LAND USE BULLETIN

Vol. 19, No. 04 *A publication of the Land Use Research Foundation of Hawaii* July/August 2005

Executive Director's Message

Improving Government Performance
By Dean Uchida

Watching the devastation caused by hurricane *Katrina* to cities and towns along the gulf coast, you can't help but wonder how things got so bad. Theses types of disasters showcase governments' ability to plan, prepare and implement programs for public health and safety.

This is not the glamorous, sexy stuff that government does. This is "having the discipline to simply grind it out." Unfortunately, we have become desensitized to the performance of government at all levels. Everyone expects government to "do the right thing, all the time." In government, mistakes are highly visible, and conversely, unlike the private sector, there are no rewards or bonuses for government "exceeding expectation."

We can all see (or feel) when roads need to be repaired, or when our parks, schools, libraries and other public facilities are in dire need of basic maintenance or upkeep. However, we generally don't notice when the bathrooms are clean or the roads have been repaired, it is an expectation, with the only comment being: "It's about time!!"

Katrina and now *Rita* exposed deficiencies in certain areas of government preparedness (i.e. grid-lock caused by mass evacuation from coastal cities in Texas, and the lack of maintenance of the levees protecting New Orleans). Is it unreasonable to expect that when natural disasters like these occur, government has the responsibility to provide for basic government services for public health and safety?

When performance falls short of expectation, it is natural to look for the cause. While the initial focus is usually on the agency or individuals involved, this may actually be a symptom of a larger problem. Perhaps the larger problem is over time, government at all levels has developed an inability to attract and retain talented people into government service. This is not to diminish the efforts of the few existing dedicated and professional people in government right now. The problem is we don't have enough of them.

Consider for a moment, what our expectations are for government. For example, we, the public, expect government to be on top of basic public health and safety issues, thinking through the problem, developing alternative solutions and planning for implementation. We expect the best from government, yet we shrug our shoulders when both State and County Administrations have difficulty in finding qualified people to fill appointed and civil service positions. How can we expect the best and brightest solutions to new challenges we face when we have difficulty attracting the best and brightest people into government service?

The world has gotten more complicated and diverse. In the private sector, competition usually drives business evolution. Performance and success are rewarded. The bottom-line is either evolve or become extinct. Unfortunately, government is not subject to these market forces. Perhaps it is time to have government move beyond its fixation on "process" and begin to focus more on the defined outcomes. Perhaps it is time to consider new ways to allow government more flexibility, give them the responsibility for specific outcomes, and hold them accountable (i.e. creating incentives for performance and dis-incentives for non-performance).

No one wants more government involvement in all aspects of our lives; however, we all want to feel safe and have some reasonable expectation that in a crisis, government will be there to help. The next time you experience performance falling short of expectation in dealing with a government agency, consider what your outcome might have been if the people on the other side had better staffing and resources.

STATE OF HAWAII

Legislative Auditor: Working Group on DOE Impact Fees

The Legislative Auditor's Office has contacted us regarding participation in the working group on impact fees for the Department of Education (DOE), established by SB 1814 passed in the 2005 Seesion of the Legislature (see the *Land Use Bulletin* for May/June 2005).

The bill spells out the participants in the working group, whose primary focus will be on developing a process for establishing impact fees for schools. The intent is to have the working group establish the scope of work for a consultant, experienced in impact fees, to set up a structure for impact fees for schools in Hawaii. The consultant will then use Central Oahu as a case study to illustrate how the impact fees work. The process is intended to educate the policy makers and agencies in the State on how impact fees could be used to assist in construction of schools in Hawaii. As of this date, we are awaiting instructions from the Auditor's Office on when the first meeting will be for the working group.

Office of Planning: Relationship to Land Use Commission

Office of Planning (OP) Director Laura H. Thielen spoke to LURF Directors, members and friends on August 15 regarding the role of her office and its relationship to the Land Use Commission (LUC). She later made presentations to the American Planning Association Hawaii Chapter on August 24, and to the LUC itself on September 8, in which she expressed similar and related thoughts. Following is a composite of some of her remarks on those occasions.

