

PC Committee

From: Jim or Belinda <2jbhome@hawaiiantel.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2017 6:56 PM
To: PC Committee
Subject: TESTIMONY - RELATED TO PC - 01 AND PC - 02
Attachments: TESTIMONY COUNCIL 06_15_17.odt

Hello,

I am transmitting testimony to you for tomorrow's Planning Committee concerning Items PC 01 and PC-02
please provide to Members of that Committee, if this is possible.

thank you

Jim Smith

Jim Smith
99 Kapuai Road
Haiku, Maui, Hawaii 96708

Testimony regarding Items (PC-01) and (PC-02) of
the **Planning Committee**

In 1992, I served as a member of the Paia/Haiku Citizen Advisory Committee and recognized the validity and importance of this process, so I am concerned when a former Member of this Council raises the question of its legitimacy.

Thirteen members of the Community of Paia Haiku were appointed by Members and the Mayor. A Council Member from Lahaina, Kihei, Wailuku each submitted the name of citizen it knew and respected that resided in the area. There was diversity of economic status as well as professional and non-professional life experience. The work was conducted and completed in three years, start to finish; so the notion that Process the problem, as alleged at County Communication 16 – 85 is absurd. It was necessary was the election of a Chair by that Committee. John Bose was our Chair.

This Committee is asked to start the process without providing names of prospective members for appointment to the Lahaina Community Advisory Committee. With or without the completion of Department of Planning preparation, this Council should proceed. Council Service can provide clerical assistance to a CAC that will give it specific on the ground advice. We have the existing plan, not much else is needed. Start the process by each of you naming a person to serve. This comment relates to PC – 01

PC – 02 concerns the Molokai Community Plan Update and my concern that the Department of Planning presented to community members an exhibition of individual power, that they viewed as out of place, then responded for the wrong reason. They appear to have concluded OK the Director is sovereign, not Law. Not my sovereign. There response needs attention.

This process concerns advice to political power as refinement to an existing plan. The “power” exhibited by the director was personal. Certain citizens concluded “Fine. We have our own sovereignty” This response needs your consideration. Take the time necessary to make it right, so that

“right” matters to everyone, so that consent given it's value.

Jim Smith

June 14, 2017