

LAND USE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

March 22, 2017

9:30 a.m.

County of Kaua'i Moikeha Building Conference Room 2A/2B
4444 Rice Street, Lihu'e, Kaua'i, Hawai'i, 96766

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Edmund Aczon
Gary Okuda
Arnold Wong
Kent Hiranaga
Aaron Mahi
Jonathan Scheuer
Linda Estes
Nancy Cabral
Dawn Chang

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: None

LUC STAFF PRESENT: Daniel Orodener, Executive Officer
Diane Erickson, Deputy Attorney General
Scott Derrickson, Staff Planner
Riley Hakoda, Staff Planner/Chief Clerk

COURT REPORTER: Jean McManus

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Aczon called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Aczon asked if there were any corrections or additions to the February 15, 2017 minutes and the March 5, 2017 site visit minutes. There were no corrections or comments. Commissioner Estes moved to approve the February 15, and March 5, 2017 minutes. Commissioner Mahi seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved by voice vote (9-0).

TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE

Executive Officer Orodenker provided the following:

- The regular tentative meeting schedule has been distributed in the handout material for the Commissioners for the following dates and docket numbers.
 - APR 12- A89-649 Lanai Remand Site Visit on Lanai
 - APR 26-27- A89-649 Lanai Remand on Lanai
 - MAY 18-19- A94-706 Ka`ono`ulu Ranch FEIS acceptance
 - MAY 24-25- SP09-403 Waimanalo Gulch- Special Permit
 - JUN 14- A94-706 Ka`ono`ulu Ranch Motion to Amend (Maui)
 - JUN 15- A16-800 Island School and A16-801 UHCC- Kaua`i; A17-802 County of Kaua`i Housing Agency-Lima Ola 201H) Project
 - JUN 28-29- Big Island Motions
- Any questions or conflicts, please contact LUC staff.

Commissioner Cabral requested confirmation of the proposed dates for the LUC meetings. Mr. Orodenker repeated the tentative meeting dates and scheduled items. There were no further questions or comments.

Chair Aczon stated that the two dockets that the Commission would be hearing at this meeting were neighboring properties and that the Commission should be aware that separate and distinct testimonies would be provided by witnesses for the respective Petition Areas, even though the witnesses may testify in both dockets. Chair Aczon called Mr. Derrickson to provide a map orientation to familiarize the Commission with the two Petition Areas to be addressed during the hearings. Mr. Derrickson used Docket No. A16-801 Petitioner Exhibit 7- Surrounding Areas Map and Docket No. A16-800 Petitioner Exhibit 2- Tax Map in his presentation.

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on the location of the Puhi Cemetery on the maps. Mr. Derrickson indicated where the approximate location was on the maps.

There were no further questions.

HEARING AND ACTION

A16-800 ISLAND SCHOOL (Kaua`i)

To amend the Agricultural Land Use District Boundary into the Urban District for approximately 38.448 acres at Puhi, Lihu`e, Kaua`i, Hawai`i, Tax Map Key: (4) 3-8-002: 016

Chair Aczon stated that this was a hearing and action meeting on Docket No. A16-800.

APPEARANCES

Curtis Tabata, Esq. and Benjamin Matsubara, Esq., Counsel for Island School
("IS")

David Pratt, Petitioner Representative, IS

Matthew Bracken, Esq. Deputy Corporation Counsel, for County Planning
Department ("County")

Michael Dahilig, Director, County

Lean Kaiokamalie, Planner, County

Dawn Takeuchi Apuna, Esq., Deputy Attorney General, for State Office of Planning
("OP")

Rodney Funakoshi, Land Use Administrator, OP

Lorene Maki, Planner, OP

Chair Aczon updated the record, and described the procedures for the hearing. There were no questions or comments on the procedures. Chair Aczon asked if Petitioner had been made aware of and was agreeable to the LUC's hearing expenses reimbursement policy. Mr. Matsubara acknowledged that Petitioner was aware of and would comply with the reimbursement policy. There were no questions or comments on the procedures

Chair Aczon called for public witnesses and swore each witness in before they began their testimony.

PUBLIC WITNESSES:

1. Veah Edwards

Ms. Edwards described why she supported Island School's petition.

There were no questions for Ms. Edwards.

2. Milo Spindt

Mr. Spindt provided his reasons for supporting Island School's petition.

