

From: Naghme Najafi [Naghmenajafi@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:33 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

RECEIVED
FEB 14 5 52 PM '12
CITY CLERK
HONOLULU, HAWAII

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Naghme Najafi
Kamuela, HI 96743

150

From: mike deycaza [mdeycaza@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:27 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

mike deycaza
425 ena rd.408a
honolulu, HI 96815

From: Alea Schechter [alealani@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:21 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Alea Schechter
1777 Ala Moana Blvd. #813
Honolulu, HI 96815

From: Jo An Gaines [jgaines519@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:17 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jo An Gaines
3594 Akaka Place
3594 Akaka Pl.
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Ikaika K E Anderson [ikaikaa@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:15 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Ikaika K E Anderson
mililani, HI 96789

From: Nancy Crom [ncrom1@nycap.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:04 PM
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Nancy Crom
7 Elm Place
41 Russell Road
Albany, NY 12205

From: robert ebanez [aliikapu@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:53 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

robert ebanez

waianae, HI 96792

From: Santos Alvarez [pipoantonio9@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:48 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Santos Alvarez

Jersey city, NJ 07306

From: Natashja Tong [natashja@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:44 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Natashja Tong
85-260 Ala Hema St. #A
Waianae, HI 96792

From: Mirna Stoll [hanamauhi@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 7:59 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Mirna Stoll
1618 Ihiloa Loop
Honolulu, HI 96821

From: Desdra Dawning [Desdradawning@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 7:41 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Desdra Dawning
25626
Sun Lakes, AZ 85248

From: Michele Nihipali [nihipalim001@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 7:37 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Michele Nihipali
54-074 A Kam Hwy
Hauula, HI 96717

From: Marian Heidel [mheidel@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 3:39 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Marian Heidel
1341 Manu Mele St.
Kailua, HI 96734

From: Sheryl Fletcher [sfletch@hawaiiantel.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 4:08 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sheryl Fletcher
14-4918 Kaheka St
RR2 Box 4061
Pahoa, HI 96778

From: Ka'imi Nicholson [mknaloha@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 4:26 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Ka'imi Nicholson
2197 10th Ave.
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Tim Rieth [timothy_rieth@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 4:23 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Tim Rieth
Honolulu, HI 96826

From: H B [hbonmaui@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 10:13 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

H B
PO Box 822
Makawao, HI 96768

From: Saleh Azizi [az@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:02 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Saleh Azizi

Honolulu, HI 96383

From: Timothy Johnston [tjohnst@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:04 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Timothy Johnston
825 Fell Street
Apt. 1
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: Kent Fonoimoana [trislandinspections@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:05 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Kent Fonoimoana
PO Box 122
Laie, HI 96762

From: Valerie Tweiten [vtweiten@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:40 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Valerie Tweiten
15-1822 7th Ave
HPP
Keaau, HI 96749

From: donnalene sing [donnalenes@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:31 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

donnalene sing
pob 10305
3325a kalua road
honolulu, HI 96816

From: Jerome Bautisa [jbautista619@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:06 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jerome Bautisa
400 Hobron LN #2307
Waikiki, HI 96815

From: Pamela Punihaole [moowahine@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:24 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Pamela Punihaole

734310A Mamalahoa Hwy. Kailua-Kona, HI. 96740 Kailua-Kona, HI 96740

From: vera
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:17 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

vera

honolulu, HI 96822

From: Ingrid Friedberg
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:47 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Ingrid Friedberg

Honolulu, HI 96828

From: Mike Saiz [supaveda@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 4:15 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Mike Saiz
PO Box 562
Haleiwa, HI 96712

From: Angela Lammers
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 2:18 PM
Subject: ** SPAM ** testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Angela Lammers

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Robert Bates
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 1:11 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Robert Bates

Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Tara
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:26 PM
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Tara

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Jules Martin
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 10:36 AM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jules Martin