Under the original 1964 Land Use Law, the LUC was more planning oriented than it is today, as a quasi-legislative body that conducted periodic land use district boundary reviews. The *Town* decision [*Town v. Land Use Comm'n*, 55 Haw. 538, 524 P.2d 84 (1974)] changed all that, when the Hawaii Supreme Court said that the LUC determines property rights and is therefore required to follow the Administrative Procedures Act in conducting its hearings. After the 1969 and 1974 land use district boundary reviews, there was one more review in 1992 under the new process, but it was found to be cumbersome on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and has not been repeated since. Subsequently, the *Pa`akai* decision [*Ka Pa`akai o ka `Aina v. Land Use Comm'n*, 94 Haw. 31, 7 P.3d 1068 (2000)] required further detail in the determination of native Hawaiian rights during the boundary amendment process.

Although it is unlikely that the LUC will be abolished, perhaps its emphasis can be more planning-oriented and closer to the locus of development, at the County level. For example, the LUC might set the parameters and goals for County plans [along the lines of Oregon's Land Conservation and Development Commission]. In any case, Ms. Thielen would prefer that the Counties assume a greater role in growth management, with the LUC returning to a quasi-legislative rather than contested case decision-making process.

The State has not faced the hard question of where growth goes and how to pay for infrastructure. The Counties are permitted to adopt impact fees, but State agencies are not. State agencies that appear before the LUC typically focus either on their own regulatory issues [*e.g.*, the Department of Health (DOH) and Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR)] or on provision of their services and facilities [*e.g.*, the Department of Transportation (DOT) and Department of Education (DOE)]. Each agency seeks its own particular "contribution" from the developer applicant. The LUC then conditions approvals of district boundary amendments by requiring developers to provide infrastructure such as roads and schools. Large infrastructure development costs assessed in this manner typically are passed on to end users such as new home buyers, and may conflict with other policy goals such as keeping new housing affordable. No one has been looking at the <u>total</u> impact of development, or at how to fund infrastructure upgrades to accommodate smaller "infill" developments.

Ms. Thielen would like to have the OP ensure that impact fee principles (rational nexus, consistency, predictability, refund for non-expenditure) are followed by the LUC when attaching conditions. Absent a stipulation to that effect, there is currently no legal requirement that the LUC meet the test for government exactions set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court [in *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374 (1994)]: "reasonable relationship," "rough

proportionality," and "individualized determination." Arguably, a condition requiring a developer to pay for infrastructure meets the first part of the test, but probably not the second. Ms. Thielen's thought is that the *Dolan* test should be met based on the total impact of a development and the total contribution assessed, not one part at a time.

While Ms. Thielen is trying to keep OP's focus on the whole picture, she is mindful that SB 1814 CD1 (Act 246, 2005) established a working group looking separately at school impact fees. This Act requires preparation of a pilot needs assessment study for Central Oahu as part of an overview of alternative methods of financing school construction. This will affect the timing of proposing any broader approach to the next Session of the Legislature. One problem with school funding is that the Legislature is not part of the negotiation between the DOE and developers over the amount of its "fair share contributions." If the Legislature fails to appropriate its share of the funds required, no school gets built.

Ms. Thielen is also trying to limit the agencies' comments before the LUC to their existing statutory and regulatory frameworks, rather than what these agencies *think* their framework should be. The OP has prepared an eight-point position statement regarding imposition of impact fees, exactions, or required construction of public facilities. The elements of this position statement are: (1) needs assessment; (2) rational nexus; (3) proportionality (fair share); (4) segregation of funds; (5) credits and refunds; (6) consistency; (7) predictable and evenly applied costs; and (8) timing for accurate measurement. OP is in discussions with the DOE and the Counties on how to meet the framework for imposition of exactions. Once the framework is in place, she will invoke it before the LUC if a developer objects to an agency's proposed conditions, but not if the developer stipulates agreement.

Department of Health:
Uniform Environmental Covenants Act

The Department of Health (DOH) has now proposed draft legislation to enact a Hawaii version of the "Uniform Environmental Covenants Act" (UECA) (see the *Land Use Bulletin* for May/June 2005). LURF commented to DOH on this draft bill on August 12 and September 6. We pointed out that LURF had actively participated in the deliberations of the Advisory Group convened to assist the DOH in this matter. Both in two meetings and subsequently in writing, we raised basic questions about the very need for a UECA bill, as well as substantial issues regarding the proposed bill itself. Yet answers to our questions and concerns have simply not been forthcoming. We therefore expressed concern that the planned third meeting of the Advisory Group was cancelled in favor of simply circulating a final draft of the bill.

