on the record, that clearly this property is under 15 acres, we have no jurisdiction. Then I think that's a Land Use Commission determination.

The Planning Commission didn't want to make a unilateral determination saying it does or doesn't have to go, and be seen as cutting the Land Use Commission out of its decision.

If there is guidance we can get on ongoing cases for things like this, it's an issue that's been ongoing because applicants, I think, some may feel we're entitled to do a Special Use under 15 acres, and Land Use Commission doesn't review that.

So we get up to 15 acres and that's it. In this case we were iffy on what the potential of the use spilling out, and the use of the driveway as an issue.

But we did have the information submitted by Mr. Orodenker talking about not just cases like this where the uses may not be clearly delineated, but also other cases.

That may go beyond the scope of this

```
220
     hearing in particular, but we wanted to raise this as
1
2
     an issue, because this isn't the last time this is
 3
      going to come up, and wanted the Commission to be
 4
      aware of this.
 5
                At this point, I don't know if -- I don't
 6
      know if I addressed all of the concerns you would
7
     have. We wanted to go into our background of what
      the Commission, I think, what the Commission action
8
9
      was and why this was forwarded to you as the Land Use
10
      Commission.
11
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr.
12
      Hopper.
13
                Commissioners, questions?
14
                Commissioner Wong.
15
                COMMISSIONER WONG: I'm going to ask these
16
      questions.
17
                Yes or no, was a TIAR done?
18
                MR. HOPPER: No.
19
```

COMMISSIONER WONG: Yes or no, was a 20

cultural impact analysis done?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOPPER: Other than what was in the study, there was separate CIS in addition to that.

May I further address that? That's one thing I wanted to address.

This was discussed in the staff report, but

because this was an applicant for a change in use, there was an existing dwelling, existing properties there. This was an application for change in use that would involve the same structures as would be there before the use.

So in that case, the Planning Department did not transmit to SHPD for an update or require the Applicant to do a TIAR or to do a cultural impact analysis. And that was because the nature of the use was not a large subdivision or something like that. It's a change in use of an existing property without any additional construction.

So for Ka Pa'akai purposes, I think the statement would be the department did not see evidence of valued cultural resources that would be effected by this application, because the nature was to change the use of a property, but not to, for example, urbanize a property that was ag before.

If there is additional requirements that this Commission wants, as far as Ka pa'akai analysis, in a case where the use is being changed like this, we would want guidance from you. But this is something we went over at native Hawaiian law training that Ka Pa'akai analysis, how does it change depending on the impact of the project and the size

of the project? Will every developer have to do a cultural impact assessment? What is appropriate for one or the other?

So in this case the department did look at the record to see what was there previously from SHPD or other letters, but did not require a new cultural impact statement or a new update of the issues because of the nature of what the application was.

If there is something additional you want done in those cases, we can look at that. But we did believe, for Ka Pa'akai, this was sufficient in this particular case.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Going back to the TIAR, going off Commissioner Ohigashi's question, there's going to be possible increase in traffic, possible.

Did the Planning Commission ever take into account that increase in traffic in the area? Say, hey, maybe we should look at a TIAR?

MR. HOPPER: I don't believe the Planning

Commission -- I don't know of any case where the

Planning Commission has ordered a TIAR, frankly, for
any of its permits. You may have an existing one

usually from the State Land Use Commission permit, or
for a more substantial development, like a change in
zoning where in the county code it would says you've

got to do a traffic study because of this project.

In this case I think they relied on agency comments as well as the record, which was here's how many more people would come in, put in conditions to mitigate that impact as far as how many people you can have in when they can be there, certainly traffic was a consideration there, and approved with those mitigation conditions, but they did not order a TIAR to be done on the project.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Going a little off track.

Again, I know you said use this map. You were talking previously, use this map. However, it still bothers me in the sense that you got a map that says 14.8 acres. Then the second map, or exhibit that was shown to us just recently, showed another 14.8 acres, where they adjusted the size.

This is the local boy talking. It looks like someone is fudging something just to keep that number. So what should I think about that?

MR. HOPPER: I don't think the Commission, though they admitted the 13th map in evidence, I don't think they relied upon that in making the decision. That map is not a readable map in the County's opinion. It appears to go outside of

property lines in cases. I understand it was done by an architect, but I think that the map, because of what you're identifying the map on the 12th, which does delineate a clear area, is the map to use.

I don't think the map on the 13th can be used as a map, and I don't think it was relied upon by the Commission in determining the permit area, because it's just not -- it's really hard to say that's an accurate map.

I can say that map adds up to 14.8 acres. The other map I can look at the components and see there is 14.8 acres, the driveway is .7 acres. But this map, it's difficult for anybody to say this is 14.8 acres.

COMMISSIONER WONG: So the next question I have is: There was a statement that was taken during the public testimony about people's testimony was thrown out and not part of the record.

Can you explain that? Tell me what was the issue with that?

MR. HOPPER: Because this was considered a contested hearing, under HRS 91, and because the Planning Commission in past cases actually had decisions for denial reversed because they did not allow cross-examination of testimony, that they were

going to be careful with testimony they admitted.

So at a certain point the Commission did close public testimony, and some written letters did come in after that point. And I think it's at the beginning of the August 13th meeting the Chair announces some letters came in, but they would not be considered part of the record, because they came in after public testimony was closed.

Again, there may be questions on the Sunshine Law, but HRS 92, if the board is operating under quasi-judicial function, then it's not subject to the Sunshine Law requirement.

And so that's what happened there, is that there were letters that were received after public testimony was closed, at subsequent meetings, that were not made part of the record. That's why they weren't transmitted to Land Use Commission.

Also one other exhibit. There was an exhibit, you can see it in the record, where there was a vote taken to strike it from the record. It was a Dropbox link where a lot of the items could not be opened, and the concern was maybe some

Commissioners could open, maybe they couldn't. They didn't know who saw what evidence. So that was stricken from the record. That was received after

public testimony as well.

That is what happened to some of the letters that were not received into the record. They also weren't considered by the -- they were also not received and considered by the Planning Commission.

To get along with that, some of the written testimony also were not present for cross-examination by the Applicant. Now, that written testimony was allowed earlier, but the ones that were submitted after the date, the Applicant wanted to cross-examine and they weren't present, so their testimony was stricken.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Okay. So I'm going to take just my experiences.

So let's say I'm going in front of the legislature and somehow my mom got sick, but I submitted written testimony. They would strike that too because of that issue that they cannot talk story with me?

MR. HOPPER: Well, the state legislature wouldn't be conducting a hearing under HRS 91. We have cases where we have remands from the circuit court for public testimony-related issue. This is an on-going issue with Maui Planning Commission. The County argued that public testifiers should not be

subjected to cross-examination like other witnesses, but the circuit court disagreed and said you have to allow for cross-examination of public testifiers.

We were concerned about the chilling effect that would have on testifiers, but we were told by the court they had to allow it and so we do do that.

But in this case, the stuff that was excluded there was an opportunity for public testimony and hearing at the first meeting. There was some written testimony that was excluded after that. There was no additional oral testimony taken after the first meeting either, after the public testimony was closed. And there was some oral testimony and letters that were not included in the record transmitted to you, because they were not part of the record that the Maui Planning Commission considered.

I mean this, I think, is separate from whether the Land Use Commission today can take additional written or oral testimony to supplement its findings. I don't have an objection to that.

The Maui Planning Commission decided we are going to create a record. Here's how we would like to do it as far as evidentiary submissions, and that's the decision they made.

1 I think the way they did it was a good way 2 to balance the -- I suppose it could try to argue 3 that you don't have to have public testimony at all, 4 and give notice to people, if they want to intervene, 5 they can, they become parties. Other than that, 6 public testimony shouldn't be part of a contested 7 case hearing. It should be no different than if I 8 have an appeal before an administrative agency, and 9 it's just me and that agency. 10 But because of the public interest, I think 11 there was public notice in the newspaper. There was 12 notice sent to neighbors. There was public testimony 13 allowed by the written testimony, allowed by the 14 Commission, but it was cut off after a certain date. 15 COMMISSIONER WONG: Just a statement, don't 16 answer, please. 17 This was much clearer to me, and I just 18 want to say thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner 20

Ohigashi. Thank you, Commissioner Wong.