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Liberty
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:03 AM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley. As someone who grew up in Lualualei and comes from a family of farmers -- in fact, a whole community of farmers -- this "purple spot" would jeopardize the economy and lifestyle of the farmers there. It would also send the message that bending the rules in favor of developers' interests over the community's is okay. Thus, it would be the tipping point of losing what little fertile land we have left to grow our own food -- and the ability to nourish the bodies and minds of our people.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming

community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Liberty

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Dustin
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 10:18 AM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Dustin

Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Carmen alohastevens@yahoo.com [alohastevens@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 1:53 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Carmen alohastevens@yahoo.com
4999 Kahala Ave
APT249
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Nicholas Gregory [nicholas.ryan.gregory@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 12:01 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Nicholas Gregory
5889 Kalanianaʻole Highway
Honolulu, HI 96821

From: Linda Tauotaha [linda.tauotaha@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 12:28 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Linda Tauotaha
1617 Young St
A-201
Honolulu, HI 96826

From: Robert Conlan [robertj.conlan@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:56 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Robert Conlan
520 Pine Street, # 313
313
Wahiawa, HI 96786

From: Crystal Brookover [crystal_amber21@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:52 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Crystal Brookover

Kapolei, HI 96707

From: Melinda McBride [kupuohi@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:08 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Melinda McBride
21408 Entrada Rd
Topanga, CA 90290

From: Eric Tong [EJTong@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:11 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday ,
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Eric Tong
1443 Kalaepohaku St.
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Tricia Beaman [tricia.grant@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 6:18 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Tricia Beaman
718 10th Ave
C
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Jenny Rawlings [qualynevaldia@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 6:11 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jenny Rawlings
324 Auwinala Road
Kailua, HI 96734

From: Sharon Paltin [shsharealike@saber.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:10 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sharon Paltin
PO Box 18
Laytonville, CA 95454

From: Diane Chun [dichun@ksbe.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:44 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

We should learn how to maintain farming for sustainability in the islands.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Diane Chun
421C Olomana Street
Kailua, HI 96827

From: Melissa Yee [drmlsukyo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:49 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Melissa Yee

Honolulu, HI 96814

From: Beth Irikura [irikura@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:46 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Beth Irikura

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: eliel starbright [elielstarbright@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:28 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored
industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it
would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new
vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is
prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support
heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting
that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would
drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony,
could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf
course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the
property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water.
However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming
traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers,
allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing
the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in
this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and
their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola,
Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the
perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these
donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the
expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

eliel starbright
5306 kahala st.
kapaa, HI 96746

From: Glenn Martinez [olomanagardens@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:35 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Glenn Martinez
41-1140 Waikupanaha Street
Waimanalo, HI 96795

From: Rebecca Doescher [bexter1966@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:45 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Rebecca Doescher
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Natalie Cash [sistahcash@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:42 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Natalie Cash
41-1140 Waikupanaha Street
Waimanalo, HI 96795

From: Milly Ring [Millyring@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:40 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Milly Ring
3138 waiialae ave
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Hiep Nguyen [hiep0sut@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 3:01 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Hiep Nguyen
1702 Kewalo St
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Schantell Taylor [sataylor@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 2:30 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Schantell Taylor
87-137 Keliikipi st
Waianae, HI 96792

From: Ashley Lukens [ablukens@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 2:07 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Ashley Lukens
6121-D Summer Street
Honolulu, HI 96821

From: Lynne Wooddell [lynne@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 2:33 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Lynne Wooddell

Kailua, HI 96734

From: Bonnie Bonse [bbbtutu@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 1:17 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Bonnie Bonse

Makawao, HI 96768

From: Doug McGregor [dougmcgreg@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:28 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola; Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Doug McGregor

Kihei, HI 96753

From: Sindona Cassteel [sindona@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:43 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sindona Cassteel
681776 Niu Haohao
Waikoloa, HI 96738