The draft UECA bill defines "environmental covenant" as a servitude arising under an environmental response project. But the bill does not go back to amend the Hawaii Environmental Response Law (HRS Chapter 128D) to make that connection. Therefore, it is fundamentally unclear how a "covenant" would arise in the first place, *i.e.*, who would initiate it? Could the DOH impose a covenant *without* the landowner's consent? The bill is silent on these points, as far as we can determine.

Our questions and concerns regarding the bill, in summary, are:
• There is no clear indication of need for a UECA-type bill in Hawaii.
• Existing statutes (in particular, HRS sections 128D-39 and -40) cover much of what the draft UECA bill would do.
• It is unclear how the draft UECA bill would relate to situations of persons with "unclean hands," or persons who received a "no further action" determination.
• The draft UECA bill seems to be driven in large measure by a desire within DOH staff to impose greater administrative enforcement and penalty power.

In support of the last point, DOH's August 31 notice of opportunity to comment expressly states that the bill "includes provisions for strong administrative enforcement *not found in the model act*" (emphasis added). Indeed, a paper enclosed with the notice (Breetz and Schwenke, "The Uniform Environmental Covenants Act: An Important Tool for Brownfields Remediation") explicitly states: "Other important issues … that [the model] UECA does *not* address … include: … (3) any mechanism for a regulator to use the power of eminent domain or otherwise to *impose an environmental covenant in the absence of consent by the owner of the parcel* …" Rather, the intent of a UECA is to confirm the "legal validity and

enforceability of recorded use restrictions *negotiated* in connection with so-called 'risk-based cleanups' of contaminated real estate" (emphasis added).

LURF therefore strongly questions the logic of proceeding with draft UECA legislation that contains no statement of intent, and that so significantly departs from the intent of the model Act, when basic questions and substantial issues such as we have raised have not been resolved. It is essential that everyone affected determine first what (if anything) needs to be fixed in Hawaii's existing Environmental Response Law. Then it can be decided whether a UECA is necessary or whether more modest amendments to Chapter 128D would suffice.

Department of Land and Natural Resources: Shoreline Certification Process

Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) No. 51, adopted in this past legislative session, requested a review and analysis of the issues surrounding the shoreline certification process for the purpose of establishing shoreline setbacks. SCR 51 requests the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) to convene a working group to review current laws and administrative rules governing shoreline certifications; identify specific problems and issues regarding the implementation of those laws and rules; explore alternatives; and make recommendations to address the problems and issues. LURF has participated in the three meetings of the working group.

At its last meeting on September 7, the working group discussed DLNR's proposed report and suggestions made by participants. It appears from the discussion that conceptually, the majority of the group is willing to consider the establishment of a scientifically determined shoreline (based on tidal elevation or mean high water) as an objective datum that surveyors know how to mark in the field, to be used solely for setback purposes. This new definition would be clearly distinguishable from the definition of shoreline for ownership purposes, which is marked by the higher of the vegetation line or the debris line.

While there are still details to work out, we may have avoided the initial push from some on the committee to change the definition of shoreline to the "highest documented annual reach of wave run-up on the shore," which would be impractical and not feasible to mark in the field. Establishing a scientifically determined shoreline will make the subsequent determination of the setback line by the Counties less subject to interpretation and dispute. The Counties would need to modify their setback rules and regulations accordingly.

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

Affordable Housing Conditions in Unilateral Agreements

In the early part of the 1980s, the State and the Counties began imposing various requirements on residential development projects, to ensure the production of affordable housing, in compliance with "unilateral agreements" or other conditions attached to the rezoning ordinances for such projects. However, due to economic conditions during the 1990s, the prices of housing fell to levels such that market-priced homes, without buyer income qualification requirements and buyback and shared appreciation conditions on resale, were selling at the same prices as affordable housing. Essentially the free market for new owner-occupant housing in Honolulu was so close to the "affordable" price-controlled, income-controlled market that the restricted affordable units were less attractive to buyers and did not sell. It is typical in unilateral agreements to require a mix of affordable and market units. Thus the inability of developers to sell affordable units resulted in the construction of fewer housing units overall, on account of the affordable housing requirements.

Ordinance 99-51 (extended by Ordinance 01-33) was enacted to address the above problems by imposing a moratorium on enforcement of certain conditions attached to affordable residential development projects by unilateral agreement. The moratorium expired on August 5 (see the *Land Use Bulletin* for May/June 2005).