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Arnold is not the only local boy.

I'm just kind of curious. The Applicant is saying that Commission decided to accept the second map, and passed it on based on the second map. Ιs

that your understanding of what occurred?

MR. HOPPER: Not passed it on based on -there were a lot of documents that were submitted as
rebuttal testimony by the Applicant's attorney that
day. And the Commission did say we will accept this
into evidence. But I do not recall, and I did look
at the minutes, discussion of anything saying we are
adopting this map. This is the map we're using, that
includes the driveway.

And like I said, there was not -- in its motion, the Commission did not say we are doing this based on map X. It said based on the representations made. The only actual map with acreages in it was the map on the 12th, and because that was in response to a specific question by the Commission of what is the area we are dealing with. I think that was the better map to use.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I understand what you're saying, but I didn't see that discussion in the record.

MR. HOPPER: There wasn't an extensive discussion of -- again, there were a variety of documents that came --

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I didn't see that discussion in the record, so I'm just pointing that

- 230 1 out. 2 The SMA Permit that we're referring to for 3 that structure, was that issued? 4 MR. HOPPER: I believe, yes, it was. 5 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Was it issued for a 6 church use? 7 MR. HOPPER: It would have been a farm 8 dwelling -- it would be a farm structure. COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: It would be a farm 9 10 structure, so it wasn't a permit issued for a church use as the Applicant indicated? 11 12 MR. HOPPER: No. 13 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: That's what I'm 14 kind of wondering. This is a SMA area, is that 15 right? 16 MR. HOPPER: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Isn't a church more intensive use than a farm structure? 18 19 MR. HOPPER: There is some clarification 20 here. 21 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm sorry, I'm
- 23 MR. HOPPER: I think that --24 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Just to be really 25 clear. The Applicant has presented. We're talking

asking you, Mr. Hopper.

22

with the County.

MR. HOPPER: I think the Special Permit is to approve the church use. I believe that there would not be a need -- the department can look at this, as the department administering the Coastal Zone Management Act, to see if a change in use would be a change in the density or intensity of use that would require another SMA assessment or amendment to the permit terms.

But I think at this time the department's position would be that the use permit here would be -- the first step and any assessment of whether they need an amended SMA Permit would be determined by the Planning Department afterwards.

The staff planner wanted to clarify that there was a SMA Permit for a variety of structures.

It was an after-the-fact permit, because a lot of the stuff was built without a permit in the first place, but it covered the structures as existing, but didn't include the church.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Again, the Applicant was wrong. They haven't gotten a SMA Permit for church use.

MR. HOPPER: I wouldn't necessarily say you would need a new SMA permit for a change in use like

```
1
     this. I don't think --
2
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: But it wasn't
 3
     considered?
 4
                MR. HOPPER: The application, as I
     understand it, for an SMA Permit did not say --
5
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes or no, it
 6
7
     wasn't considered?
                MR. HOPPER: I don't have it before me.
8
9
      I'm getting this from the staff.
10
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: My question is --
11
               MR. HOPPER: Wait, I'm sorry, the Applicant
12
     is contradicting --
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm not asking him.
13
14
     He's not on record.
15
                MR. HOPPER: I want to get you accurate
      information.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I expect his
     attorney to control his own client. Isn't that
18
19
     right?
20
                So I'm just asking you some questions.
21
     And, you know, I'm a simple guy, simple lawyer. I
22
     think I took the bar with -- we've got about the same
23
     number.
24
                So anyway, I'm asking the question. Is the
      church use that requires more people there, up to 100
25
```

```
people, additional cars, a more intensive use?
1
2
                MR. HOPPER: I don't think that would
 3
     require a new SMA --
 4
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm asking a
5
     definition. I'm not asking you if it's required.
 6
                MR. HOPPER: Well, there's a statutory
7
     definition there that has a legal implication and I
     would say I don't believe that statutory
8
     definition --
9
10
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Who's going to make
     that determination?
11
12
                MR. HOPPER: That would be the Planning
13
      Department, but I want to get this clarified.
14
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Specifically HRS
15
     205A-22 identifies a development as change in
      intensity of use of land, right?
16
17
                MR. HOPPER: Could you repeat that?
18
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Can you control
19
     your client, please?
20
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: We can't actually
21
     hear the proceedings if you are holding a loud
22
      conversation in the room at the same time.
23
     Understood?
24
               MR. ABRAMS: I do understand.
25
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm just asking,
```

- 1 | that's what HRS 205A-22 says.
- MR. HOPPER: As development, yes.

3 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So is it your

4 position that you will have to review it to determine

5 | whether a new SMA or additional SMA is required?

6 MR. HOPPER: I believe with the change in

7 use, yes, you could have to review it. How HRS

8 205A-22 works is that you have the action that is

9 | considered a development. There's a variety of items

10 that are considered not development that are

11 exemptions that the County would look at as part of

12 an SMA assessment.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: My minimum

14 understanding of this, because I looked at the

15 | exemptions, and I don't think it applies.

But besides that, this is a commentary on

17 | my part. Would the fact that the intensity of use

18 requiring a review for an SMA Permit bring up the

19 issue of whether a Ka Pa'akai analysis should be

20 done?

21 MR. HOPPER: If it's just the change in

22 use, I wouldn't see why you would do that.

23 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Who would make that

24 determination?

25 MR. HOPPER: This would be the Planning

Department, because under the Coastal Zone Management

Act, Maui Planning Commission is designated the

authority by County Charter, and by rule as stated,

the Planning Department would be involved in both

enforcement and in processing SMA Applications.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So if I want to -if I have an SMA Permit, and I have an office
building, and I get the great idea of saying, hey, I
want to make a hotel. And my hotel may affect the
neighborhood; may affect water usage; may effect
other kinds -- may affect traditional rights of
people, because more people are coming on the land.
Intensity of use. Would you say that that would
require a change?

MR. HOPPER: I would say maybe. It would have to be reviewed.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So the record doesn't contain anything, does it, that identifies this change of use as not requiring an additional SMA Permit, because that would be something that the Planning Commission would have to decide?

MR. HOPPER: Mr. Chair, the Planning

Commission for a State Special Permit wouldn't be

making findings, I don't think, on what other permits

would be required. I suppose it could say -- it

could add a condition that says that if there's any additional, based on the change in use, if there are -- if it has a SMA review done or something by that nature, but I don't know if in granting one permit you would say, you also have to -- I mean the HRS applies regardless of whatever the finding of the Commission is, so if they have to get a new permit or reassessment, they would have to in either case, but that's not something the Commission, that I understand, makes specific findings on nor do I think it's part of the criteria of 205-6 or the LUC's rules.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: We do have to consider whether or not this is consistent with 205 and 205A under our review, isn't that true?

MR. HOPPER: I know that's true of district boundary. I'm trying to refresh my memory for the Land Use Commission rules.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: We don't have to worry about 205A on Special Use.

MR. HOPER: 205A is going to apply, yes.

