

From: [Tariq Aboufakhr](#)
To: [WPCTestimony](#)
Cc: [LPCTestimony](#)
Subject: Revise Hawaii General Plan Testimony
Date: Thursday, November 21, 2024 9:55:37 AM

This raises my eyes..

Here are some concerns:

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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!

7. 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:

Papaikou Site
Plan:

Papaikou Development:

A Hawaiian born Kanaka revised the Collaborative Biocultural Stewardship that is in the plan. You can see it in the pdf

Part Two:

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

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