MAUI PLANNING COMMISSION PORTION OF REGULAR MINUTES ITEM D.1 APRIL 13, 2021

Ms. McLean: The next item on the agenda, we actually have two proposed findings of fact conclusions, law and decisions and order before you. The first is one that would deny the request for State Land Use Commission Special Permit for Dr. Lew Abrams and Maria De Abrams to operate Sacred Earth Assembly, a non-profit interfaith church in the State and County Agricultural Districts at 4505 Hana Highway in Haiku, TMK: 2-8-003: 075.

There were a number of documents linked on the agenda and then a few more emailed just over the past few business days, the Commission may act to adopt, adopt with modifications or take some other action regarding the Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order.

D. CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND DECISION AND ORDER

Pursuant to Chapter 91, Hawaii Revised Statutes, and Maui Planning Commission Rule 12-201-119, no public testimony will be taken.

1. Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order denying the request for a State Land Use Commission Special Permit for DR. LEW ABRAMS AND MARIA DE ABRAMS to operate Sacred Earth Assembly, a non-profit, interfaith church in the State and County Agricultural Zoning Districts at 4505 Hana Highway, Haiku, Island of Maui, TMK (2) 2-8-003:075 (SUP1 2019/0001)(SUP2 2017/0011) (T. Furukawa) (Action on the application was taken by the Commission following public hearing at the July 14, 2020 meeting.) (Matter was rescheduled from the March 9, 2021 at the request of the applicant's attorney due to a scheduling conflict.) (Members: Please refer to your March 9, 2021 packet with which your received a hard copy of the D&O and a hard copy or flash drive for the Exhibits which you requested at a previous meeting.)

The Commission may take action to adopt, adopt with modifications, or take some other action regarding the proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order.

Ms. McLean: The applicant does have an opportunity to address the Commission. First, I think it would be appropriate for Mr. Hopper to guide the Commission in the steps taken today and what actions would be appropriate. And then, of course, the applicant has an opportunity to address the Commission. Mike, do you have anything that you want to say to direct the Commission on this?

Mr. Hopper: Mr. Chair, if I may?

Mr. Tackett: Yes, please do, Mr. Hopper.

Mr. Hopper: As an initial matter, I know not all of the members have heard the whole record of this proceeding. I believe the entire record, however, was sent to all of the members. So, I think just verbally, I want to confirm that all of the members have read the full record prior to proceeding so you know how many members will be participating. That might be a good initial matter to, to go through.

Mr. Tackett: Understood. Anything else, Mr. Hopper?

 Mr. Hopper: I would, if it would, I think it would be beneficial for the Commission once you've established that to have an executive session prior to getting into the adoption of the Decision and Order. There's some legal advice that I think would be important for the Commission to hear with respect to this item and in the various filings or letters that have arisen since then. And I think that's something I'd recommend prior to hearing from the applicant and deciding what to do with this item.

Mr. Hopper: Okay. Yes, Kellie?

Ms. Pali: Chair, would you like me to call or I should say, I could call the executive session if you would like, in pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(4) for us to be able to talk to our attorney about questions pertaining to the commission's powers, duties and privileges.

Mr. Tackett: Sure, I would entertain your motion and P D second—

Mr. Hopper: Mr. Chair?

 Mr. Tackett: --after I do the verbal confirmation. So, for those of you that were not here for the initial, for the initial presentation, you guys were supposed to have all been provided all the documentation and so I just need to confirm that yes, you did receive that documentation, you did read that documentation, and that you feel that you have all the information you need to make a sound decision on that information. Does anybody here not feel like they've had an opportunity to, to read all the information and to be able to make an educated decision on this matter? Go ahead, Mel.

Mr. Hipolito: Thank you, Chair. I've read all of the documentation, including the jump drive. Not attending the original presentation there's a lot of things that could have been said that may not be part of this. I read the documents. I understand it, but I still feel not comfortable at this point.

Mr. Tackett: Understood. So, at that point, are you saying that you would like to, you would like to recuse yourself from the vote or are you comfortable with—

Mr. Hipolito: I recuse myself.

43 Mr. Tackett: Okay. And I believe also, Ashley, I believe you are also not on at that time. Have you read all the information and do you feel comfortable weighing in on this adoption?

46 Ms. Lindsey: Yes, Chair, I read the information and I feel comfortable weighing in on the adoption.

Mr. Tackett: Outstanding. Anybody else have anything to say on this matter? Hearing none, oh, go ahead Jerry.