It does talk about A, the use shall not be contrary to the objectives sought to be accomplished by Chapter 205 and 205A HRS and the rules of the Land Use Commission.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So an inquiry by
2
     the Commission that the record be supplemented to
3
      include an analysis of that, is not beyond our power,
 4
      is it?
5
                MR. HOPPER: Would they be applying for two
 6
      SMA permits?
7
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I'm asking that
     question. Is that condition, asking for a finding in
8
9
      relation to that, say that it is consistent with 205A
10
      is not beyond our power?
11
                I withdraw the question, Mr. Chair.
12
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
13
     Commissioner.
                Are there further questions for Mr. Hopper?
14
15
                Commissioner Okuda.
16
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17
                Mr. Hopper, maybe you can educate me a
18
      little bit about what Maui County requires, because
19
      I'm only a little bit familiar with what the City and
20
      County of Honolulu sometimes requires or allow.
21
                In an Urban Zone on Maui, can you also have
22
     agriculture?
23
                MR. HOPPER: It's going to depend on your
24
     actual zoning itself. Because underneath the Urban
25
      designation by the State there is going to be a
```

County zoning designation and Community Plan designation.

I think under Urban technically you can have any underlying zoning. But I don't think -- if the zoning is other than agriculture, I think Rural zoning allows it. I think Agricultural allows it.

Some other zoning districts allow it, but not all of it. You could have an Agricultural zone under urban, I believe, depending on the zone.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: If the Applicant here, the church, were to request a boundary redesignation to Urban, and in fact got the Urban designation, could it still continue doing its agriculture?

MR. HOPPER: I think that if that's the only thing that changed, that was urbanized, I think it probably could. It would open the door potentially for them to get a change in zoning to something other than agriculture once their district boundary is changed.

if the applicant, the church in this case, intended because that's part of its theology and its mission in the community and in the world to have this sustainable type of agriculture, it could continue conducting its agricultural use even if the boundary

1 | was redesignated to Urban, correct?

MR. HOPPER: I think if the zoning was still Agriculture, and the community plan was still Agriculture, yes, I believe they could.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Wouldn't a church be more appropriate in an Urban designated area, designated by the Land Use Commission, than in an Agricultural area?

MR. HOPPER: Generally speaking, yes. But that's why you need a Special Permit, and it's not an outright permitted use under HRS 205. But, again, the Special Permit process in HRS 205-6, I do think is something that's available to church uses, school uses, and has been utilized for those uses historically.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: The Hawaii Supreme

Court case involving the Waianae Board dealing with

the water park in Kapolei where the Hawaii Supreme

Court said it's inappropriate to issue a Special

Permit to allow basically an Urban use, meaning a

water park on agriculturally designated land.

Are you familiar with that case?

MR. HOPPER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Do we have that problem or issue here that we're basically, if we

grant the Special Permit, we're basically saying, yeah, put this Urban use on ag land, and it looks like, since the testimony was -- or the record seems to indicate even if we ignore the testimony that's been given here by public witnesses, that this building has been constructed to last for a long time.

That's really what are we're doing. A Special Permit is really a disguised boundary amendment.

MR. HOPPER: If you're looking at the time issue, I understand that, but I wouldn't compare it to a case of a water park.

it's a water park at all, and I'm not even suggesting that it is as extensive as the water park, and I'm not denigrating the social good that the church may bring. It's just, yeah, focus really on time, that really what we're having here is what amounts to a disguised boundary redesignation without the protections and the processes that normally take place with a boundary redesignation.

MR. HOPPER: I'm using the discussion of a water park because that was the case where they said you can't really grant a special permit in that case.

I don't think that is applicable here.

do think you can grant the permit as long as the criteria are met, and I believe that they are met.

That's why I'm saying I don't think the court would reverse the Commission's decision to grant the permit or not. And I don't know if we think you should get a district boundary amendment is sufficient grounds to deny a State Special Permit if they otherwise meet the criteria. I mean, of course, that's a discretionary call by the Commission, but that's within the Commission's position is that in this case this is an appropriate situation to grant a State Special Permit, because the criteria and the statute are met. I understand your point though certainly.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: If I can just shift topic or focus just a bit.

Looking at a number of these conditions that --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Excuse me,

Commissioner Okuda, about how long -- if you have

much longer, I think we're going to take break.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I think only five minutes.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There is going to be

other questions. It is 3:32. We will take a 1 13-minute break to 3:45.

(Recess taken.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's 3:44. We're back on the record. Thanks to everybody, including the Commissioners, especially for their stamina. I know that you if you don't normally come in front of this Commission, this might alternately seem exhausting, brutal, bizarre. I can assure you that to the degree that we take a long time on things, that I've served over six years on this Commission, a real feeling and exercise of duty towards properly implementing the laws that we're supposed to.

We were having questions for Maui County's counsel from Commissioner Okuda.

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

Mr. Hopper, if I can switch gears now and go to a Fourteenth Amendment, equal protection question, since the Fourteenth Amendment require that people's rights of equal protection under the law be protected.

You probably heard me ask questions of some of the earlier public testifiers about these various conditions that were included with the Maui Planning

Commission's approval, you know, such as Condition No. 4, which limits the time of church or religious activities. Condition No. 5, which limits the days of church or religious activities. Condition No. 6, which specifically allows county inspection by officials who simply present credentials; and Condition No. 11, which requires 72 hours notice to neighbors for events with more than 40 participants.

Can you point to any other church in the County of Maui where the County of Maui has required or imposed similar conditions?

MR. HOPPER: I believe that -- I know generally of two. One I believe, and this is secondhand, because I did talk to counsel for the Planning Commission before the -- I think within the last two years they granted a permit in Wailuku Country Estates for a church use that had -- I don't know if it's exactly the same conditions, but conditions on the timing and other aspects there.

In addition, the case that the County is currently in litigation about right now, Spirit of Aloha Temple case was a proposed church use on ag land, and the Commission denied that permit because it found that the criteria in HRS 205-6 and Land Use Commission rules were not met, and I think that's

relevant because I think the Commission does still have a duty and the Planning Commission has a duty under 205-6 in the rules to mitigate the impacts of the projects. And I think that's what those conditions did.

And I think any other similarly situated project, again, church use is not allowed on ag land. If you look at 205-2 or 445, you won't find church as an outright permitted use.

So I think to grant the Special Permit, it has to go through the process, and in doing that, it does have a duty to impose conditions under 205-6 to mitigate the impacts of the project.

So, again, I don't think there's a large number of churches on ag land that come up. Churches that operate on non-ag land, they're subject to general requirements, but they wouldn't have condition because the impacts for that area are already determined to be appropriate because it's zoned for church use.

But because they're not zoned for church use here, I think the conditions are appropriate.

And in other similarly situated cases, I believe County does look to conditions like this.

Again, I don't think they're exactly the

same, but I think any other special permit, if there is complaint about traffic, noise, other things, that conditions like this would be imposed.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Before the County
Planning Commission imposed these conditions, what
standard of scrutiny did the County use, or what
standard of review?

Did it use strict scrutiny, or did it use some other standard?

MR. HOPPER: I believe the standard of review would apply to judicial review of the County's permit if it was challenged.

What the County did was follow the requirements of HRS 91 for a contested case hearing, which would be the person bringing the action bears the burden of proof in persuasion, and that burden is by preponderance of the evidence.

So what they reviewed was whether or not the Applicant, as shown by a preponderance of the evidence, that they were entitled to their permit given the statutory scheme.

I think that strict scrutiny would apply if the permit got challenged in court. I think the court would look over these conditions with strict scrutiny. I think it would find not irrelevant that

1 | the Applicant said we can abide by these conditions.

And that's what's ongoing right now with the County

3 and this other church that was denied.

But I think what the Commission applied would apply to any other Special Permit, which is already in HRS and in the Land Use Commission's rules.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So the County did not apply a strict scrutiny standard, correct?

MR. HOPPER: No. And I do not believe such would be applicable as far as whether or not it would grant or deny the permit.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Is there anything in the record which indicates that before the County imposed these conditions on the church Applicant here, there was any investigation, consideration or discussion of lesser restrictive means of dealing with the complaints or problems for which the conditions were intended to mitigate or cure?

MR. HOPPER: I think there were three meetings worth of deliberate -- not all deliberations, but substantial deliberation on this.

I don't recall at a point in the minutes if someone said maybe we can be less restrictive than this, but I do think it was within the Commission's mind of the

right or of the request to do the church use in an area where it's not zoned, and I think that was considered.

I don't think it came out and said we're considering other less restrictive means in addition to these conditions. I do believe that this is the Commission's expression of the least restrictive means, and does an evidence of balancing. I think they were constantly sort of discussing with the Applicant when they went through these conditions, whether they are appropriate, and what days the church wanted these on.

So while it didn't use the actual words, least restrictive means, I think in questioning back and forth with the Applicant, as far as okay, what can you live with here? What days do you do your services? Do you do them here or there?

I believe Commissioner Robinson was one who had a lot of questions on that. I think that back and forth did evidence a discussion that would qualify for showing that this was the least restrictive means to both follow HRS 205-6 and consider any First Amendment or Fourteenth Amendment rights that the Applicant would have.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Was there a specific

discussion in the record, for example, shown in the transcript that there was a conscious decision by any of the Planning Commissioners to discuss least or lesser restrictive means?

In other words, to basically specifically and consciously discuss that there are less restrictive ways of accomplishing the goals or the objectives for which these final conditions came out?

MR. HOPPER: Less restrictive such as what? As not imposing conditions?

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Well, for example, there is a restriction of the amount of sound based on decibel levels that can cross a boundary line of a property at a certain hour, correct?

MR. HOPPER: I think Department of Health has those regulations.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: I believe, you can correct me, but I believe it's 65 decibels during certain periods of time at the boundary line using a weighted B ANSI. Does that sound familiar?

MR. HOPPER: Sounds like you know that better than I do certainly.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Not to make fun of this, it's because our overpaid son who is now a computer guy, ten years ago he had a rock band and

the police would come to my house. So I had a sound meter. But the reason why I'm asking this question is a serious reason.