There were no questions for Mr. Spindt.

3. Ferdinand "Fred" Pascua

Mr. Pascua shared his reasons for supporting Island School's petition.

There were no questions for Mr. Pascua.

ADMISSION OF EXHIBITS

Chair Aczon asked if the Parties had any Exhibits to be entered into evidence.

Mr. Tabata offered Petitioner's Exhibits 1-19. There were no objections and Petitioner's Exhibits 1-19 were entered into the record.

Mr. Bracken offered County Exhibits 1-2. There were no objections and County's Exhibits 1-2 were entered into the record.

Ms. Takeuchi-Apuna offered OP Exhibits 1-8. There were no objections and OP's Exhibits 1-8 were entered into the record.

PRESENTATIONS

Chair Aczon called for the Parties to make their presentations.

Petitioner

Mr. Matsubara's opening statement summarized the reasons why the Petition should be granted and stated that six witnesses would appear before the Commission to support the petition. There were no objections by County or OP to the designated witnesses being qualified as experts.

Petitioner Witnesses

1. David Pratt- Island Schools Vice-President and Board Member

Mr. Pratt, after being sworn in, shared the background history of Island School, its current and future plans and reasons for seeking a land use district boundary amendment.

County Questions:

County had no questions for Mr. Pratt.

OP Questions:

OP asked if Mr. Pratt had the authority to make commitments on behalf of Island School and whether he had reviewed the 8 conditions contained in OP's proposed conditions and if he was agreeable to them. Mr. Pratt acknowledged that he had commitment authority and had reviewed and was agreeable to OP's proposed conditions.

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Estes inquired whether the 7 original women founding members were still around. Mr. Pratt described the various founding members still involved with the school and community.

Commissioner Cabral requested clarification on Island School's enrollment of approximately 370 students. Mr. Pratt shared how the enrollment had grown over the years and what the future plans for handling student population growth were.

Commissioner Wong questioned what factors Island School considered during its future planning for increased enrollment. Mr. Pratt described how the institution assessed its current and future needs for facilities, funding and other school related matters.

Commissioner Scheuer requested clarification on why Island School had withdrawn its initial Petition. Mr. Matsubara explained that Island School had worked with the University of Hawai'i Community Colleges – Kaua'i campus to coordinate its initial Petition filing but had to withdraw and re-file the Petition to synchronize with the University of Hawai'i's delayed scheduling for Petition filing.

Commissioner Okuda requested clarification on how Island School had dealt with Hawai'i's Constitutional requirements. Mr. Pratt described how Island School had proceeded as a private institution to satisfy all requirements set before it.

Commissioner Hiranaga requested clarification on how Island School handled the existing reservoir system within the Petition Area. Mr. Pratt described how Grove Farm, as the reservoirs owner, was responsible for the maintenance and operations of the water resource; and what the details of the relationship between Island School and Grove Farm was in regards to the reservoir. Discussion over the inspection and upkeep of the reservoir ensued for further clarification.

Commissioner Wong requested clarification on the various modes of transportation involved with the institution. Mr. Pratt described the school's use of buses to transport students to/from the school, how parents dropped off and picked up their children; and how student pedestrian traffic moved within the Petition Area.

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on Mr. Pratt's involvement with expansion planning. Mr. Pratt described how he participates in the future planning process as part of the administrative governing body.

Chair Aczon requested clarification on whether the proposed master plan for Island School had a maximum student body in mind and how financing would be arranged. Mr. Pratt responded that funding from various sources needed to be obtained, assessed and considered before committing to expanding to and sustaining a larger student body of 500 or so students and estimated that the cost might be approximately \$30 million dollars.

Commissioner Mahi inquired what curriculum offerings Island School had. Mr. Pratt described how the school's courses involved academic and practical instruction including agricultural activities.

Commissioner Scheuer requested clarification on the full build-out plans for the Petition Area. Mr. Pratt described how the entire build-out was dedicated towards educational purposes and how various portions of the school would be used for more learning facilities with open spaces for athletic/special events venues.

There were no further questions for Mr. Pratt.

2. Sean Magoun- Island School Director of Institutional Advancement

Mr. Magoun, after being sworn in, described his background and role within the Island School administration and summarized Island School's general operations.

The Commission went into recess at 10:28 a.m. and reconvened at 10:35 a.m. (Commissioner Cabral returned at 10:37 a.m.)