 Mr. Edlao: I read all the documents, a lot of documents, even on the jump drive and everything else, and you know, yeah, I agree with Mel there may have been some things that were done in person that may not be part of the documents but based on what I read, I feel comfortable moving forward and discussing this.

Mr. Tackett: Okay, thank you Jerry. I believe, I believe that, that takes care of the verbal confirmation. Next becomes the executive session which I believe we already have a motion from Kellie, and a second from P D., not exactly how that, how that's gonna work, but if we could, if we could move into that next section, please?

 Ms. McLean: Chair, the way it works is that everyone would have to leave this meeting. Carolyn will send a link to everyone with a new meeting that will just be for the executive session participants, and then once that's concluded, you'll leave that meeting and then rejoin this one. So, you'll need to have on hand the original link that you needed, that you used to join this morning. So, you'll leave that and then come back to it.

Mr. Tackett: Understood.

23 Mr. Thompson: Carolyn sent out the email already. We have it.

Ms. McLean: Okay, did you vote on the motion?

27 Mr. Tackett: No.

Ms. McLean: Okay, so you need to vote on the motion.

Mr. Tackett: Okay, we need to call those in favor of going into executive session, please raise your hand? And all those opposed? I believe it's unanimous, Director.

Ms. McLean: Yes, Chair.

It was moved by Ms. Pali, seconded by Ms. La Costa, then unanimously

VOTED: To Go Into Executive Session.

(Assenting – K. Pali, P D. La Costa, J. Edlao, K. Freitas, M. Hipolito,
A. Lindsey, D. Thompson)

Mr. Tackett: So, Commissioners, you guys should have all received a link and so we'll exit this meeting and we'll enter that meeting and then we'll report back to this same meeting via the same number we used the first time. All right, see you guys there.

The regular meeting was recessed at approximately 11:25 a.m., and the Commission went into Executive Session at approximately 11:27 a.m. The Executive Session was adjourned at 12:01 p.m., and the regular meeting was reconvened at 12:03 p.m.

Mr. Tackett: And our next order of business?

Ms. McLean: Chair, I think Mr. Hopper would advise that the Commission establish that no decisions were made in executive session and that the discussion related only to the commission's powers, duties and liabilities.

Mr. Tackett: Can we all confirm that, what Director has just said was the case? All those all those confirming, please raise your hand? (All members raised their hand) Thank you.

Ms. McLean: Chair, continuing on to the first Finding of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order that's before the Commission, we already read that matter into the record. I don't know if Mr. Hopper has any procedural guidance for it, but at this point it would be appropriate to offer the applicant the opportunity to address the Commission, and Chair, if you wish to establish a time limit on that I believe it is your prerogative to do so.

Mr. Tackett: Yes, if we could please start that process with a time limit of 15 minutes.

Mr. Leslie Iczkovitz: Is it my turn now? Ready to go? Okay, good morning Commissioners, Director McLean and Mr. Hopper. Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today on my behalf of my clients, Dr. Lew Abrams and Mrs. Maria Abrams, and their nonprofit Sacred Earth Assembly.

First, I want to share something from my heart. I've known this family for years, and I know that the...and I know this property very well, and I know that they've spent 13 years working very, very hard to convert useless pineapple land into incredibly beautiful organic farm, certified organic and just got recertified organic.

Mr. Tackett: Excuse me, Les. Excuse me, Les.

Mr. Iczkovitz: Yes.

Mr. Tackett: Could I just please ask Mr. Hopper a question. Mr. Hopper are you there?

38 Mr. Hopper: Yes, Chair.

40 Mr. Tackett: Do I have to, do I have to have him promise to tell the truth.

Mr. Hopper: I think he's legal counsel making arguments so generally you don't need to swear in legal counsel for that.

Mr. Tackett: That's what I thought. Sorry Les, I just wasn't sure on my procedure with that. Go ahead.

Mr. Iczkovitz: Not a problem. I understand.

Mr. Tackett: If you could please restart his 15 minutes. Thank you.