On August 30, LURF testified before the City Council Planning and Intergovernmental Affairs Committee in support of three resolutions relating to affordable housing conditions in unilateral agreements, and to the City's affordable housing program. In general, we asked the Council to take a broader perspective in its attempt to provide more affordable housing. Ultimately, the moratorium simplified restrictions on

both home builders and home buyers, thereby helping to increase both the supply of and demand for housing.

Resolution 05-252 would transmit a draft bill to the Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) for Planning Commission hearing, to have the moratorium on affordable housing conditions that expired on August 5 renewed until June 30, 2006. The moratorium continues to represent an innovative approach that reduces government paperwork and processing time, and does not hinder bona fide buyers of affordable housing. Rather than focusing on conditions and restrictions that slow down the production and sale of affordable housing units, the City should use the time provided by a renewed moratorium to develop solutions such as less costly design standards for affordable housing, and ways to shorten the entitlement process to open up more lands for all segments of the housing market.

Resolution 05-294 would establish a City Council policy that buyer eligibility conditions be required only for a set period of 90 days each in two steps (first for buyers below 80 percent of median income, then for buyers from 80 to 140 percent of median income), after which the requirement would be removed. Resolution 05-294 represents a workable compromise in the matter of buyer qualifications for affordable housing. Along with this, the development industry in collaboration with lenders and State and City agencies could create a "fast track" application and loan pre-qualification review process in which prospective buyers in the income target group(s) receive first preference to purchase affordable units for the specified periods, after which the units would become available to any buyer in the market.

Resolution 05-285 would request the City Auditor to audit the City's Affordable Housing Program for effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy of current staffing, and appropriateness of selling prices of affordable units. Resolution 05-285 highlights a larger, longer-term problem, namely that the City in effect no longer has a housing program since the City Charter amendments of 1998. The immediate evidence of this is that the affordable housing rules still in use as a basis for unilateral agreement conditions were promulgated more than ten years ago (in 1994) by an agency no longer in existence. Since the Charter Commission is currently accepting proposed amendments until October 31, 2005, there is no better time to consider reestablishing a City housing agency that can effectively coordinate and implement public sector housing development and relieve private developers from some of the burden for this responsibility.

On September 9, several LURF members met with DPP Director Henry Eng and staff to discuss the effect of lifting the moratorium, which will result in reimposition of buyer income qualifications and buyback and shared appreciation conditions on sales of homes to households in the 80 percent to 120 percent of median income range. DPP indicated that they are prepared to reassign staff as necessary to process all of the buyer qualification applications for certification as soon as possible.

After some discussion, DPP also indicated that they would be open to looking at an easier way to process the buyer qualification certifications, and would seriously consider any forms or checklists that could standardize the process and make it simpler. In that regard, LURF suggested moving to a form of "self certification" by developers, subject to audit by DPP. Since such a process is not allowed under the current affordable housing rules, we provided DPP with a proposed redraft of the rules to accomplish this change.

Since the proposed rule amendments would take at least 18 months to process for final adoption, also discussed was the concept of a "short-term fix" in the form of an ordinance that would retroactively make all unilateral agreement affordable housing conditions consistent, and permit "self certification" during the interim while the rules are being changed.

COUNTY OF MAUI

Traffic Impact Fees

On August 29, LURF presented information to the Maui County Council Planning Committee regarding proposed fee schedules intended to fulfill the technical requirements of Maui County's two ordinances relating to impact fees for traffic and roadway improvements in West Maui, and in Kihei and Makena (Maui County Code, Chapters 14.62 and 14.68). The fee schedules are contained in "Traffic Impact Fee Program for West Maui and South Maui" (March 2003), prepared by Kaku Associates, Inc. for the

County Planning Department and transmitted to the Council for review.

Impact fees are monetary contributions imposed by the government upon developers as a condition of development approval, to pay for capital improvements necessary to accommodate the impacts of the new development. As such, impact fees must meet certain legal requirements for constitutionality and fairness. In our testimony, we suggested both the basic steps in the impact fee process, as well as the minimum content of a needs assessment study that is essential to the process. We then evaluated where we think Maui County is in the process, and the extent to which the existing impact fee ordinances and the proposed Traffic Impact Fee Program conform to the legal requirements.