I mean, is there any evidence in the record that enforcement of state noise standards would not be as effective or would not be effective in sanctioning or presenting or preventing or mitigating noise which violates the law?

MR. HOPPER: They did discuss state noise standards as being applicable during the hours such as on New Year's Eve and other times there. They did have a concern that those standards -- that one of the additional protection of having the timeframe was based on the neighbor's concerns.

I think the discussion of least restrictive means started from denial of the permit, which there was a vote for to consider that. And I think that was a starting point. And then those means got less restrictive, and turned into these conditions that you have.

I think if you look at the Commission's discussion over the three meetings, it would reflect that. And if the County or Land Use Commission had to go to a court to defend that, I think they could, defend that well on the record to show -- if they had

taken it up, allowed people to talk, and then denied it with no explanation, then I think you could argue there is a problem.

But in this case I think there was substantial amount of discussion and collection of evidence to determine whether this was the least restrictive means to do this, while still having to deal with the requirements of HRS 205-6, which the Commission can't ignore, even if it's a proposed church.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: And my final question, Mr. Hopper, I agree with a lot of what you say, you're a very knowledgeable person, and you clearly state the law, but don't you think that part of the problem we have here is, especially when you're dealing with a church, the record should be especially clear?

I mean, we all strive to have clear records because I think any applicant, any government agency that appears in front of us, that's what they deserve from us. But here with this record, as one of my fellow Commissioners are pointing out, it requires a long explanation of which map is being relied on. There's issues here about whether or not constitutional rights are being implicated. What

standards have been used. We're having even questions of what Findings of Fact really support jurisdiction.

Wouldn't it actually be better -- and I'm not saying this is what would happen -- but it's just better that this matter just be remanded back to the Planning Commission to frankly just clean this up, because a confused record can lead to litigation, more delay, more litigation, possible liability for people.

I mean, now that you sat through all of this, heard the questions, observed the confusion that a lot of us have here, wouldn't it be better you think for the community that this matter just be remanded so that we have clear Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law. There's clear findings like with the numbers and references to the record where each of these findings come from. Conclusions of Law that have clear statements of what the standard of review that's being used. What's the standard being applied with citation to the authority so that, you know, everybody is clear, you know, what the deal really is; what the approval really is and what it was based on?

MR. HOPPER: You have the option under HRS

certainly to remand. If you do that, I think, after having three meetings on this, and having a pretty extensive record, the Commission would request, and they're nine volunteers, just like you, they would request what exactly you want from them in addition to what wasn't in the record already?

As fair as the RLUIPA issue, I don't know how much clearer that could be, other than using the actual statutory words "least restrictive means", I don't think there's any other additional items that can be added to that discussion.

And the County, like I said, in the Spirit of Aloha Temple case, the County has been successful in its lawsuit through motions for summary judgment as well as a jury trial in that case. And I think went through a similar process as far as RLUIPA analysis, as far as what they considered, and what factors they determined in denying that permit.

And I think in this case similar factors that were being used to deny that permit, are being used to mitigate the impacts in this case.

As far as the other issues, it's within your discretion to remand. The County does not believe it's necessary. We do believe you've got a complete record. As far as actual numbers, Findings

of Facts, Conclusions of Law, the Planning Commission does not do that because they're not considered decisions adverse to a party under HRS 91.

What you do have is a staff report and it's part of the record as far as the facts, as well as the approval letter with the conditions.

If you want something more precise, then we can look at that, but that's not traditionally what has been done with approvals by the Commission, because we don't believe that's required by HRS 91 in those cases.

But if there's a remand, we would want to know what issues you would want the Commission to deal with, and we would hope that within the existing record, if it's a matter of clarifying a map or something, we could say, okay, this is the map we're going to use, and send it to you, rather than having to reopen and have another record.

Again, three meetings on this. That is not necessarily your issue, and if you're dissatisfied with the record, it's your right to remand. But that's our position at this stage.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I'm not a lawyer, just a real simple simple person here. But what I do back in Hilo, I manage subdivisions, homeowner's associations, and I enforce house rules and use of land in a lot of ways.

And I've got to say, and I think my fellow Commissioners have touched on a lot of the same concerns I have, is that I have the feeling, and I think that's what he just said, but you did some lawyer talk in there. And certainly Mr. Okuda is such a good lawyer.

But what I feel like I'm missing is when petitioners or developers come to us and they want to make something that -- something is -- they got the land and they want to do something. They bring us the traffic study. They bring us the water study. They give us the cultural inspection. All of these things have been determined, the water usage -- you've got wastewater addressed in your 12 items, I think. But you have CC&Rs, I'm assuming, conditions, covenants and restrictions, you have some kind of homeowner's association. You share a road of some sort. Or you have to share maintenance of that roadway in some way, shape or form.

And you share water, right? The water is

shared with the other neighbors in someway. So you have some kind of rules and regulations that need to be addressed here. And I feel like I'm missing those basic things. So whether you've got 100 people going down to even do an agricultural use, and you're putting some kind of added value manufacturing plant down there, and you have 100 employees a day going down there, or during certain hours or what have you, you still need to deal with those 100 cars driving in and out of the driveway. Those 100 toilets flushing three times a day. Water coming in and sewage going out. And I feel like I'm missing those basic things.

Then my second concern is something like the police. On what basis -- does your county have some kind of a house rule enforcement agency, or that is just really the police?

So if they have their noise past

11:00 o'clock, or if they have more people than what
they're permitted to have on the wrong night of the
year. If somebody's funeral service wants to be on a
Tuesday instead of the Wednesday or whatever, you
know. How is your town is equipped to enforce that
type of a problem? I have a big concern there
because I want to know, because I do that
professionally, and I have a hard time doing it, and

1 | I'm private enterprise.

So I think I feel like we're missing a lot of, you know, you've addressed the neighbors' concerns, but I feel like we're missing the real basic of why you would allow somebody -- the fact they went in and got the land and then started building all these different buildings, and start changing the use of it without the permit, doesn't mean you have to go back to square one.

I'm sorry, I was going to ask you questions, but I think you answered them for Mr. Okuda.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Cabral.

Are there other questions, Commissioners?

I have a couple for Mr. Hopper. Sorry if I missed it.

Is there somewhere in the record transmitted by the Planning Director to us, the actual application?

MR. HOPPER: The full application, the original application was not given to the Commission, so it was not submitted to you, the actual full application, because that's something that's not generally transmitted to the Commission. It's

1 difficult to provide.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Planning Commission.

MR. HOPPER: To the Planning Commission, and HRS talks about the full record before the Commission being transmitted. And so that application wasn't transmitted. And I think that is consistent with -- we have certainly done other special permits, some that were clearly over 15 acres that were transmitted to you, and I don't believe the full application is ever part of that as well.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I was looking at the language of HAR 15-15-95(b) which says:

Special permits approved by the County
Planning Commission which require Commission approval
must be forwarded to the Commission within 60 days
following the County Planning Commission's decision.

The county shall assure that prior to the county hearing on the petition for special permit, copies of the special permit petition are forwarded to Land Use Commission which would, I assume, to be equivalent to the application.

MR. HOPPER: Again, that's in fact prior to the Planning Commission hearing, I believe.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: In any case, we don't have the application in the record, correct?

MR. HOPPER: This whole application, no, because, again, the Planning Commission didn't consider it. If you want them in the future --

2.1

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: The question I have is, do we have the record that we need to be able to decide on this or not in regards to that question?

I also had looked at the second set of questions, there's three. I had also looked at the same condition placed by the County regarding noise that Commissioner Okuda asked about earlier. Forgive me, just point to me that you've already answered the question, but I think I'm asking a slightly different question than Commissioner Okuda asked.

The original recommendation from the Planning Director, which was transmitted to us, had a noise standard, to paraphrase, that was that noise couldn't be heard from outside the property boundary.

And then that was changed and in the actual granted permit transmitted to us that noise needed to not exceed the standards held by the State Department of Health for land uses in the agricultural district.

Have I understood the record clearly on that, Mr. Hopper, correctly?

MR. HOPPER: I did read over the minutes but I don't recall exactly -- let me look at the

- 1 conditions just to be sure. You have -- do you have
 2 have a number on the Planning Department's
- 3 recommendation?

- 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: I believe it's No. 4,
 5 but I'm not positive. I can pull it up.
 - MR. HOPPER: Shall not be heard beyond the subject property lines.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So No. 4, and I believe in the final recommended condition, and I believe it was No. 4 in the original.
 - MR. HOPPER: Yeah. So it looks like it went from can't hear it outside at all, to not exceed the State Department of Health noise standards.
 - CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So somewhere in the record other than in the discussion of the transcript is there a specific finding that was made as to why that new standard was more appropriate that we can point to?
 - MR. HOPPER: I don't recall. I do remember extensive discussion of the -- not extensive, but discussion of the State Department of Health regulations as sort of a maximum -- of kind of what the law was in general as far as noise was concerned. And that may have been why the Commission changed the two.

But, again, I went over the minutes, but I don't have that before me. But I do believe it was a discussion in the record.

I can consult with our staff, I just don't remember offhand, but there was a lot of discussion on a variety of these items. The staff planer is trying to look to see maybe --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Hopper, just to be clear, so I'm not trying to find fault or be difficult at all. But part of what I wrestle with in this is -- even let's say for argument's sake, that we thought this was deserving of just us saying, yes, we agree with the county, we want to issue the Special Use Permit, there are procedural issues that come up.

And one is, can we clearly point on the record to specific findings that were made justifying what those conditions were. So that's really what the question is oriented towards?

MR. HOPPER: Well, whether you use the, can't be heard outside the property, or using the State Department of Health regulations, the finding would be, in the staff report, that here's the use, the record shows that there were concerns about noise, and a condition was placed on it dealing with

noise.

I don't know if you would have a separate finding showing here's why we're changing from one language to the other. I think the condition is there's been concerns raised in the record regarding noise, here is a condition to mitigate noise impacts.

not trying to -- I hope I haven't adopted an argumentative tone with you, but I'm just trying to explain what I'm struggling with in trying to understand, which is in my experience and other kinds of dockets as well as dockets like this, the particular mitigation that's proposed is supposed to be tied to Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law that show why that's reasonable and why we chose one thing over another.