Mr. Iczkovitz: So, the Abrams have worked 13 years very, very hard to build an incredible property here. Agriculture is what Maui is supposed to be about, and that's what they've done, they've converted depleted pineapple land into a beautiful organic farm and they've...they spent over 20 years as ministers through the Temple of Peace in Haiku, where they've been ministers and helping Kedar St John, the reverend there put on services for over 20 years and they've done a lot for the community. The Commission, if you've looked through the, the testimonies, you have over 60 people who's testified in support. You have dozens of letters in support and they've all talked about just how much they've done for the community. Last November, Thanksgiving was the first time in over 20 years the Abrams did not host a potluck Thanksgiving for people on the island who did not have another place to go. And they've been available for, for so much and they've always stepped right up. But they've had a vision for a church and they bought 25 acres in Haiku, and they needed a place where they wanted to be far away from people.

So, the building they built as the temple building which they get the permit, the authority to go forward, they...this building is 1,500 feet from the closest neighbor and there's just no noise, there's no possible impact and you know, I've been impressed by this. I've, I've, you know the services that they plan to do is similar to Temple of Peace, and quite frankly, I moved to Maui after 40 years on Oahu. I moved to Maui two years ago to help them build this church. I was so moved by what they do and the community that is so supportive of them. So, I'm just you know, asking you, please, to do what you've already done, which was granted a permit back in August of 2013...a, 2019.

Now, the record is over a thousand pages long, and I'm happy to hear that the commissioners, the new commissioners have said that they've, they've read it all. But it's important for me to do some history just so that we know we're on the same page. Procedurally in my letters to you, I said, I put the point which I'm asking for a legal response is that legally you do not have the authority to revoke SEA's existing permit. You granted a permit. The important questions and the facts are these, the permit was issued and approved by the Maui Planning Commission on August 13, 2019, and there's been no revocation of that permit...2019. There's been no revocation of that permit. There's never been any notice on any agenda of any proposed revocation of that permit. And under the Administrative Procedures Act, you have rules that you have to follow. You can't just issue a permit and then change your mind.

Well, what we have here, the first order of business, I believe, is that whether or not, you know, we've asked you to take this off the agenda because legally, procedurally, you do not have the right to move forward, but that's, that's the first point that I'm asking to address.

But historically, the important thing is this, as on July 14th. Let me, let me go back a second. On ...(inaudible)...three meetings, August 13, 2019, the Maui Planning Commission approved the permit with 12 conditions. Everything is in the record. All the discussions about traffic, about water, about returns...requests for services. This was all in the record. And it was

discussed. You had three neighbors that...(inaudible)...but they all talked about, that there's no traffic problems, there's no noise issues. You have three neighbors that complained, and after all the information that was in the record, this Maui Planning Commission voted five to one in favor of the permit. It granted the permit on August 13th. And then on September 16th, Director McLean wrote a letter issuing the permit, gave it a permit number, so yes, it was approved, but instead of issuing it right away, there was a question of jurisdiction so the Maui Planning Commission sent it back up to Land Use Commission and said, you have jurisdiction. But the Land Use Commission said that's not our job, your job is to determine who has jurisdiction. So, the Land Use Commission issued an order sending it back down to the Maui Planning Commission to determine who has jurisdiction and if it...and also had directed them to make six findings. First finding being who has jurisdiction, the...once the Maui Planning Commission voted in favor of jurisdiction, they had jurisdiction. The Land Use Commission had done its final action. There was nothing left for them to do. So here you have a record which is clean that the Maui Planning Commission relied upon to grant the permit in August 2019.

Now, what has happened since then? Has there been any new evidence negative to SEA's SUP application? Absolutely, nothing. There's absolutely no new evidence into the record. Somehow on July 14th...(inaudible)...just to really address the issues that were being discussed, and you know, regarding incorrect information about the water system. So, you know, without us giving us a chance, Maui Planning Commission decided we're going to just change our mind, even though there's absolutely no new evidence in the record which would support changing our decision back in August 2019. We're gonna go ahead and do it. We're gonna just...and so what makes things more difficult is that somehow the Commission lost an hour and a half of the recording. So, there's no audio recording. The motions that were made, the discussions of the participants, your minutes which are required to be accurately describing what took place at the meeting, are woefully incomplete. So, you know, and but then somehow somebody drafts findings of facts and they come up with things and the three that I want to direct you to are Numbers 39 to 41.

And Number 39, it's stated that the applicant did not get approval of their neighbors to, to use the common water system. Well, legally, we don't have to, and I'm not the only one who says that, but Director McLean said that, attorney Michael Hopper said that, Deputy Director Jordan Hart all said that on the meeting July 14, 2020. They all told you...(inaudible)...private water agreement, a civil dispute is not a reason why you can deny a permit. But in spite of having said that, somehow somebody put in the findings of fact that they have such a legal obligation. It's just not true. There's no law. There's no fact. There was no case that your counsel can point you to that says this is valid.