Our conclusion was that the "Traffic Impact Fee Program for West Maui and South Maui" report does not address all the issues required by the State impact fee enabling statute (HRS Chapter 46, Part VIII) or even the existing County impact fee ordinances. There is no step-by-step discussion of the methodology by which the impact fee schedules were generated, so that the reader could understand whether the resulting fees fairly reflect developers' "proportionate share" of allowable facilities costs. There is no discussion of alternative means of financing or funding the highway facility improvement projects. No mention is made of projects named in the West Maui and Kihei-Makena Community Plans, and State versus County projects are not distinguished. Yet projects appear to be included that, as stated in the report, are not subject to impact fees or would purely serve local needs or the needs of one development. Finally, there is no breakout of the allocation of individual highway improvement costs by land use category, and the basis for the cost allocation within the residential and commercial categories in the impact fee schedules is not explained.

The underlying problem for the County of Maui is how to get roads constructed as soon as possible to alleviate traffic congestion. LURF has no objection in principle to developers providing their fair share of the costs of these roads in the regions where they are developing new projects. However, neither the existing Maui impact fee ordinances nor the proposed fee schedules for traffic impact fees in West Maui and South Maui are yet ready to provide the solution the County seeks. Time and energy needs to be spent first on creating a partnership between the County and the development community to find better ways to build roads faster. The bottom line is that the development community would like to have the roads built when the new homeowners start moving into their homes. Focusing on building partnerships with the development community, as was done on Oahu to achieve enactment of the Ewa impact fee ordinance (Revised Ordinances of Honolulu, Chapter 33A), may provide a more immediate solution to the problem than simply enacting and imposing impact fees that have not been fully vetted with those most affected.

Maui County Housing Policy

On September 15, the Maui County Council Housing and Human Services Committee considered a Bill for an Ordinance Amending Chapter 2.86 of the Maui County Code, Pertaining to County Housing Policies [County Communication 05-132 from the Director of the Department of Housing and Human Concerns, March 22, 2005] that would replace the County's "Affordable Housing Program" [Maui County Code (MCC) Chapter 2.86, Article VI] with a "Maui County Housing Policy." The proposed bill would apply to all applications for County change of zoning under which residential housing projects may be developed as permitted uses. An applicant's affordable housing requirement may be satisfied by one or more of an offer for sale or rent of 15 percent of the units, in-lieu payment of monetary contribution, provision of developable land or lots, or other in-kind services or facilities. Business or industrial zoning would require a study to determine housing needs. Before filing a building permit application or upon final subdivision approval, the applicant must execute an affordable housing agreement setting forth the detailed terms and conditions for compliance with the housing policy, including designation of units for specific income categories, eligibility of income qualified households, and buyback and shared equity restrictions. An applicant may receive credits for contribution of excess land, lots, units, money, or services, to meet potential future obligations. In-lieu monetary contributions would be calculated at 10 percent of the affordable sales price of the required number of units (15 percent of total units). The proposed bill also deletes reference to "affordable housing project" and "County housing unit," and adds definitions of "income qualified households," "rental unit,"

"residential housing project," "single-family unit," and "special housing target group" in MCC § 2.86.140.

Mandatory housing unit dedications or linkage fees will pass constitutional muster if there is an "essential nexus" between the exaction, the impact of the development, and the public purpose served by the imposition. A municipal inclusionary zoning ordinance generally applicable to *all* residential and nonresidential development, and requiring that ten percent of new dwelling units be "affordable" or that the developer pay an in-lieu fee, withstood a facial takings challenge where (1) a clear policy established the legitimate governmental purpose; (2) no *ad hoc* land use bargain was at issue; (3) the housing requirement was a modest burden which could be offset by significant benefits to the developer (*e.g.*, expedited processing, density bonuses); and (4) the exaction could be reduced, adjusted, or completely waived upon appeal. *See Home Builders Ass'n v. City of Napa*, 90 Cal.App.4th 188, 108 Cal.Rptr.2d 60 (2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 1356 (2002).

LURF testified that the shortage of affordable housing is a symptom of a larger problem, the lack of housing in general for all segments of the market. One of the major factors contributing to the affordable housing crisis in Hawaii today is the land use entitlement system. Providing a greater supply of housing in all segments of the housing market is one way to address the affordable housing crisis. As more product (homes) is made available, existing homeowners may move to larger, more expensive homes and free up existing inventories. Without an adequate supply of housing product for all segments of the market, competition and demand for a limited supply will continue to drive up prices. We suggested that rather than focusing on exactions through linkages and inclusionary zoning, the County of Maui should consider developing less costly design standards for affordable or worker housing, and ways to shorten the entitlement process to open up more lands for all segments of the housing market.