MR. HOPPER: So would you want each condition to reference certain findings?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Typically there should be some kind of relation between the two.

MR. HOPPER: I think there is definitely a relationship. Even in Land Use Commission D&O's you have a list of conditions, but they -- I mean they end up corresponding to something in the record, but I don't necessarily say this condition is based on

1 findings X, Y and Z.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: As long as they're readily identifiable in the record, that's correct.

And that there's nothing contradictory in the record.

MR. HOPPER: I think as a Commission, you can sometimes see we've got testimony saying the noise is fine, testimony saying the noise is very bad. So there's a condition to mitigate the noise impact. I think that's relatively straight forward as far as this record, hopefully.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And then the third thing, was a little more discussion regarding Ka Pa'akai and the standards, and when we apply those standards. I really do try, some may disagree, I imagine in my own mind I try to be reasonable and not seek to apply reviews or conditions that are absurd or nonsensical.

And I heard what you were saying about that there was not a new physical building that was being proposed with this use, but rather a new use of an existing building. And that's why the county chose to not further make specific findings under Ka Pa'akai. Do I under you correctly?

MR. HOPPER: More so than what was in the staff report, that's correct, not go beyond that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: So I think there are two issues. One, if that was the case, is there sufficient record before us identifying that, so that a party not here, would understand that?

The second thing is, and this is a point that I think we may differ on, is that while building of a building might impact certain kinds of traditional and customary practices and cultural and natural resources, changes in use may affect different kinds of traditional and customary practices, even if they don't involve construction at all.

And so I think really the duty that's required by the permitting agency to look at, is there any valued natural resource used for cultural practices in the area at all, and not just the property itself, not just the four corners, that may be affected by the proposed use. And if there is, further go down the test.

I would just say that my review, for the record, but I'm inviting comment from you, the document from the State Historic Preservation

Division included in the transmission to us was a review for, I believe, simply aquaculture pond and one other activity on the part of the property not

for the actual use that's being considered now.

building to a church.

MR. HOPPER: So what we would want then is what review we would require the Applicant to do in a case where you're changing a use, where we do have the supreme court's case, but there is no rule or statute or anything else that specifies -- I mean, do they have to do a cultural impact statement, and they have to hire a planner who's versed in those areas. Is it sufficient for them send a letter to SHPD?

This was done because I think what was in the staff report was what was done again by the Commission and County staff would do for any other application that had a change in use from an ag

The record did not have any evidence, that I -- other than in that section, that implicated that there were valued cultural resources that would be impacted by this.

The question would be, would investigations have to be done beyond this? And we would like your guidance for that because there is certainly not a clear guideline for, in a case like this, what degree of investigation would need to be done by the Applicant before accepting the application.

If in the County and the Land Use

Commission's view and the Commission failed in that respect for what investigation they would have to do, we would like to know what you would be satisfied with, or what would be something that you would require the Applicant in this case to do.

And, again, I think part of it is balancing the risk to those natural resources with the nature of the application and the potential impacts of the project?

So, again, whether it's sending a revised -- them sending a revised letter to the SHPD waiting for a response saying something like we're changing this to this, do you think there's going to be impacts that you know of, based on the area; or if there's something else, because this is really an area where when you get to the specifics, it can be difficult to tell applicants here's what you have to do before coming to the Commission.

So any assistance you can give there, if you believe this was inadequate, we would take. But I think in this case, the county did what it would do in other cases where the uses are changing, but there's nothing in the record showing there is an impact on the uses which is where Ka Pa'akai would come in and say, well, now you have to protect those

1 interests.

2.1

But if there is an inadequate investigation to begin with, we would want to know what investigation would you want to be done, what level would you want to be done?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Again, I think I'm looking for common sense practical things that also meet our obligations.

Thank you, Mr. Hopper. I have nothing further.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Is there anything more, Commissioners? Are we good to continue on with Office of Planning? Ms. Takeuchi Apuna.

MS. APUNA: Thank you, Chair.

I think what the Office of Planning wants to address is the procedural review of jurisdiction on this matter, the Commission's jurisdiction, which might also be an issue of an incomplete record.

So a few of the Commissioners have touched on this, and it's the issue of whether this Petition is for more than 15 acres, which is the only requirement for this to be in front of you.

So it's here and we're here talking about it all day, and you can assume it's 15 acres, but I think that the record is not clear, it's ambiguous.

14.8 acres is what we assume the Applicant has put forth as the acreage. And when you look at the County's approval of this Special Permit it's not clear. There's reference to the 14.8 acres within the 25-acre parcel, and there's reference to the portion in the TMK, but it isn't clear; it's not definitive of what we're working with.

And then, you know, through the different -- the three hearings there were fits and starts about defining what that meant. I think their Deputy Corporation Counsel said that the Planning Commission needed to determine jurisdiction. And there was the letter from Director McLean to the Land Use Commission for guidance.

And I think that the Land Use Commission

Director did two things. I think that the Executive

Director provided his opinion based on the facts that

were provided to him, the limited facts. And that's

just an opinion, I don't think it's an analysis or

conclusion made by the Commission overall.

And the second thing that the letter did was it instructed the County, it urged the County to look at what, or determine the footprint of the Special Permit and the impacts of that Special Use.

I think that's what the County needed to

do. And so I think the record is ambiguous. And why is this important? It's not just important in order to determine the jurisdiction of this Commission, but it's important to know what the parameters are for the Applicant to know exactly where those boundaries are.

It's important for the neighbors to know how far out the Special Permit applies, it's important for the general public.

And so what is the role of the Land Use Commission today? And there's only a few things that you can do, but first, when you look at HRS 205-6, it says that the County Planning Commission may permit certain unusual and reasonable uses within agricultural districts other than those which are classified under such protective restrictions as may be deemed necessary.

And then from there, so it's saying that the Commission must make this determination, must approve the permit before it comes to the Commission.

And when it comes to you, it should be a complete record. It should be a complete approval with basic information, including the acreage or the parameters of the Special Permit. And I think that the record does not show that. We're not clear on

what that is.

So it's arguable that it could be less than 15 acres, based on what the Applicant represented, and the different maps, but it really isn't clear. And I think it's something that at this point the Commission, you know, it can approve, deny or modify or remand. But I do think that the Commission is limited in that it can't say that, it can't make the determination this is over 15 acres. The only thing that the Commission can do when it gets the permit, the Special Permit from the County, that it can impose — it can either approve, deny or modify, but that modification can only be restrictions, further restricting the use.

So if, say the Commission wants to designate the boundary greater than 15 acres, which it's arguably 14.8 at this point, it can't do that because that's the opposite of making it less restrictive.

You're expanding the Special Permit area, you're allowing more Special Permit uses in the Agricultural District, that's not less restrictive, that's the opposite of less restrictive.

So I think that the Commission, you are limited in the what you can do, and I think that you

are probably -- the best route might be to remand and get clarification to eliminate the ambiguity in the record. And if that means that the County finds that it is less than 15 acres, and it doesn't come back up here, I think that's a possibility too.

And then -- so I think OP has its position that to be supportive, but I think based on what our procedural issue is, we are going to put a hold on what our position is now as far as Special Permit.

One last comment I had. So some of the information on the B element of the map where the Applicant stated that there are agricultural uses, and it wasn't clear why the Special Permit would apply to element B. I think we need to look back, or remind ourselves of what a special permit is for, and that is to allow unusual and reasonable uses in the Agricultural or Rural District, but with these certain protections.

So we want to ensure that we protect the Agricultural District when we're looking at special permits. So I don't quite understand, you know, we can kind of change the parameters for a special permit, and allow more or less of the Ag District in there. Basically it should be pretty definitive as far as how we can protect it, or how we can limit the

1 uses, special uses in the Aq District under the 2 Special Permit. 3 Other than that, I think that's it. 4 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Ms. Apuna. 5 Commissioners? Commissioner Ohigashi. 6 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: So you're saying 7 that if we do approve it, we can be more restrictive; is that right? 8 9 MS. APUNA: Yes, you can provide more 10 restrictive conditions on the permit. 11 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Is the Commission 12 able to say we approve only a portion of, the portion 13 where the actual church is? 14 MS. APUNA: I think, based on the record, I 15 don't think you can. I think it's too ambiguous. 16 think that the Commission, and maybe County is 17 supposed to give you a final approved permit, special 18 permit, and that all those things as far as area were 19 determined. And from there, you could delineate, 20 maybe you could move it in further and make it more 21 restrictive, but I don't know where that's starting 22 at this point. I don't know where the baseline is 23 for that acreage based on the record. 24 COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER:

Thank you,

25

Commissioner Ohigashi. 1 Commissioner Okuda. 2 3 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. 4 Similar to Commissioner Ohigashi's 5 question, can we approve the permit but delete certain conditions that we might find not appropriate 6 7 or not -- well, delete certain conditions? MS. APUNA: Well, deleting -- I'm assuming 8 that these conditions are restricting, so if you 9 10 delete, you're make it less restrictive. So I don't 11 think you can delete. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 13 Commissioner Okuda. 14 Anything further for the Office of 15 Planning? 16 MR. HOPPER: Mr. Chair. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Hopper. MR. HOPPER: You asked for a record 18 19 reference for how the State Department of Health 20 language got in there. 21 Just to help, I think on the June 25th, 22 2019 minutes page 70 there is discussion of adding 23 the State Department of Health guidelines into the 24 condition. And I think eventually that's what became

25

of the condition.

So as far as a reference as to where that discussion happened, that might be helpful to you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It is helpful, though respectfully, I think part of the challenge of this Commission is not to have to hunt through transcripts to find what we believe might be the basis for one of the conditions.

Commissioners, do you have any final questions or comments for the parties for OP?
County?

Any final questions, Commissioners? If not, then the Commission will now conduct formal deliberations on this matter.

I will note for the parties and the public that during our deliberations I won't entertain any additional input from the parties or from the public unless, there's a small exception, that individual or entities are specifically requested to do so by me. And if called upon, comments will have to be limited to the questions asked.

Commissioners, let me confirm that each of you have reviewed the record and transcripts for any meeting that you may have missed and are prepared to deliberate on the subject docket. After I call your name, would you signify with either an "aye" or a