The next issue is traffic. Well but, let's go back to the water. What happened on July 14th, you didn't really discuss the letter from the engineer that said there's plenty of water and even Commissioner Pali did not, didn't argue that the water is adequate. She just wanted permission. Permission is...(inaudible)...use a common water agreement. When it comes to the traffic, you know, all the issues were discussed about traffic, the three people complained, but in spite of whatever is in the record and which now includes the letter from the Department of Transportation, which said traffic is not a problem. So how is it that somebody came up with an issue, a finding of fact that said, oh, traffic's a problem. Name me one fact in the record which supports that. I

don't think you can do it because there are no such facts and there's nothing new came back regarding traffic on August 19th, so it's not possible legally to change your mind.

And then the finding of fact, 41 says that we have a history of violating the law. And you know, you mentioned new RFSs but was not mentioned in the findings of fact was that all RFSs were submitted by neighbor Michele Drewyer, who's been a disgruntled...in opposition of this thing. And each one of those four new RFSs were, were closed out because they had no basis for them. So here we have a neighbor who complains and about potential traffic, but again, there is nothing in the record that supports any finding of history of violation of the law. And the RFSs were...(inaudible)...they did what they were supposed to do, but in order to revoke a permit, because once you have a permit, you have a permit. You have...there's a value to that, and you cannot just deny that permit. There's no law that says you can deny a permit. Ask your Lawyer, what's the, what's the law, what's rule of Maui Planning Commission that allows you to revoke the permit after it's been granted?

And you know, if you want to point to the Land Use Commission Order, the Land Use Commission Order specifically does not say that you can revoke the permit. What it says is to modify the conditions as appropriate. And going back to Land Use Commission there was a big misunderstanding, the Land Use Commission was in favor of this permit. The State Office of Planning wrote a letter to the Land Use Commission on November 4th that confirmed that we met the five guidelines, there are five guidelines and we met them. They proved positively. So, when Director McLean, her initial report in 2019 that was approval, the Commission, the Commission voted its approval August 2019...(inaudible)...by giving the approval and said we met the five guidelines...(inaudible)...planning said we met the five guidelines and everything in the record says we've met the five guidelines. So how can you revoke a permit when you don't have the legal authority to do so considering that the Land Use Commission said, you know, if you, if you look at their minutes and I encourage you to of their meeting, they were concerned that the restrictions imposed on SEA's permit was too restrictive.

And, you know, they do not, you know, they wanted to know well, how do you justify limiting this congregation to six Saturdays a year? I mean, Dr. Abrams is Jewish. I'm Jewish. I want to be able to celebrate the Sabbath in my church and to say that, you know, arbitrarily say you can't do something. We said we wanted you to reconsider that because we don't think it's fair for Saturdays to be excluded. So, what we did for the July 14th meeting last year was we brought a letter addressing all the five, the six issues that LUC wanted us to comment on, and we commented on it and we just asked the commission to consider some slight changes. Please consider modifying it. We weren't demanding anything. We were just asking you to consider it. But in response to that, everything just went south. It seemed like the Chairman, first of all, was refusing to allow us to testify, even though Tara had had given us assurance the day before that we would have a chance to testify. And she did tell the Commission that we planned to testify, but somehow the Chairman last time did not really let us testify. He just said we're going to vote, are we ready to vote without giving us a full chance to do that. It's just not fair.

But in order for this commission to make a decision today, it has to make a determination under what legal right do they have to revoke the permit. And then, and if you look at your findings of fact, what particular facts are there that supports the findings of fact 39 to 41, and there's just

nothing, nothing there. The...you know, and I have to say that whoever, you know, I'm very curious, we're very curious as to who drafted these findings of fact without minutes, without an oral recording, who took notes of that July 14th meeting, were those notes, what was used in order to create those findings of fact? You know, and when did you discover that you didn't have a recording and you're dependent upon someone to create minutes without notes? But the prejudice that was shown in the drafting of these findings of facts is, is, is obvious. You know to say that their history of violation of the law and using that a basis to deny the permit. That wasn't anywhere in the meeting, someone just created that out of whole...(inaudible)...Same thing with that there's a...you have a obligation to get your neighbor's permission to use the water. That was never discussed at the July 14th meeting. That was, that was not found as a fact, that's not a law, and the same thing with traffic, you know, a couple of people complaining about traffic does not create facts sufficient to deny it because of a potential traffic impact.