COUNTY OF KAUAI

Proposed Draft Bill 2132
Relating to Gated Access Subdivisions

On July 26, LURF testified before the Kauai County Planning Commission in opposition to proposed draft Bill 2132 (see the *Land Use Bulletin* for March/April 2005), buttressed by the appearance of Professor David Callies on behalf of LURF.

As stated by the Mayor of Kauai, the purpose of Bill 2132 is to provide for integrated, welcoming communities accessible to everyone, without gates and barriers that hinder access. The bill would amend Kauai County Code (KCC) § 9-2.1, General Environmental Standards, by adding a new subsection (b), Limitations on New Subdevelopments [*sic*], that prohibits (1) construction of gates that prevent access to private roads serving five or more lots or dwelling units; or (2) installation of guard stations or other means of restricting public access across private roads.

Professor Callies testified that Bill 2132: "violates the right to exclude, a fundamental property right enjoyed by landowners and protected by the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The stated purpose of the proposed bill appears almost certainly designed to permit and require public access to private property. Despite its proposed placement as an amendment to subdivision environmental and design standards, there is no attempt to relate the prohibition on gates and guard houses to either type of standard, and no attempt to justify the prohibitions on legitimate police power grounds, such as the need to provide residents of gated or 'guarded' private residential developments with adequate police and fire protection. The blanket prohibition has the effect of preventing the owner of private property from excluding the public. Absent public rights of way such as public roads and easements or limited rights of way for discrete and separate segments of the public based upon custom and usage (native Hawaiians exercising traditional and customary rights, or private citizens claiming a prescriptive easement through uninterrupted trespass over a period of years), a landowner has a nearly unqualified right to exclude the public from private property. The only exceptions are for members of the public asserting First Amendment rights of assembly and freedom of expression on commercially-used property, and even these rights are circumscribed. The proposed bill is designed to prevent all exclusion on residential property, without any constitutional basis for so doing. It is, in sum, unconstitutional."

LURF cannot support unconstitutional legislation that would require private property owners to dedicate private roads for public access without compensation.

If that is the intent, the appropriate means to secure such public access would be for the County to accept the roads by way of dedication, thereby relieving the owners of the responsibility and expense of maintenance and the liability for public use of the improvements.

LOTMA

Beat the School Jam. LOTMA appeared at the annual press conference, and provided an updated flyer on "what we offer" that was included in the press kit distributed by the Department of Transportation (DOT). One of the daily newspapers mentioned LOTMA programs briefly in its writeup. Since then, there have been a few more contacts for carpool rideshare information.

Commuter Express Bus ridership. There has also been a noticeable spike in interest in the LOTMA express bus, and several new riders have signed up. Although the bus is not yet quite at capacity, we are monitoring this more closely now. Walk-on riders can be accepted only on a space available basis.

The Leeward Oahu Transportation Management Association (LOTMA) is a nonprofit association of landowners and developers that promotes alternative transportation opportunities in Leeward, Central and North Shore Oahu.

For more information about LOTMA's programs and services, visit www.lotma.org or call 677-RIDE.

LURF WEBSITE

Please visit our website at www.lurf.org for back issues of the *Land Use Bulletin*. We update information on the website periodically to bring you current information regarding LURF's activities.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

September 5, 2005
Labor Day holiday

September 15, 2005 8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
Second Annual Planning Directors' Panel
Renaissance Ilikai Waikiki Hotel

September 19, 2005 12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m.
Alexander & Baldwin
- Executive Committee Meeting

October 17, 2005 12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m.
Plaza Club
- Board of Directors Meeting
Speaker: Harry Saunders and Lucien Wong
"Economic Momentum Commission"

October 20, 2005 8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
HSBA Annual Bar Convention
"Regulation of Agricultural Lands - 2005"
Sheraton Waikiki Hotel

October 20, 2005
Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation
59th Annual Convention
"Important Agricultural Lands and Hokuli`a"
Royal Lahaina Resort, Lahaina, Maui

November 3-4, 2005
Hawaii Congress of Planning Officials (HCPO)
Fall Meeting on Kauai
"Important Agricultural Lands"

The offices of the Land Use Research Foundation are located in the Topa Financial Center, Bishop Street Tower, 700 Bishop Street, Suite 1928, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.
Telephone: (808) 521-4717. FAX (808) 536-0132.
Website: www.lurf.org.

Editorial Staff:
Dean Y. Uchida, Executive Director
Paul J. Schwind, Esq.,
Director of Research and Legal Affairs