Mr. Magoun provided additional information on Island School's efforts to be self-sufficient and interact with the general community.

County Questions:

County had no questions.

OP Questions:

Ms. Takeuchi-Apuna requested clarification on how Island Schools would protect endangered bird species within the Petition Area. Mr. Magoun described how students and staff were educated to assist in protecting the endangered species.

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Chang shared her appreciation of the history of Island School and that including aspects of it in the school curriculum might be valuable. Mr. Magoun acknowledged her comment.

Commissioner Okuda requested clarification on the percentage of Island School graduates going on to college after graduation and how the approval of the District Boundary Petition would assist the school's efforts. Mr. Magoun responded that nearly 100% of their graduates matriculated to college and shared his perspective on how the Petition's approval would benefit the school.

Commissioner Hiranaga requested clarification on aspects of the school's operation and what other private schools were established on Kaua'i. Mr. Magoun described how major operational decisions were based on maintaining a quality education for the students and shared his knowledge of what other private schools operated on the island.

Commissioner Cabral inquired whether approval of the Petition would help the stability of school operations. Mr. Magoun agreed that the district boundary amendment would stabilize and assist the school's efforts to implement its current and future plans.

Chair Aczon requested clarification on the graduation rate and whether post-graduation tracking of students was done. Mr. Magoun responded that there were a few occasions where students dropped out of school for different reasons, but that it seldom happened. He also described how technical career choices played a role and how feedback from graduates helped update the school on the whereabouts of their past students.

There were no further questions for Mr. Magoun.

DISCLOSURES

Commissioner Cabral stated that during the break, she had discovered that Mr. Pratt's niece had worked for her but that this matter would not affect her ability to remain fair and impartial during the proceedings. There were no objections to Commissioner Cabral's continued participation.

Petitioner's Witnesses (continued)

3. Earl Matsukawa- Wilson Okamoto- Vice President (Expert Witness)

Mr. Matsukawa, after being sworn in, summarized his role in preparing his portion of the Petition for Island School and described what planning, environmental impacts and land use issues were unique to the Petition Area.

County Questions:

The County had no questions.

OP Questions:

Ms. Takeuchi-Apuna requested clarification on the quality of the agricultural land that was in the Petition Area and what the impact to the island's agriculture would be by changing the land use designation to urban. Mr. Matsukawa provided his perspective of what the loss of agricultural-designated land impact would be and shared how the existing irrigation facilities would continue to function if the Petition were granted; and shared his recollection of what the soil ratings for the Petition Area were.

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Scheuer requested clarification on the Grove Farm Irrigation System's water source and whether any diversion demands were involved with it. Mr. Matsukawa replied that he was not familiar with the water source for the irrigation

system or diversion demands placed upon it, but that there was an ample water supply available, even for future use.

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on whether the master plan included night-time lighting for the proposed athletic facilities. Mr. Matsukawa replied that the facility plans were under review at this time and that conditions for such lighting would take into consideration any Commission conditions associated with it.

There were no further questions for Mr. Matsukawa.

The Commission went into recess at 11:16 a.m. and reconvened at 11:22 a.m.

4. Hallett Hammett- Archaeological and Cultural Surveys Hawai`i President (Expert Witness)

Dr. Hammett, after being sworn in, summarized his findings, studies, and conclusions in regards to the archaeological and cultural aspects of the Petition Area.

County and OP Questions:

County and OP had no questions for Dr. Hammett

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on various aspects of the Archaeological Inventory Survey, Cultural Impact Assessment and various Traditional/Cultural Practices reports prepared by Dr. Hammett. Dr. Hammett stated that he did not recall any consultation with the Kaua`i Island Burial Council when preparing the Archaeological Inventory Survey and did not find any Land Commission Awards that he could identify or any surface or sub-surface evidence of habitation. Dr. Hammett also mentioned that he had contacted the Office of Hawai`ian Affairs and other sources for the Cultural Impact Assessment and described his findings and recommendations; and how the *Kapa`akai* analysis had been performed.

Commissioner Scheuer requested additional clarification on how the *Kapa`akai* analysis had been performed; whether any requests for access across the property had been made and whether the *Menehune* fishpond received downstream water flow from the reservoir. Dr. Hammett responded that he wasn't aware of any requests for access across the property and did not know if the fishpond received any water from the reservoir or of any mitigation measures for water containment *Makai* of it.