From: Keiko Shimazu [kshimazu@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:25 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Keiko Shimazu
47-205 IUIU ST
Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Armance Flores [degenerate_67@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 11:58 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Armance Flores
521 W Lanikaula St. #D102
Hilo, HI 96720

From: Cynthia Hathaway [doorways@aloha.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 11:52 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Cynthia Hathaway
HCR1 Box 5377
Keaau, HI 96749

From: Eugenie Troia [eugenietroia@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 11:44 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Eugenie Troia
Orehof
Amsterdam, ot 1060RW

From: Adam Ayers [alawbnc@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:31 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Adam Ayers
910 Pueo Street
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Jennifer Hadlock [jenorganizer@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 11:26 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jennifer Hadlock
1261 Ekaha
Honolulu, HI 06105

From: Jamie Makasobe [Jmekawai@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 11:13 AM
To: Chung, Vicki K. N.
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jamie Makasobe
247 Paiko dr
Honolulu, HI 96821

From: Terra Sutton [terrasutton@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 11:12 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Terra Sutton
PO Box 21
Kapaau, HI 96755

From: Jennifer Macey [Jenn85575@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:40 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jennifer Macey

Honolulu, HI 96817

From: Elizabeth McDermott [bmcd50@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:51 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Elizabeth McDermott
2739 Terrace Drive
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: anthony aalto [abaalto@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday February 15, 2012 9:44 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

anthony aalto
3946 Lurline Drive
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Emily Kandagawa [ekandagawa@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 10:36 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Emily Kandagawa

Honolulu, HI 96819

From: Erica Witzel [erykah808@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:07 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Erica Witzel
PO BOX 611
Haleiwa, HI 96712

From: Joseph Miller [jmill@kkv.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:09 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Mahalo,

Joey Miller

Joseph Miller
3351 Kalihi St.
Honolulu, HI 96819

From: David Orr [dorr@waimeavalley.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:01 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

David Orr
59-526 Aukauka Rd.
Haleiwa, HI 96712

From: kai holland [kai_holland@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:31 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

kai holland
555 Elm
Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Sylvia Spalding [sylvias@lava.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:36 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sylvia Spalding
2171A Kaululoa Place
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Teri Skillman [skillman@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 10:45 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Teri Skillman
2833 Nihi St
Honolulu, HI 96819

From: Cheryl Ginter [cgquest@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:54 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored
industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it
would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new
vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is
prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support
heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting
that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would
drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony,
could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf
course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the
property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water.
However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming
traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers,
allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing
the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in
this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and
their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola,
Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the
perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these
donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the
expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Cheryl Ginter
PO Box 298
Mountain View, HI 96771

From: Rachel Harvey [racheharvey@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:55 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Rachel Harvey
316 Keaniani St
Kailua, HI 96734

From: Cheryl Ginter [cgquest@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:54 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Cheryl Ginter
PO Box 298
Mountain View, HI 96771

From: Julie Leialoha [jkleialoha@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:30 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Julie Leialoha
POB 1792
Keaau, HI 96749

From: Akiemi Glenn [akglenn@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:24 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Luālualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Akiemi Glenn
1002 Prospect Street
#5
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Daniel Alexander [danielal@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:40 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Daniel Alexander
2043A 10th Ave
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Henry Mochida [henrymochida@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:41 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Henry Mochida
3524 Loulu Street
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: James Melcher
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:33 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

James Melcher

kaunakakai, HI 96748

From: Mary
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 4:48 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Mary

Superior, CO 80027

From: Lydi Morgan Bernal
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 8:41 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

I oppose the continued abuse of our island home. I urge you to stand with the people of Hawai'i, protect our lands, waters, and the integrity of our communities.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles. This behavior is no longer acceptable.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Lydi Morgan Bernal

Haleiwa, HI 96712

From: Roberts Leinau
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:51 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Roberts Leinau
59-524 Aukauka Pl.
Haleiwa, HI 96712

From: Ana
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:40 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Ana

Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Terry & Kahele Miura [miurat002@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:58 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Terry & Kahele Miura
646 Iwalani St.
Hilo, HI 96720

From: Maura McCormick [msmlmccormick@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:57 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Maura McCormick
801 South King Street #2303
Honolulu, HI 96813

From: Tricia Beaman [tricia.grant@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 6:18 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Tricia Beaman
718 10th Ave
C
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Jenny Rawlings [qualynevaldia@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 6:11 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jenny Rawlings
324 Auwinala Road
Kailua, HI 96734

From: Melinda McBride [kupuohi@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:08 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Melinda McBride
21408 Entrada Rd
Topanga, CA 90290

From: Mawaekamaka Copeland [nahalenaauao@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 6:53 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Mawaekamaka Copeland
541 Florence Ave
Port Hueneme, CA 93041

From: Eric Tong [EJTong@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:11 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Eric Tong
1443 Kalaepohaku St.
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Sharon Paltin [shsharealike@saber.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:10 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sharon Paltin
PO Box 18
Laytonville, CA 95454

From: James Long [daegnut@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:25 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

James Long
1261 B Center St.
Center St.
Honolulu, HI 96744

From: David Giantomasi [dgiant13@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:16 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

David Giantomasi
73-1304 Awakea St.
Kailua-Kona, HI 96740

From: JAMIE OSHIRO [jamie.oshiro@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:35 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

JAMIE OSHIRO
1801 b 10th Ave
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Moriah Smith [moriahwind@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:32 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Moriah Smith
58023 Makanale Road
Haleiwa, HI 96712

From: Angela Breene [angelavideotron@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:45 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Angela Breene

Haleiwa, HI 96712

From: Michael Howells [howellsm@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:40 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Michael Howells
3253 Pinao St.
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Ah Lui [ahlui808@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 8:16 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Ah Lui
S R 32
Mamalahoa hwy
Naalehu, HI 96772

From: Melody Melody Torres [mauimel@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 7:49 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Melody Melody Torres

haiku, HI 96708

From: Jill Miller [JILLM51@AOL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:02 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jill Miller
Dunlap, TN 37379

From: Ginger Gohier [ginger.gohier@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:02 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Ginger Gohier
1002 Prospect Street
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Edward Renaltner [renaltnee001@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:36 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Edward Renaltner
PO Box 951
hanalei, HI 96714

From: Laura Clint [laura_clint@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:13 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Laura Clint
371 Haili St
Hilo, HI 96720

From: jenny estrella [jenny3@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:56 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

jenny estrella
45-359 Nakuluai St
Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: raymond Estrella [re3@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:57 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

raymond Estrella
45-359 Nakuluai St
Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Emanuel Milea [m.miles02@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:49 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday
February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Emanuel Milea

Wai'anae, HI 96792

From: Katherine Orr [orrk001@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:56 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Katherine Orr
44-119 Bayview Haven Pl
Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Olin Lagon [olin.lagon@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:07 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Olin Lagon
2950 Laelae Way
Honolulu, HI 96819

From: Dawn Mahi [dawnmahi@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:04 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Although I don't live in Lualualei I have friends who farm there and other places on O'ahu and I want to continue to be able to support local farmers and local produce and hope that my children will be able to do the same. We need to protect what little ag land we have left on this island! Once we over-develop the 'aina, how will we be able to sustain ourselves and future generations?