```
1
      "nay" that you are prepared to deliberate on this
2
     matter.
 3
                Commissioner Aczon?
 4
                COMMISSIONER ACZON: Aye.
 5
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Cabral?
 6
                VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Yes.
7
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
8
      Ohiqashi?
9
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Aye.
10
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda?
11
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
12
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Wong?
13
                COMMISSIONER Wong: Aye.
14
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: And I am also
15
     prepared to deliberate on this matter.
                Commissioners, what's your pleasure?
16
17
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Mr. Chairman.
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner
18
19
     Ohigashi.
20
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I think, I move to
2.1
     remand the matter to County for further hearing, and
22
     to specifically make findings regarding the
23
     questions -- regarding the area to be covered under
2.4
     the Special Use Permit. To provide us a clear map,
25
      clear indication in the record of findings, show us
```

1 | what is the area that we are required.

If the County finds that we are not required, then that would answer OP's problems.

We also, if we are to continue our review, also request that there be specific findings regarding relating to conditions that have been applied to the record. In other words, what is the basis for all the conditions.

Also would like to know whether or not that's the actual use of the church. In other words, is it the -- we're faced with dual interpretations, I believe, on whether or not the actual church and the relationship between the agricultural use and the church. I'm not sure whether or not the 14.8 acres as claimed is going to be -- is required because of church use or not. If there's a finding that says that it's not going to be used, then there should be determination as to what would be the size of the proposal. What would be the size of the necessary Special Use Permit.

I think that there should be findings relating to traffic impacts, that appear to have been raised but not really answered by the conditions or any other -- if there are no significant impacts, it should be at least a finding or reflection to the

record to say why there isn't.

I bring up the water system because it was brought up, and the water system serves these people in the neighborhood. There should be at least a finding that this does not affect the water system and the basis for that finding as to why --

COURT REPORTER: As to why?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi, can you repeat the last?

System for the project, there should be a finding as to whether or not that water system is adequately -- adequate for the supply of that -- for the supply of the project without detrimenting the other water users. If it is, it would seem to reflect -- the record should -- it should reflect in the record why there is adequate water.

I think that the findings should indicate also what the history of violations identified in the staff report, and explain whether or not that has anything or any relationship to any of the conditions. If it doesn't, it should be at least explained why.

I am concerned about whether or not this is an intensity of use. And I believe that a finding to

that effect, whether or not it is intensification of use requiring additional 205A safeguard should be addressed in the findings.

In addition to that, there should be some definitive statement as to the reason why the determination under the Ka Pa'akai case is not required.

So that's my motion?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: It's been moved by Commissioner Ohigashi.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Wong has seconded the motion as stated by Commissioner Ohigashi.

Mr. Orodenker, would you read what the motion is going to state?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: I'm so taken back by that request that -- as far as I could, as quickly as I could write what I have is:

It's moved to remand the matter to the County, ask the County for further proceedings to determine what the actual acreage of the Special Permit is, and that questions with regard to, and specific findings be made with regard to the conditions that have -- facts regarding relating to

the conditions that have no finding, and what is the basis for the conditions.

Whether or not the actual use of the church is related to the agricultural use. What is the actual size of the Special Permit. What traffic impacts need to be addressed, whether or not traffic impacts need to be addressed, and a finding made with regard to those.

With regard to the water system, a finding with regard to the impact of users of the shared system, and whether it is adequate for the project without causing detriment to the other users and why.

What the history of violations are, and explain whether or not that has any relationship to the conditions on why or why not?

Whether or not the Special Permit is intensification of use. And finally, the reason why a determination under Ka Pa'akai is or is not required.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Mr. Orodenker.

So, Commissioners, we are in deliberation.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: You were listening
after all.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Okuda.

1 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Can I ask a procedural 2 question? 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes. 4 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: How many votes do we 5 need for this motion to pass? 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Five. COMMISSIONER OKUDA: So all five of us? 7 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There are six of us. 9 Mr. Hopper, I will recognize you briefly. 10 MR. HOPPER: Was part of that motion -- I 11 don't know if it was restated, that if after 12 reviewing the map, the Commission determines the area 13 is under 15 acres, that it would not return to the 14 Commission? 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Yes. The motion is 16 constructed really to have two parts. The acreage 17 issue is a threshold issue. If you first -- if this 18 motion passes, and I'm not presupposing that, because 19 on a recent Special Use Permit we went through four 20 motions until we found one that succeeded. 2.1 But if this motion is the one that passes, 22 the way I understand its construction is: 23 First there is the threshold issue. Wе 24 need specific clarity on what the acreage is. And 25 should it happen that the Planning Commission

decides, you know what, it is clearly under 15 acres,
we then have no jurisdiction and none of the other
conditions apply.

But if it is found to be within our jurisdiction, then we have specific requests for further findings.

MR. HOPPER: Thank you for clarifying that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Did I do well by

understanding your motion, Commissioner Ohigashi?

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: Yes. Can I speak in favor of my motion?

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: You may.

making this motion essentially is this, that the threshold question is whether or not we really have jurisdiction as pointed out by OP. And Maui Planning Commission seems to say, yes, we do. And the Applicant seems to say, well, you may or may not, but from -- what I'm not clear about is whether or not jurisdictional issues can be waived.

So I think it's important for us to decide whether or not it's 15.5 acres or 15.6 acres or 14.8 acres.

The second thing is that if you do find that it is before this Commission, I think that

Findings of Fact, and Conclusions of Law is necessary for our review. And you may say that it's not required under the statute, you may say that it's not the practice of the Commission, but in order for us to review the record, we would like to know some answers to these questions, and the best way to do it is to create proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. It's not unusual for lawyers to do that, and to have them prepare it.

Maui Planning Commission would be, because essentially if we do have jurisdiction, we are a reviewing body, that requires us to go through a process of review and ask these questions. And what we see -- when we don't see it directly in the record, we have the right to say, hey, we want to see answers to these questions. And essentially those are -- that's the basis of my motion.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Can the Chair, as a privilege, ask you a question about the motion?

The motion did not request that the actual application be transmitted to us as well, if it comes forward.

COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI: I would be glad to include it, because --

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Mr. Orodenker.

to a certain extent. In situations where it's immediately apparent that the application is for over 15 acres, the County Planning Commission forwards the entire application, knowing that sooner or later we are going to have to review it.

This is isn't that situation. I can ask

Maui County Planning Department to forward on the --

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: For the record,

Planning Director is nodding her head in the

affirmative that there is not a problem in forwarding
the application should this motion pass. Thank you.

We are in deliberation. Commissioner Aczon?

COMMISSIONER ACZON: Mr. Chair, I fully agree with Commissioner Ohigashi about those information.

COURT REPORTER: Speak up, please.

COMMISSIONER ACZON: I fully agree with Commissioner Ohigashi with the request of those additional information to make our decision, but what bothers me the most, is after eight hours of this hearing, I'm still not sure of the total acreage that we talking about. We were presented by competing

maps which doesn't show really the actual boundaries where it is 14.8 or more than 15 acres. Nothing on those maps convinced me of the specific number that we supposed to be using. So, therefore, I'm going to be supporting the motion.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you,
Commissioner Aczon.

Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: I have a problem with the motion, and most of it I support, but in one regard I'm not really clear on history with the Land Use Commission, but it bothers me.

This is really a 25.4-acre parcel. So the fact that we're going to sliver off

14-point-something-acres so we can make it easier to do something different because whatever, whatever, and I look at that in dreaded fear for my own County where we've got lots of big ag land, and it would be really easy to buy affordable ag land and sliver off 14 acres at a time and make it industrial waste land or something different.

And it bothers me because I think that that's contrary to what our job is as the Land Use Commission for the State in trying to keep an eye on the conversion of Agricultural land into different