So, what we're just asking of the Commission from the bottom of our hearts is that you granted a permit with 12 conditions on August 13, 2019. Jurisdiction was confirmed with Maui Planning Commission so the LUC had nothing to do with it. We're just asking respectfully the Commission to give us, to reconfirm that our permit which was approved and has been in effect since 2019 remains in effect, we're not asking you for anything more than we've asked for. We'd like to have a discussion about making some minor modifications, but right now we just, you know, ...(inaudible)...this for over five years. The Abrams have been working on this for over five years, they have invested so much money, so much time, so much energy, hundreds of their supporters have, have shown their support to us, dozens have appeared, and this...the middle of this pandemic this island needs spiritual support. You have people here who are suffering from the pandemic or who have had the worst year ever.

Ms. Takayama-Corden: Fifteen minutes.

Mr. Iczkovitz: They're looking for support, they're looking for things. So, the, the, you know, I'd like to turn over and give Dr. Abrams a chance for him to speak as well, and you know, I would like an opportunity to, to summarize before your votes are taken.

Mr. Tackett: Yes, Les, let me, let me, as I understand it the 15 minutes was your 15 minutes. If you wanted to split it with Dr. Abrams then, then that would have been your choice, but I don't believe we have 15 minutes for each of you and then time for a, for a recap, but—

 Mr. Iczkovitz: Chairman, I believe that under the rules, the applicant has to be given sufficient time to address the issues. The applicant and his representative. So, I did not realize that I was supposed to split the 15 minutes because I was told that, you know, Dr. Abrams and I would be given a chance to speak. So, all we're asking Dr. Abrams is for maybe ten minutes to speak to the three issues that's all we're asking.

Mr. Tackett: Mr., Mr. Hopper?

Mr. Hopper: I think that's fine, Chair. If it's going to be ten more minutes, I think that if they're asking for that, it's, it's, you can do that.

1 Mr. Tackett: Okay. Ten minutes it is. Go ahead, go ahead, Mr. Abrams.

Dr. Lew Abrams: Thank you, Maui Planning Commissioners, Director McLean. ...(audio feedback)...

6 Mr. Tackett: Les, are you still on?

Mr. Iczkovitz: I'm off.

 Dr. Abrams: I think we have it settled. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you one more time. We've had four Maui Planning Commission hearings and one State Land Use hearing and I just want to acknowledge that you all have spent a lot of time and energy reviewing volumes of documents and spending time trying to come up with a fair solution associated with this permit, and so I just want to acknowledge that.

And I also wanted to just say, acknowledge that there are several new members of the Maui Planning Commission that I haven't had a chance to meet and weren't able to hear my initial presentation, so I wanted to speak briefly to that, but also to acknowledge that it is a lot of work that you have taken on as volunteers, and I appreciate your efforts to read all of this extensive record, and for fair judgment, and I understand that your motivation for being on this committee is to make a positive difference for the Maui community.

Just a little background, I am a PhD licensed clinical psychologist. We've been on Maui since 1998, and I've worked in a variety of public agencies, including the Molokini psychiatric unit and private practice, and simultaneously my wife and I have been interfaith ministers at the Temple of Peace in Haiku for more than 20 years where we sing and play in the church band. I held the prayers. We cover the Sunday service, we've been covering...Kadar St John is out of town and so this is a longstanding dream that we have been working on to be able to offer an interfaith earth-based ministry to the Maui community.

 Since 2007, we've been working on this 25-acre farm north shore, Haiku which is old pineapple land, ...(inaudible)...permaculture and regenerative farming methods to restore the depleted land left from that mono cropping and chemical agriculture. We've developed permaculture tours where we educate people about some of these methods, and we have some actual solutions for food sovereignty and ways of reclaiming some of the depleted land on this island. So, we feel that, that we're offering value in that way.

And then my work as a psychologist interfaces and that I'm aware that in this time there's a lot of people who are dealing with separation, alienation, anxiety, depression that are made worse by COVID, and so, everyone needs a sense of community and belonging and purpose and this value of putting the earth...(inaudible)...sustainably and being stewards of the planet for the future generations which is basically a summary of the Hawaiian principle of malama aina is a great unifier and we're inclusive, we're welcoming people of all faiths to gather and work together on the land, learn to live sustainably, share locally grown potlucks, be together on the holidays, honor rites of passage for our community members. That we're proposing to offer something positive and enriching to the Maui community.