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Dawn Mahi
1889 Mott Smith Drive
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Luwella Leonardi [kanakaoomaunawili@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:17 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Luwella Leonardi
85-1363 Halapoe Pl
Waianae, HI 96792

From: Van-Nicholas Velasco [van.velasco@pbahi.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:13 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Van-Nicholas Velasco
3311 George St
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Yvonne Jolley [lakona_marin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:51 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Yvonne Jolley
425 Ena Rd. 1206C
Honolulu, HI 96815

From: Thomas Tizard [tizard8@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:47 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Thomas Tizard
591-A Keolu St.
591-A Keolu Dr.
Kailua, HI 96734

From: Candace Fujikane [fujikane@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 11:03 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Candace Fujikane
46-318 Haiku Road, #63
Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: CHRISTINE Kauahikaua [cchow78@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:55 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

CHRISTINE Kauahikaua
PO BOX 50
WAIMANALO, HI 96795

From: Bobby McClintock [redahi@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 11:36 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Bobby McClintock
Disabled-email only
Honolulu, HI 96825

From: Glenn Martinez [glennmartinez@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 11:20 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

To deny the community is to ignore all the effort they made to have a sustain ability plan! They voted for industrial use to stay on the Hawaii.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Glenn Martinez
41-1140 Waikupanaha St
41-1140 Waikupanaha St
Waimanalo, HI 96795

From: Lopaka Oliveira, Jr. [righteouspromo@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 11:39 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Lopaka Oliveira, Jr.
PO Box 86-0181
231 Lehua St. E2
Wai'anae, HI 96792

From: Laurie Cicotello [Lcicotello@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 11:37 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Laurie Cicotello
2740 Kuilei St
#2404
Honolulu, HI 96826

From: Chai Blair-Stahn [chai.blairstahn@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 2:27 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Chai Blair-Stahn
1130 8th Avenue
Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Frederika Ebel [lapuma7@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:43 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Frederika Ebel
PO Box 701
Flemington, NJ 08822

From: Andrew Benson [etatch@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 4:51 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Andrew Benson
2635 Tanager Drive
Wilmington, DE 19808

From: Sonia Geerlings [sonia_geerlings@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 2:50 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sonia Geerlings

Macksville, ot 2447

From: Kelly Salling-Davies [kepari2@q.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:27 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Kelly Salling-Davies

Peyton, CO 80831

From: Kaohua Lucas [kaohua@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:12 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Kaohua Lucas
3416 Kalihi St. #A
Honolulu, HI 96819

From: john miller [pumtec@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:50 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

john miller
1570 Bertram St.
Fort Collins, HI 96816

From: Linda Aipa [l@aipa001@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 6:02 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Linda Aipa
Kakalena St.
Waianae,, HI 96792

From: ed atkins [heartdance@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:54 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

ed atkins

boulder creek, CA 95006

From: Sylvia Thompson [sylvia@e-liciousdishes.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 6:27 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sylvia Thompson
1015 Wilder Ave.
#702
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: john miller [pumtec@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 6:06 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

john miller
1570 Bertram St.
Fort Collins, HI 96816

From: Colleen Kudo [editor@becausewesurf.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 6:47 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Colleen Kudo
3008 A Hinano Street
Honolulu, HI 96815

From: Vivian Chau [lomichick@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 6:36 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Vivian Chau
250 Ohua Ave Apt 6A
Honolulu, HI 96815

From: Amy Cutler [alcutler@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:28 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Amy Cutler
P.O. Box 11384
Hilo, HI 96721

From: Carolyn Knoll [clk5356@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:26 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Carolyn Knoll

Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Peggy Jayne [peggyjaynehawaii@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:36 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Peggy Jayne
1057 Makawao Ave.
Makawao, HI 96768

From: Rebecca
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 8:51 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Rebecca

Anahola, HI 96703

From: Nick Smithson
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 9:55 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Nick Smithson

Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Joannie
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 10:16 PM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Joannie

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: Lynn
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 8:10 AM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Lynn

Honolulu, HI 96816

From: marta
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:48 AM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

marta

kula, HI 96788

From: Melissa Kolonie
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:04 AM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Melissa Kolonie

Honolulu, HI 96822

From: Terry & Kahele Miura [miurat002@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:58 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Terry & Kahele Miura
646 Iwalani St.
Hilo, HI 96720

From: Maura McCormick [msmlmccormick@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 5:57 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Maura McCormick
801 South King Street #2303
Honolulu, HI 96813