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on whether any impact reports were received about the proposed activity during the Environmental Assessment process. Dr. Hammett responded that no reports of possible impacts were received. There were no further questions for Dr. Hammett.

The Commission went into recess at 11:40 a.m. and reconvened at 12:47 p.m.

5. Pete Pascua- Traffic Engineer (Expert Witness)

Mr. Pascua, after being sworn in, summarized his Environmental Assessment traffic report and recommendations for the Commission.

County and OP Questions:

County and OP had no questions for Mr. Pascua.

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Wong requested clarification on the factors considered during the Traffic Impact Assessment Report (TIAR) data analysis. Mr. Pascua described the various considerations made in formatting and reporting the collected data and what recommendations were made to mitigate anticipated problems or maintain/provide acceptable service levels of traffic. Mr. Pascua also described provisions and recommendations made to ensure pedestrian safety and consider “worst case” scenarios and cumulative effects.

Commissioner Scheuer requested clarification on how and why the TIARs differed for the two neighboring dockets (Docket Nos. A16-800 and A16-801) since they were in the same general area. Mr. Pascua detailed how the respective TIAR studies were designed and conducted based on established projections and data extrapolations from the two institutions up to the year 2020; and stated that he had no comments for additional improvements needed to maintain traffic levels associated with the studies.

Commissioner Chang stated her concerns about the need to update the TIAR since it had been conducted in 2010 and contained a recommendation to update the traffic study report in 2020 if implementation of the proposed project exceeded its projected time limits. Mr. Tabata stated that Island School would abide by the recommendation and update the report. Discussion ensued regarding how traffic projections were based on enrollment and how other development conditions/factors may need to be included and what agency would be responsible for requesting the

update. Mr. Pascua described the projected variables involved in TIAR updates and what roles the various government agencies would play as the methodologies and considerations to update the TIAR evolved.

Commissioner Chang expressed her concerns about the accuracy of forecasted growth projections. Mr. Pascua described how the current traffic system could continue to handle increased flow beyond existing levels to accommodate projected growth in the area.

Commissioner Scheuer requested clarification on what TIAR Recommendation #5 intended to suggest as a representation. Mr. Pascua described how his report reflected no need for additional mitigation measures even beyond 2020.

Commissioner Cabral requested clarification on how recent nearby highway/roadway improvements would allow for increased capacities in the area. Mr. Pascua acknowledged that the improvements were designed to absorb additional traffic volumes.

There were no more questions for Mr. Pascua.

6. Reginald Davis- Rana Biological Consulting Inc. President (Expert Witness)

Mr. Davis, after being sworn in, summarized his Biology/Avian/ Mammalian Survey Report findings and conclusions for the Commission.

County Questions:

County had no questions.

OP Questions:

OP requested clarification on the bird species findings for the Hawai`ian Common Moorhen. Mr. Davis provided the differences between the endemic and non-endemic species and shared general information about those birds.

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on recommendations to prevent/reduce any adverse impacts from the proposed development of the Petition Area. Mr. Davis described how various methods and practices would mitigate the urban intrusion to the local habitat. Commissioner Chang commented how the school

might integrate those useful concepts and environmental awareness into its curriculum. Mr. Davis and Mr. Tabata acknowledged her remarks.

Commissioner Cabral requested clarification on the absence of finding no rats/rodents or chickens in the Petition Area findings. Mr. Davis shared how he had prefaced his survey to address the various rodent species common to Hawai`i and that the chickens were included as part of the local bird population.

There were no further questions for Mr. Davis.

Mr. Tabata stated that his last witness, Eric Guither- Botanist (Expert Witness) was not available to testify but that Mr. Davis was co-author of the submitted botanical report and was available to address any questions on flora in the Petition Area.

There were no questions about flora and no further questions for Mr. Davis.

Mr. Tabata stated that Petitioner had concluded its presentation. Chair Aczon asked if the Commission had any further questions for Mr. Tabata.

Commissioner Scheuer requested clarification on the landowner's willingness to abide by the recommendations of the Traffic Impact Analysis. Mr. Matsubara replied that Petitioner would comply with the TIAR recommendations and cooperate with the various government agencies involved as required. Discussion ensued on how future recommendations would be included and what roles the government agencies would assume. Chair Aczon deferred responses to the government agencies' roles to their respective presentations and moved on to the County.

