

From: [AddressOnlyTemporary](#)
To: [WPCtestimony](#)
Subject: Revise Hawaii General Plan Testimony Here
Date: Friday, November 22, 2024 5:13:03 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

Here are some of my concerns with the General Plan:

- There is a huge part of the plan dedicated to "Climate Change". However, why do most experts state there is NO climate danger?

Over 1900 credentialed scientists have signed a World Declaration literally stating, "There is No Climate Danger". Review it here <https://clintel.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/WCD-241023.pdf>

*The declaration states: "To believe the outcome of a climate model is to believe what the model makers have put in. This is precisely the problem of today's climate discussion to which climate models are central. Climate science has **degenerated** into a discussion based on beliefs, **not on sound self-critical science**. Should not we **free ourselves from the naive belief in immature climate models?**"*

John Coleman, Good Morning America's first weather man and the founder of the Weather channel states, "There is No Global Warming". Find it here <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K56fms2VZTc>

50 Years as Meteorologist with the US Airforce and Climatologist Professor David Dilley, says the earth is cooling not warming. He explains the Milankovitch Cycles here: https://youtu.be/sa_tllTPnM?si=0-ubPSELxpFnAVH5

On the Boston Globe's YouTube channel, on May 14, 2010, MIT Professor of Meteorology Richard Lindzen shared, "If one asks, "Is the temperature increasing or decreasing?" it's always doing one or the other. I have no concern about that. By asking people to worry about whether it's going up or down, you're immediately establishing dishonesty. The Earth is always changing. Climate change is nothing you have to prove. It always is happening. It always has happened. So, to make that into something alarming seems a little bit weird to me." Find his interview here <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pwvVephTIHU>

Professor Lindzen also stated, "At any given place, traditionally, sea level is measured by what are called tide gauges: a stick in the water, basically. Two things that change are what a tide gauge shows: the land moving up and down and the sea moving up and down. In most places, it's the land that has the biggest effect, and so you don't have a good measure of sea level rise."

On August 21, 2020, NASA published an article titled "NASA-led Study Reveals the Causes of Sea Level Rise Since 1900." Find the article here: <https://climate.nasa.gov/news/3012/nasa-led-study-reveals-the-causes-of-sea-level-rise-since-1900/>

It reads:

"Sea levels have risen on average 1.6 millimeters (0.063 inches) per year between 1900 and 2018."

That means the sea level has risen a little over 7.4 inches in the last 118 years! Does that show the world is in danger of being engulfed by water? No. It shows that it will be a very, very, very long time before humans are in danger. Does that mean documentaries like "An Inconvenient Truth" are telling lies?

An article was published in the Seattle Times on October 12, 2007, titled "British judge ruled the Oscar-winning film on global warming, "An Inconvenient Truth," contains "nine errors."" Find the article here: <https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/truth-is-gore-film-has-9-errors-british-judge-rules/>

Here is the list of inaccuracies found in Court taken from the "Friends Of Science" website.

The inaccuracies in the documentary include (Find the article

here: https://friendsofscience.org/assets/documents/FOS%20Essay/British_High_Court_Ruling_on_An_Inconvenient_Truth.html):

1. The film claims that melting snows on Mount Kilimanjaro evidence global warming. The Government's expert was forced to concede that this is not correct.
2. The film suggests that evidence from ice cores proves that rising CO2 levels cause temperature increases over 650,000 years. The Court found that the film was misleading: over that period, the rises in CO2 lagged behind the temperature rises by 800-2,000 years.
3. The film uses emotive images of Hurricane Katrina and suggests that this has been caused by global warming. The Government's expert had to accept that it was "not possible" to attribute one-off events to global warming.
4. The film shows the drying up of Lake Chad and claims that this was caused by global warming. The Government's expert had to accept that this was not the case.
5. The film claims that a study showed that polar bears had drowned due to disappearing arctic ice. It turned out that Mr. Gore had misread the study: in fact, four polar bears drowned, and this was because of a particularly violent storm.
6. The film threatens that global warming could stop the Gulf Stream, throwing Europe into an ice age. The Claimant's evidence was that this was a scientific impossibility.

7. The film blames global warming for species losses, including coral reef bleaching. The Government could not find any evidence to support this claim.

8. The film suggests that sea levels could rise by 7 meters, causing the displacement of millions of people. In fact, the evidence is that sea levels are expected to rise by about 40 centimeters over the next 100 years and there is no such threat of massive migration.