So, at the end of the third hearing in August 2019, you guys, we worked on developing conditions that were balancing the neighbor's concerns and our ministry's request, and then after you received this outpouring of support from our community with more than 500 people signing a letter saying they were in support and would like to participate, and then 41 people either wrote letters of support or appeared in person, including many elders older than like 80-years-old, including Uncle George Kahumoku, Jr., Kahu Leiohu Ryder, Kahu Alalani Kuhina Hill, Aunty Piilani, Reverend Dr. Ayin Adams, Reverend Kedar St John, ...(inaudible)...Kahn and the spiritual, the late spiritual teacher Baba Ram Dass all offered support for this vision, and I believe that helped you make a decision to decide to grant us that permit in August 2019.

But we were sent to the State Land Use Commission ...(inaudible)...were discussed and we were basically, I understood instructed to return to ...(inaudible)...discuss and provide information with the possibility of revising conditions to be less restrictive. And so, when we entered that fourth Maui Planning Commission hearing, I had written a letter addressing every one of the Land Use Commission's concerns and was eager to present that. And then the discussion started to go into reservations about three main issues, and those issues are proposed in the findings of fact that last was...(inaudible)...so, I encouraging you all to reexamine is water supply, traffic and noise, and request for service. So, I just wish to briefly speak to each one of those things in an effort to elucidate and clarify those issues.

So, regarding the water, the question was, will the...(inaudible)...have any negative impact on the availability of water from the neighbors. And the one solid piece of evidence we have about that is an engineering report done by Neil Nishida was requested by Tara Furukawa, our planner in the Department, and he evaluated the capacity of the well, the holding tank, the pump, the history of use, and his conclusion was that there's ample water in this well system that currently with serving everyone in the water agreement, we're working, we're operating at slightly less than 50 percent capacity of that well. And that there's no anticipated negative effects on water supply to the neighbors.

And then, as was mentioned, our water system is governed by a private water agreement, ...(inaudible)...water that we use, and it was...we've, we've been doing that for the last 13 years. We pay our share of the water use as well as take on responsibility for landscaping and trimming around the well area. And in that private water agreement, it's clearly states that no lawsuits are allowed to settle disagreements and all disputes should be settled through mediation or binding arbitration. So, that is something that if, if it comes up, we will have the ability to work it out with the, with our neighbors in the private water agreement. But in any case, we've also put...(inaudible)...gallon water tank that's right next to the temple, and plumed into the temple into which we have had delivered potable county water and we can have more truck deliveries of that water if needed to supply any additional church use, so really the water issue is a nonissue. This church does have access to water whether or not our neighbors agree within the private water agreement.

Related to the traffic and noise, the only new data that I'm aware of was this letter from the Department of Transportation that stated that there were no anticipated traffic concerns, and I can say there's never been an accident, to my knowledge, anywhere near the entrance of my driveway

on the highway or on our land. We have 90 feet of frontage on the Hana Highway with views in each direction of a thousand feet in one direction and several hundred feet in the other. And then when people turn off the on the Hana Highway and enter our property, they basically disappear from view from many of the neighbors. And the one-way loop road drive on our land where we could ample parking for more than a hundred cars. So, that traffic laid to rest.

And then related to noise, again, our temple is located on a spit of land surrounded by gulch on three side with more than a thousand feet to any neighboring house, and so there's never been any formal noise complaints. It's not like the police have been called coming to our place about loud, you know, events or anything. So, of course, if we were to get a call from a concerned neighbor about noise, we would be very accommodating to turn down any volume or close up the windows and doors. So, I just want to assure you that, you know, if you are to reconfirm this SUP, we'll be extremely sensitive to any potential noise impacts on neighbors.

 And then regarding the, the RFS complaints, you know, the, there's...it was mentioned in, on the findings of fact that the three new complaints since the last Maui Planning Commission hearing, what was not noted was that they all came from a single individual and they were all investigated and closed and found to have no basis. In Director McLean's original report and recommendations, she reviewed the history of RFS complaints in years prior, which were very few, you know, five, six years ago, and she determined that they were not significant enough to interfere, interfere with a recommendation to approve this SUP for five years. So, the primary source of complaint has been one neighbor, Ms. Drewyer, who is between us and the Hana Highway and we have gone to great lengths to try to mitigate and address her concerns. We actually stopped using more than three acres of our property...(inaudible)...road on our land to create a buffer, sort of a no man's land between us and the Drewyers. We have invited her to holiday celebrations, we brought her harvest boxes free, gifts of produce from our land, we cut down trees that she complained about that were growing in her view.