From: John Hendry [johnfhendry@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 7:35 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The corruption in Hawaii must be stopped. All you have to do is look at Maluhia County Ranches agricultural subdivision to see how completely out of control it has become. If you don't believe me, just ask some of the other MCR/KAPWC HOA members affected by it. You will have a hard time believing what happened and continues to happen because of it. But there is a limit to everything so I'll let time do its job and tell all.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai'anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai'anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

My Best Regards,

John F. Hendry^^

John Hendry

Haleiwa, HI 98672

From: Jennifer Ho [j.h.simplerway@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 8:41 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley. Self sustainability is even more important today- importing the bulk of food needed to Oahu is a poor plan for the people of these islands. Keep farmland viable for agriculture.

Jennifer Ho
198 Hoku St
Hilo, HI 96720

P-17

From: francis farrelly [francisfarrelly@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 11:36 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

francis farrelly

waianae, HI 96792

From: William . Harris, M.D [HARRISMDW001@hawaii.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 6:44 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

William . Harris, M.D
1765 Ala Moana Blvd. #1880
Honolulu, HI 96815

From: Donna Cussac
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 5:21 AM
To:
Subject: ** SPAM ** Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Donna Cussac
1510 14th st SE apt 3
Cleveland, TN 37311

From: Jessica Juselis [jjuselis012@lejardinacademy.org]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 5:57 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Jessica Juselis

Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Jessica Juselis [jjuselis012@lejardinacademy.org]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 5:57 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Luaualei Valley.

Jessica Juselis

Kaneohe, HI 96744

From: Robbie Stewart [Rgparker.5@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2012 1:49 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

We don't need anymore toxic in this community. We need farms and a reeducation on the absolute vital practice of eating and farming organically.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primary be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the gold course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Robbie Stewart
86218 Moelua st
Waianae, HI 96792

From: dinda Evans [dindamcp4@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2012 1:37 PM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

dinda Evans
POB 178695
San Diego, CA 92177

From: Sherrie Robertson [sherrierobertson@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 11:27 AM
To:
Subject: Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 unless amended to remove purple spot

Testimony in opposition to Bill 50 and the Purple Spot Honolulu City Council
Wednesday February 15, 2012 Kapolei Hale

I am writing in opposition to Bill 50, unless it is amended to remove the purple-colored industrial zone and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

The purple spot is a proposed industrial park. The EIS for the project indicates that it would primarily be a trucking baseyard. It would increase traffic by at least 500 new vehicles every hour. The legal access is a sometimes-single-lane country road. The area is prone to drastic and sudden flooding. The soil is self-inverting and thus cannot support heavy structures.

The Land Use Commission denied the landowner's petition for a boundary amendment, noting that the project would not create jobs, had insufficient legal access, and would drastically increase traffic burdens.

The Planning Commission considered the Wai`anae Plan, but after days of public testimony, could muster majority support for the plan.

The property where the proposed purple spot is located is currently zoned P-2 for a golf course. The golf course never happened because there was insufficient water on the property and the zoning approval restricted the golf course from using potable water. However, other land uses in the P-2 zone are consistent with agriculture and farming traditions of this community. I-1, the zoning change ultimately sought by the developers, allows for a wide range of land uses that undermine a healthy farming community. Allowing the purple spot in Lualualei Valley would further spread the cancer of urban sprawl in this community.

The owners of the property -- Thomas Enomoto, Clyde Kaneshiro, and Michael Nekoba -- and their associates are frequent contributors to the political campaigns of Romy Cachola, Nestor Garcia, Stanley Chang, Ann

Kobayashi, and Ikaika Anderson. This raises the perception that their support for the purple spot is motivated by the influence of these donors, and not the public testimony of Wai`anae residents or good planning principles.

Bill 50 should not be adopted unless it is amended to remove the purple spot and the expanded urban growth boundary in Lualualei Valley.

Sherrie Robertson
827A 17th Avenue
Honolulu, HI 96816