9. The film claims that rising sea levels has caused the evacuation of certain Pacific islands to New Zealand. The Government was unable to substantiate this, and the Court observed that this appears to be a false claim.

Also, the Court's interim ruling included the following:

1. The film suggests that the Greenland ice covering could melt, causing sea levels to rise dangerously. The evidence is that Greenland will not melt for a millennia.

2. The film suggests that the Antarctic ice covering is melting; the evidence was that it is, in fact, increasing.

High Court Judge Michael Burton stated:

"Former Vice President Al Gore, the documentary's moderator, makes nine statements in the film that are not supported by the current mainstream scientific consensus. For instance, Gore's script implies that Greenland or West Antarctica might melt soon, creating a sea-level rise of up to 20 feet that would cause devastation from San Francisco to the Netherlands to Bangladesh."

The judge called this "distinctly alarmist" and said the consensus view is that if Greenland melted, it would release this amount of water "but only after, and over, a millennia."

- The word "Stakeholder," defined in the plan, is written 86 times and literally means anyone in the entire world can have input on this plan.
- Please recommend Stakeholder change to the following: "Local Communities". Local Communities are local Big Island farmers, homeowners, renters, organizations, businesses, and individuals who live on Big Island or have property on Big Island that will be personally affected by projects, decisions, or activities in the general plan. Effective local community engagement and management are crucial for the success and sustainability of any initiative, as it helps ensure that diverse perspectives and interests are considered.
- The OSCER Department in the plan will null and void all public input and leave decisions to unelected officials. This is NOT okay! This department should not be created. This is on page 188, 40.8.
- The Planning Department has sent out letters too many homeowners telling them their land use will be changed from resident to recreation due to the General Plan 2045. This will drastically lower their property value and opens the door to rezone the area. This is not pono. It breaks the Aloha Spirit law § 5-7.5. To reduce someone's property value is not okay. This must be made pono again.
- There is a huge section on climate change and things that will be affected. This needs to be further researched. There are over 1900 credentialed scientist that say there is no climate danger. Here is the pdf showing the scientist and what country they are from: <https://clintel.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/WCD-241023.pdf>. John Coleman, the first weather man for Good Morning America and the Founder of the Weather Channel has gone on CNN and other media outlets stating, "There is no climate danger". He explain the reason for this narrative is the investors, in renewable energy, want to make these changes.
- Hilo does not have a Community Development Plan. How can a Big Island General Plan move forward without that? Hilo is 22% of the island.
- 1.13 under "Increase the biodiversity and resilience of native habitats" reads, *"Incentivize private land management practices that protect and enhance natural resource values and, when appropriate, pursue the acquisition of lands for the protection of natural resources."* "Incentives" mean more taxes. "Protection" means more rules. Who's "values" is this plan referring too because it's not the locals? "Pursue the acquisition of lands" does this say they are going to pursuing taking people's private property? Again with "protection of natural resources". This plan should be focused on people growing more food and it is doing the exact opposite!
- This plan wants to turn land into "conservation". The exact opposite is what is needed for Big Island! We need to turn land into Ag Villages and grow more food! Steve Shropshire, a resident of Papaikou, has created an Ag Villages plan.

Ag Village to add to the General Plan:

Papaikou Ag Village Objectives:

https://www.standtogetherhawaii.com/_files/ugd/86fc0c_2cb1cc6d604f4cdd971ad40831c745bc.pdf

Papaikou Site Plan: https://www.standtogetherhawaii.com/_files/ugd/86fc0c_5e4cdb02efeb46a5ae949a3579aff00d.pdf

Papaikou Development:

https://www.standtogetherhawaii.com/_files/ugd/86fc0c_c2af52c8b3c645b1a6868a724eee8304.pdf

A Hawaiian born Kanaka revised the Collaborative Biocultural Stewardship that is in the plan. You can see it in the pdf [below](https://www.standtogetherhawaii.com/_files/ugd/86fc0c_0a1d5be8f1d140069415f7b691725786.pdf):
Part One: https://www.standtogetherhawaii.com/_files/ugd/86fc0c_0a1d5be8f1d140069415f7b691725786.pdf

Part Two: https://86fc0cbd-8207-4076-85fa-5a62e4e933b4.usrfiles.com/ugd/86fc0c_ecc498ba192d4a7689ebf31c3681c2ec.pdf

Here is a longer revised version of the plan from locals:

https://www.standtogetherhawaii.com/_files/ugd/86fc0c_b34739e4c99c461685de4c0207bf286e.pdf

The way this plan is written is very far from what will support our island.

Alyssa Stamey