County

Mr. Bracken stated that County supported the Petition and explained why it took that position, and called County's witnesses Leah Kaiokamalie, County Planning Department's Long Range Planner and Michael Dahilig, County Planning Department Director to testify.

County Witnesses:

1. Leah Kaiokamaile

Ms. Kaiokamaile, after being sworn in, provided her professional background information and described her role as staff planner in reviewing the Petition Area and how it related to the Kaua`i County Planning Department's

zoning and districting, the Kaua'i General Plan, County permitting processes, and Lihue's Community Plan.

(Mr. Orodener exited the meeting at 1:34 p.m. and returned at 1:36 p.m.)

OP and Petitioner had no questions for Ms. Kaiokamaile.

Commissioner Estes requested clarification on the Kekaha/Puhi traffic intersection conditions. Ms. Kaiokamaile shared her perspective of conditions on the roadways in those intersection areas.

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on how the County would interpret the traffic study information for the Petition Area and apply/enforce LUC conditions in the future. Ms. Kaiokamaile deferred to Mr. Dahilig to respond to Commissioner Chang's questions.

2. Michael Dahilig

Mr. Dahilig, after being sworn in, described the County Planning Department's procedures for assessing, reviewing, implementing and enforcing LUC's Decision and Order Conditions during the permitting process and the proposed project's development and provided additional specifics on the TIAR update in particular.

Commissioner Scheuer requested clarification on what type of language or other specifics could be included in the wording of LUC conditions on the TIAR issue. Mr. Dahilig responded that the more specifics included in the condition to assist in directing the County, the better.

Commissioner Scheuer next requested clarification on whether the A16-800 and A16-801 dockets excluded the Puhi reservoir and whether the pockets of "non-urban islands" such as the reservoir and cemetery created problems for his department. Mr. Dahilig confirmed that the reservoir was excluded from the Petition Area and explained how modern mapping technology made accurately dealing with "non-urban islands" much easier.

Commissioner Cabral requested clarification on the transportation road/highway system in the Petition Area. Mr. Dahilig described and confirmed the information for the road/highway access/exit systems in the area.

Commissioner Hiranaga requested clarification on whether it would be more practical to require a TIAR update based on factors other than the recommended 2020 date; and what types of triggers/time tables might be considered. Mr. Dahilig deferred to relying on the expertise of a traffic engineer to make those determinations instead of his department and shared his appreciation for updated and relevant information that could be obtained when certain triggers at the County/State level were activated.

There were no further questions for Mr. Dahilig.

Mr. Bracken stated that County had concluded its presentation. There were no further questions for Mr. Bracken.

The Commission went into recess at 1:51 p.m. and reconvened at 1:58 p.m.

Chair Aczon called for OP to make its presentation.

OP

Ms. Apuna called its witness, Rodney Funakoshi, to testify. Mr. Funakoshi, after being sworn in, described how his department developed its position on the Petition. Mr. Funakoshi stated that OP recommended approval of the Petition subject to certain conditions. Discussion ensued to determine how OP should file another OP Exhibit for the record.

Chair Aczon declared a recess at 2:06 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 2:07 p.m.

Ms. Apuna stated that she wished to admit Docket No. A16-801 OP Exhibit 4 – DOT Correspondence regarding the University of Hawai`i Kaua`i Community College Expansion and continued operation into evidence as OP Exhibit 9 for Docket No. A16-800. Commissioner Hiranaga requested clarification on the exhibit details under consideration. Discussion ensued to clarify what exhibit would be admitted as OP Exhibit 9 for A16-800. There were no objections to OP Exhibit 9 from County or Petitioner and Chair Aczon admitted it into evidence.

Mr. Funakoshi read OP's conditions for the Petition into the record.

Petitioner and County had no questions for Mr. Funakoshi.

Commissioner Questions:

Commission Chang requested clarification on whether OP had any objections to Mr. Pascua's traffic recommendations. Mr. Funakoshi replied that OP had no objections and described the coordinated efforts involved to implement the recommendations.

Chair Aczon declared a recess at 2:15 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 2:18 p.m.

Commissioner Cabral shared her understanding of what recommendations were made in the 2010 traffic study and requested clarification on whether the County could react to the recommendations. Mr. Funakoshi replied that the County could ask for recommendations it needed.