1 uses.

2.1

So I would have a problem with that portion of that, because I think it's a 25-acre parcel, not a 14-acre parcel. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: But, Commissioner Cabral, was that speaking in favor of the motion?

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Actually I would have to vote against it, because I am more concerned about that practice of letting people take large parcels of land and sliver off those in order to avoid having the State -- we represent the State not an individual County.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Cabral.

Commissioners, we're in deliberations.

Commissioner Okuda.

COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Mr. Chair, this might be the first time in my life I'm really not sure what I should do, and maybe I can ask for help from all of you for guidance.

I agree with Commissioner Cabral about the fact that I have the same fear that we're dealing with an unsubdivided land, and essentially we are allowing a landowner to unilaterally pick and choose when there's going to be subject matter jurisdiction

of the Land Use Commission, and when it's not.

I'm not saying it's forum shopping, but I think there is a policy question there which I'm not sure how it really comes down, and I would like to hear what everybody else thinks, because that does trouble me.

The other part that troubles me, frankly, is the fact that I believe there is a serious constitutional issue here where there is an infringement on First Amendment rights to religion. And, you know, the Hawaii Supreme Court hasn't said just because you're a church, you don't have to follow zoning laws, building codes, you know, noise restrictions, or anything like that.

But I really don't see any real evidence or things in the record which indicate that there's an intention to have the type of review which I believe the First Amendment, the Fourteenth amendment and the Hawai'i Constitution requires for the protection of religion.

And, yeah, the church is going to be treated differently under that scenario, but I believe that's what the First Amendment requires. So right now I don't mean to be wishy-washy, but these are the two things that are competing in my mind.

I see what Commissioner Cabral says that,
you know, this is like allowing applicants to
unilaterally determine what comes before the Land Use
Commission, or when the statute applies and when the
statute doesn't.

But then at the same time, based on this record which I do agree is not a complete record, I think if I had to make a decision based on an incomplete record, I truly believe there is at least a prima facie case of a violation of the First Amendment.

So I'm not sure what to do, so I want to listen to other people some more.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Okuda.

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Chair, so if I second the motion for remanding it back; if we don't remand it back, we either going to say, "yes", or "no", or add more restrictions.

So if we say "yes", the Special Use Permit goes, that is 14.8, whatever this acreage is, we don't know. If we say "no", what happens? Right.

If we said it with more restrictions, it's still smaller than the 25 point something acres. But

sending it back to the Planning Commission, at least it gives it the opportunity to say, look, this is our statement, it should be, you know, don't parcel it out. Take it as a whole. Or if you're not taking it as a whole, don't come to us, and we won't know about it, but we won't, right? Either way.

So either way we have to make a statement now to say, Planning Commission, we are unsure what is the acreage. What's happened. So that's why I second this motion.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Commissioner Ohigashi.

is that we do not have a rule, regulation or statute which identifies what 15 acres, and I think that, according to the statutory framework, that that decision is within the County of Maui. The County of Maui should or all of our counties should be the ones to protect the incremental development of property.

If they believe that this an incremental development of property, then they should rule it's as such and require them to come to the Land Use Commission for the full 25 acres, if they believe it's for the full 25 acres.

But it appears to be by statutory scheme

under the County's control, and that's why I make that motion with regard to that.

The second part regarding the condition.

If the findings and conclusions, the findings prepared by the parties are not able to support the conclusions that they have, then -- or the conditions that are in there -- then we can move to modify by saying that, or we can remand again to say that you don't have the basis. That's assuming that they don't have the basis to support these conclusions to try and rectify the problems that Commissioner Okuda has raised.

If there is, to wrestle with the First

Amendment issues that have been raised would be more

properly, I believe, from the County with the

conditions that they believe are justifiable and

supported by the record, then they would have to

plainly tell us why.

If they find that these conditions are not supportable by the record and cannot be, and it violates those First Amendment privileges afforded to the Applicant, then they have to make that decision to reduce or change the conditions.

But I don't believe we can modify the conditions as indicated by the Office of Planning.

1 So I think that the pathway that is 2 contained in the motion is the most sensible within, 3 and supported by the statutory framework and the 4 relative roles assigned by that statutory framework 5 to the various parties. 6 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 7 Commissioner Ohigashi. We are in deliberations. Commissioner Okuda. 8 9 COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Thank you. 10 Mr. Ohigashi, you've convinced me. I, 11 after listening to your explanation, I see your point 12 and agree with it, that when you look at the plain 13 language of the statute, you know, 15 acres or less, 14 or is it less than 15 acres, the magic 15 number is 15 by statute delegated to the County. 16 So I agree with your analysis that other 17 collateral issues by necessity would be delegated to 18 the County also. And that's something we should not 19 get involved with. So you've clarified my thinking 20 and addressed my concerns, so I'll be voting in favor 21 of the motion. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, 23 Commissioner Okuda.

Anything further before I speak, Commissioners?

24

25

I was a bit conflicted as well as stated by Commissioner Okuda, and particularly for the reasons spoken by Commissioner Cabral. Particularly with this proposed use and the nature of this use to me it's really clear, and to me like it is a very virtuous thing, there is not a sharp boundary line as I understood it between the worship practices in the building and the practice of taking care of this property, it is integrated, which I think is a great thing.

But to me that means like these lines on paper have relatively little meaning. So that gives me pause, but I believe procedurally the way we have to proceed with the record before us is to remand on the matter that Commissioner Ohigashi has proposed.

The reasons why I believe this way, if all you Maui people will forgive me for mentioning an Oahu chief in addition to a Maui chief, Kaka'alaneo, and then Mailikukahi was his contemporary on Oahu, and both of them are famous for being the first chief who really very actively and sharply set out moku and ahupua'a boundaries.

And it was really in many, many, many stories was the acts of these chiefs, and it was very clear, when the boundaries were set right, the people

thrived. And, you know, without being too arrogant about what we're asked to do, I believe that's what we are asked to do as a Commission. When the boundaries are set right the people thrive.

And that's why I get very frustrated when during these kinds of proceedings, when we are looking at, ah, a slight shift, it's kind of -- I much prefer the district boundary amendment. It's very clear what we are trying to do and what we are allowing in some places and not allowing in others.

In regard to that, I was thinking about those two chiefs, and thinking about speaking, the invoking of the word "pono" earlier by one of the testifiers. And commonly translated as "righteousness" but it's a word with incredibly deep layered meaning, and one of them is like pono procedures. It's like you have to follow the procedures right.

But partly I think what it felt, just funky this whole process is that clearly in their attempt to do good things on this property, there have been violations and there have been broken relationships and other things that have happened with some of the neighbors despite attempts to try and reconcile things as well. But there is some roughness here,

right. There is some awkwardness going on in this community. And the only thing I can say regarding that is that I do appreciate -- as a degree in environmental studies, who's been doing environmental problem solving for 30 years, and people looked at me and said, what do you do, recycling? No, no, not quite that. Little more sophisticated than that?

That, yes, we need clean food, we need clean energy, but the key to our long-term sustainability is just as much the relationships we build. And that I think partly the difficulty we're having with this is like things not starting from a sort of pono proper place and then proceeding from there.

That said, I will be voting in favor of the motion.

Is there anything further, Commissioners?

If not -- Commissioner Cabral.

VICE CHAIR CABRAL: Somewhat in defense of my position and my concerns is because I'm the practical person who lives these lives, it's okay, I can see it coming, the complaints from the neighbors is going to be that the five dogs that are owned by the house -- that live at the house, that is outside of the 15 acres bark nonstop every time a car comes

by. And 100 cars have come by today to go down there, and then 100 cars leave.

So now the barking regulation is regulated by some county ordinance, I'm sure. And I know what that takes, you have to get it tape recorded that it barks that long, and then take it to the police, and trust me, I try, I try all the time. You do nothing about it and the dog will bark forever.

Or if you've got five dogs, they're not regulated because they're outside of the 15 acres, right? But the 15 acres and the activities of what is going on with this Special Use Permit is causing that to happen because you've got 100 cars coming down for some event and then leaving.

So I don't see that as separately 15 acres, I see this a 25 acres, and separating that is only going to make it more justifiable to have the problems, because it's really an integrated situation.

So that's just my practical world that I live in. So I will still vote against it, just on principle that I think it shouldn't be slivered off.

CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Thank you, Commissioner Cabral.

Anything further? If not, Mr. Orodenker,