Ms. Takayama-Corden: Ten minutes.

Dr. Abrams: Okay, so I'm just saying we made great effort to appease her but that wasn't good enough. She actually, she created a—

Mr. Tackett: Lew, Lew you got your ten minutes, Lew, so, we gotta, we gotta wrap it up at that point.

Dr. Abrams: Okay, I will, I will come to the, the final conclusion here then. So,--

39 Mr. Tackett: That was the conclusion. You had ten minutes.

Dr. Abrams: Well, no let me, let me just...okay, I would just like to thank you for reconsidering then possibly reapproving our Special Use Permit and to recognize that this is your chance to make a positive difference by supporting this valuable offering to the Maui Planning Commission, please don't force us into an appeal process—

Mr. Tackett: Thank you, Lew.

Dr. Abrams: --that might take many years, and I really appreciate and hope you can recognize that malama aina is—

Mr. Tackett: Lew, Lew you're, you're running me over, Lew.

Dr. Abrams: This is a value—

9 Mr. Tackett: --You're running me over, Lew. You're running me over, okay, I'm trying to, I'm trying to be nice about it, you got 15 minutes, you asked for ten more, we gave you ten more and now you're running me over, so please, can we just please do this amiably, it would be so much better.

14 Dr. Abrams: Thank you.

16 Mr. Tackett: Thanks Lew, I appreciate it. Thank you so much.

Ms. McLean: Chair, now would be an appropriate time if the Commission has any questions for Corporation Counsel or for the Department on the draft document that is in front of you or of course, if you have questions for the applicant that would be the time to ask those as well.

Mr. Tackett: So, Commissioners, do we have anything like that? Hearing none, what is, what is in front of us is whether to adopt or not adopt our Findings of Facts and Conclusions. So, do we have a...and this requires a motion, correct, Michele? So, do we do...is it a motion and a second? Is that how this goes forward?

Ms. McLean: Yes, Chair. There would need to be a motion and a second and then a vote taken whether that is to adopt or to adopt with modifications, defer or some other action.

Mr. Tackett: Got it. Thanks, Michele, thanks Director...(audio feedback)...that was pretty cool.
Go ahead Mr. Hopper.

Mr. Hopper: Just also there's been proposed Findings of Fact submitted and Conclusions of Law and a D&O submitted by the applicant, if you do do a motion to approve your current, the, the draft, then I think you would include in that motion, a motion to reject the applicant's findings. I think just approving yours is probably implied leave rejecting the rest, but in your motion if you do approve, adopt your Decision and Order I think you'd want to incorporate in that a rejection of the applicant's proposal because they're, they're contradictory, so I think that that's something you'd want to do if you decide to adopt your...the decision and order.

Mr. Tackett: Thank you, Director and Corp. Counsel, thank you for your guidance, we appreciate it. Commissioners, do we have a motion? No motions? P D.

Ms. La Costa: Thank you, Chair. I would like to make a motion that the Planning Commission adopt the Decisions and Finding of Fact that has been presented from the Planning Commission to deny the permit.

1

Mr. Tackett: And, and in doing such, do you want to reject the...how is it, how is it stated, Michele?

3 4

Ms. McLean: Chair, if I'm understanding the motion correctly, we'd be to adopt the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order that were prepared by the Department, and to reject the same entitled document submitted by the applicant.

6 7 8

5

Mr. Tackett: Thank you so much. Is that your intent P D?

9

Ms. La Costa: That is correct. I'm sorry I'm having trouble with my video and audio today, so I'm coming in and out. So, that is correct, that is my motion to confirm and to accept the denial written by the Commission and to deny the D&O submitted by the applicant.

13

Mr. Tackett: Thank you. Do we, do we have a second? We got, we got a second. Kawika. So, moved and seconded. All those in favor, please raise your hand? All those opposed? Okay, and the abstentions? I believe, I believe Mel recused himself so he's not voting, so I believe all the votes are in.

18

Mr. Hopper: Chair, could you possibly count them for the record. I don't have everyone on my screen, and I don't know if staff has it too, but I don't know if you can just count them out, maybe you can see it, but I can't.