Commissioner Chang requested clarification on whether the County needed an LUC condition consistent with the Petitioner's recommendation. Mr. Dahilig responded that the County could deal with the condition.

Commissioner Okuda requested clarification on why Docket No. A16-800 did not have a recommendation for an updated traffic study as Docket No. A16-801 had since they were in the same general area. Mr. Funakoshi provided his opinion on why DOT did not similarly require traffic studies for both dockets.

Commissioner Scheuer shared his understanding of Petitioner's TIAR recommendation 5 and commented how a 2020 update for both dockets might be useful. Discussion ensued over whether a proposed condition for Docket No. A16-800 should exclude the need for a 2020 TIAR. Commissioner Hiranaga requested clarification from Ms. Erickson on how a representation or a recommendation should be considered. Ms. Erickson provided her perspective of how a Petitioner's representation should include complying with the stated recommendation(s). Mr. Tabata offered Mr. Pascua to be recalled. Mr. Matsubara opined that relating a need for a TIAR to an event might be helpful.

Chair Aczon declared a recess at 2:38 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 2:42 p.m.

Chair Aczon stated that the docket record would stand with the admittance of OP Exhibit 9 and continued with the Commissioners questioning of Mr. Funakoshi.

Commissioner Hiranaga requested clarification on the Department of Health recommendations for Phase I Site Environmental Assessment for potential hazardous

materials. Mr. Funakoshi described how required pre-construction studies would trigger the need to implement the recommendations.

There were no further questions for Mr. Funakoshi. Ms. Apuna stated that her presentation was concluded and that she had no re-direct examination of Mr. Funakoshi.

Commissioner Hiranaga requested clarification on whether Petitioner was agreeable to performing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the entire Petition Area if one was needed. Petitioner responded that it would perform an EA if necessary.

Chair Aczon stated that the evidentiary portion of the proceedings were officially closed and provided the filing schedule for the Parties. There were no objections to the established filing schedule from the Parties. County and OP waived their right to provide their respective proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order (D&O) but retained their rights to comment and object on Petitioner's proposed D&O.

Ms. Apuna inquired whether the filing and deadline schedule for the accompanying Docket No. A16-801 would be aligned with the Island School Docket. Chair Aczon confirmed that the filing schedules were similar and declared a recess.

The Commission went into recess at 2:50 p.m. and reconvened at 2:58 p.m.

There were no further questions for Ms. Apuna.

Chair Aczon stated that the Commission would begin on the next agenda item before recessing for the day.

HEARING AND ACTION

A16-801 UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGES (Kaua`i)

To amend the Agriculture Land Use District Boundary into the Urban District for approximately 148.37 acres at Puhi, Līhu`e, Island of Kaua`i, State of Hawai`i, (TMK): (4) 3-4-07: 01, 02, 03 and 06

Chair Aczon updated the record, and described the procedures for the hearing. There were no questions or comments on the procedures.

Chair Aczon called for public witnesses.

PUBLIC WITNESSES:

None

APPEARANCES

Laurel Loo, Esq., Counsel for University of Hawai'i Community Colleges-Kaua'i (UHCC)

Earl Matsukawa, Petitioner Representative, Wilson Okamoto & Company

Jodi Higuchi, Esq., Deputy Corporation Counsel, for County Planning Department ("County")

Michael Dahilig, Director, County

Marisa Valenciano, Planner, County

Dawn Takeuchi Apuna, Esq., Deputy Attorney General, for State Office of Planning ("OP")

Rodney Funakoshi, Land Use Administrator, OP

Lorene Maki, Planner, OP

Chair Aczon updated the record, and described the procedures for the hearing. There were no questions or comments on the procedures

ADMISSION OF EXHIBITS

Chair Aczon asked if the Parties had any Exhibits to be entered into evidence.

Ms. Loo offered Petitioner's Exhibits 1-26. There were no objections and Petitioner's Exhibits 1-26 were entered into the record.

Ms. Higuchi offered County Exhibits 1-2. There were no objections and County's Exhibits 1-2 were entered into the record.

Ms. Takeuchi-Apuna offered OP Exhibits 1-9. There were no objections and OP's Exhibits 1-9 were entered into the record.

Chair Aczon stated that the Commission would reconvene at 9:00 a.m., March 23, 2017 and declared a recess at 3:07 p.m.