```
1
     please poll the Commission.
2
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 3
                Commissioners, excuse me if I refrain from
 4
      repeating the motion again. Generally it's just to
      remand the matter to county for further proceedings
5
 6
      and request certain questions be answered.
7
                Commissioner Ohigashi?
                COMMISSIONER OHIGASHI:
8
                                       Aye.
9
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Wong?
               COMMISSIONER WONG: Aye.
10
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Okuda?
11
12
                COMMISSIONER OKUDA: Yes.
13
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Cabral?
14
               VICE CHAIR CABRAL: No.
15
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioner Aczon?
16
               COMMISSIONER ACZON: Yes.
17
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Chair Scheuer?
18
               CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: Aye.
19
               EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Commissioners Giovanni
20
     and Chang are absent.
21
                The motion passes with five affirmative and
22
     one nay.
23
                CHAIRPERSON SCHEUER: There being nothing
24
      further today, this meeting will be in recess until
25
      9:00 a.m. tomorrow, November 7th. We will reconvene
```

```
295
      at 650 Palapala Drive in Kahului.
1
2
                 (The proceedings recessed at 5:02 p.m.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF HAWAII)) SS.
3	COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
4	I, JEAN MARIE McMANUS, do hereby certify:
5	That on November 6, 2019, at 9:00 a.m ., the
6	proceedings contained herein was taken down by me in
7	machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
8	typewriting under my supervision; that the foregoing
9	represents, to the best of my ability, a true and
10	correct copy of the proceedings had in the foregoing
11	matter.
12	I further certify that I am not of counsel for
13	any of the parties hereto, nor in any way interested
14	in the outcome of the cause named in this caption.
15	Dated this 6th day of November, 2019, in
16	Honolulu, Hawaii.
17	
18	
19	/s/ Jean Marie
20	JEAN MARIE McMANUS, CSR #156
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	