22

23 Mr. Tackett: Okay.

24

Ms. McLean: Chair, I saw Commissioners Pali, Lindsey, Edlao, Freitas, Thompson and La Costa voting in favor of the motion, and Commissioner Hipolito abstaining.

27

28 Mr. Tackett: I believe he recused himself, is that the same?

29

30 Ms. McLean: Recused.

31 32

33

34

Mr. Hopper: Yeah, it's, it's a bit, it's a bit different. This is a not a situation where he's...his recusal to vote would be an affirmative vote. He would just not be counted in the total. So, I think we're clarifying that. Also, the applicant's attorney has asked to state something. I don't' know if you would want to entertain that at this point. It's an option, but not required.

35 36

Mr. Tackett: I believe the...so do you guys have the vote? Do you guys have the...you got everything you need Michele?

39

40 Ms. McLean: Yes, and I believe Carolyn you can verify that you also have that.

41 42

Ms. Takayama-Corden: Yes, I do. I have the vote.

43

It was moved by Ms. La Costa, seconded by Mr. Freitas, then

46

Mr. Tackett: No...the, the—

To Adopt Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and 1 VOTED: 2 Decision and Order Prepared by the Department and to Reject the Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and 3 4 Order Submitted by the Applicant. 5 (Assenting - P D. La Costa, K. Freitas, J. Edlao, A. Lindsey, K. Pali, D. Thompson) 6 7 (Recused – M. Hipolito) 8 9 10 Mr. Tackett: And so, Mr. Hopper, you're saying that their, their legal counsel wants more time? 11 12 Mr. Hopper: He, he had asked to, to make a statement. I mean, you've already taken the vote. I mean, I suppose you can give him time to address the Commission if you'd like. I, if it's, if it's 13 just going to be arguing against the motion, then you can, you can have it, but you can listen to it 14 15 and then, you know, continue on as you like. But that may be something you would, you'd want to do. 16 17 Mr. Tackett: I think, I think everybody's probably have a whole bunch of the same thing, but I'll 18 give him a couple minutes and that's it. So, go ahead. 19 20 21 Mr. Iczkovitz: Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you— 22 23 Mr. Tackett: Les, before we, before we get-24 Mr. Iczkovitz: I'll be very fast. 25 26 27 Mr. Tackett: --before we get started, what kind of time frame you're looking at? 28 29 Mr. Iczkovitz: What we asked for was, and what we're asking for is, you have...there's three members of the Commission who voted in favor of this permit on August 13, 2019. I have to ask 30 31 you to state for the record exactly what facts you are relying upon in the record to now change 32 your mind. 33 34 Mr. Tackett: Les, Les, no. 35 36 Mr. Iczkovitz: You have to have facts to change your mind. 37 38 Mr. Tackett: No. 39 Mr. Iczkovitz: You made a decision. 40 41 42 Mr. Tackett: No. 43 44 Mr. Iczkovitz: Based upon the record. 45

Mr. Iczkovitz: You're not allowed to arbitrarily—

Mr. Tackett: ...(inaudible)...what is on the agenda.

Mr. Iczkovitz: ...(inaudible)...violating the administrative procedures act abundantly. You have not given a single fact to support finding of fact 39-41.

Mr. Hopper: At this stage, at this stage, legal counsel is interrupting the Chairperson.

11 Mr. Iczkovitz: I do not how—

13 Mr. Hopper: The Chairperson is—

Mr. Iczkovitz: --members who voted one way without having any new evidence introduced—

17 Mr. Hopper: Mr. Chair?

Mr. lczkovitz: --changes their mind.

Mr. Tackett: Right, Mr. Hopper, right like I would have never let him talk, you know, I thought they got 15 minutes out the gate and they got 25 and now he wants to talk and now he wants to argue, like I. I...

Mr. Hopper: Understood Chair, understood. The reasons for the Commissioner's vote will be set forth in the Decision and Order and that's, that's what is there, and I think that's clear. At this point, you are in deliberation, and so, at that stage, I think you can move forward. I just, the applicant had asked to raise, raise an issue, I thought it be prudent to listen, but if it's, if it's more oral argument against the motion then I think that that's something you've already heard, so I think you can proceed.

Mr. Tackett: Yeah, thank you. I think, I think we should proceed on. We adopted what we felt we should adopt and we would, we would like to move on now at this point.

Ms. McLean: Okay, Chair, this matter is concluded, the Commission has voted on it.

Respectfully Submitted by,

CAROLYN TAKAYAMA-CORDEN
Secretary to Boards and Commissions II