

From: [Donna Z Grabow](#)
To: [WPCtestimony](#)
Subject: Aloha - General Plan 2045
Date: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 8:04:13 PM

My name is Donna Grabow and there are many reasons to reject the entire General Plan 2045.

There are so many homes that are already so many vacant, foreclosed homes because of high interest loans.

Yet The Plan promotes relocating people into new cluster housing The Plan has a list of vague rules for smart transportation in smart communities.

There is part of the Plan that mentions agricultural growth, but the details of sustainability are not feasible. Farming Expansion needs land, workers and machinery, all of which are limited. Dependence on imported food will still persist.

If the mistake is made to implement parts of the Plan, then communities of islands can be turned into controlled, dystopian housing projects.

A sterile technocratic culture would replace the friendly Polynesian culture that is so treasured.

In the General Plan, it's been discovered that a new map was either tampered with, or mistakenly mislabeled an area that is actually Urban land.

The new map has somehow been redesignated as 'Conservation land.'

This slight of hand would give the State a green light to prohibit homes, farming or building.

On the last note - Keep Hawaii the way it is. There are already plenty of Forest Reserves, Hawaiian Public Lands, and lots of well-planned parks, beautiful beaches, waterfalls, a free zoo and botanical gardens, all which are available to the public. This is a wonderful place to live. I'm so lucky to live on Moku o Keawe.

The General Plan is not the ONLY choice.

There are much better ideas and clean technology to be considered.

Sincerely,

Donna Grabow
Hilo

From: [julie schaus](#)
To: [Council Testimony](#); [WPCtestimony](#); [LPCtestimony](#)
Subject: General plan 2045
Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2025 8:49:35 AM

Dear Hawaii county council,

I am a resident and property owner in captain cook, Hawai'i. I have three sons that also live in south Kona, Hawai'i. I am writing this testimony to oppose and reject 1) the nomination of Wesley Segawa and 2) to oppose and reject the proposed general plan 2045 based on the following:

Wesley Segawa :

is a convicted felon.

He is a business owner with county contracts therefore an illegal, conflict of interest
Segawa mismanaged his position as chairman of public housing and resigned

I appeal to the council to appoint only those people with hawai'i aloha in their heart.

General plan 2045:

This proposed plan is being discussed behind the peoples backs
There has not been any form of information to the general public
There was to have been 2 meetings in January and 2 in february.
You cancelled a meeting in each month. Very wrong.
You made the meetings during business hours limiting peoples access
Overall this "plan" removes peoples land and water rights
This plan oppresses and suppresses residents and homeowners
This plan seeks to deceitfully rezone our properties to conservation
This plan reduces our property values
This plan seeks for "environmental reasons" to take away/rezone our properties
No governmental body should have the right to decide our properties fate
Referrals to a master plan & ordinances within the plan are vague and lack description
We do not want to live in a smart city controlled by government
We do not want untested/ unsafe 5g installed under our ground
We do not want 5g to surveil us

I appeal to the Hawaii county council to not just hear our voices , but to take action.

Do something to prevent this God awful plan to proceed in any way, shape or form.

This plan should not move forward.

Me and my family, oppose and reject general plan 2045.

Me and my family oppose and reject the nomination of Wesley Segawa

Mahalo nui loa,
Julie schaus
Captain cook, Hi

Sent from my iPad

From: [Marianna Kovalev](#)
To: [WPCtestimony](#)
Cc: happyd92@gmail.com
Subject: My opposition to
Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2025 6:14:36 AM
Attachments: [OppositioinPossitontoGP2045.pdf](#)

Proposition of the General Plan 2045

Sent from my iPhone

Here's an opposition position to the General Plan 2045, challenging its feasibility, priorities, and potential consequences.

Opposition Position to the General Plan 2045

While the General Plan 2045 sets ambitious goals for sustainability, economic growth, and infrastructure development, there are critical flaws in its approach that could hinder its success. The plan lacks feasibility, overestimates resource availability, and places undue burdens on taxpayers and rural communities.

1. Unrealistic Transportation Goals

The plan prioritizes multi-modal transit and emerging technologies while neglecting practical infrastructure needs:

- **Mass Transit Limitations:** Expanding public transportation is idealistic, but given the low population density, mass transit will remain underutilized and costly.
- **Neglect of Rural Needs:** Vision Zero and Complete Streets focus on urban centers, but rural roads remain deteriorating without sufficient funding.
- **Autonomous Vehicles & Smart Roads:** Investing in future technology is premature when basic road maintenance remains underfunded.

2. Housing Policies Worsen Affordability

The plan's zoning changes and affordable housing policies may exacerbate the housing crisis rather than solve it:

- **Urban Growth Boundaries Increase Prices:** Restricting land use in rural areas artificially inflates property values, making housing even less affordable.
- **Overcrowding Solutions Overlook Economic Realities:** Policies ignore that overcrowding results from low wages and high living costs, not just housing shortages.
- **Regulatory Burdens on Developers:** Strict zoning and sustainability mandates deter private investment, reducing housing supply and increasing costs.

3. Infrastructure and Utility Investments Are Unfunded and Impractical

The plan assumes major infrastructure expansions without realistic funding mechanisms:

- **Green Infrastructure & Energy Transition:** Renewable energy projects are costly, and residents will bear the financial burden of transitioning away from fossil fuels.
- **Broadband Expansion:** While beneficial, the cost of rural broadband investment is unsustainable without private sector buy-in.
- **Water Conservation Mandates:** Restrictions and green infrastructure initiatives may increase costs for consumers without clear efficiency benefits.

4. Economic Development Overlooks Local Challenges

The plan assumes economic diversification will reduce reliance on tourism but fails to address key barriers:

- **Workforce Shortages in Tech & Healthcare:** While the plan emphasizes education and business services, Hawai'i struggles to retain talent due to the high cost of living.
- **Tourism Mismanagement:** Reducing tourism's footprint is economically dangerous, as it remains Hawai'i's largest industry. Balancing conservation and tourism is unrealistic without clear incentives.
- **Agricultural Growth Is Not Feasible at Scale:** Farming expansion requires land, water, and workforce, all of which are limited. Dependence on imports will persist.

5. Climate Resilience Efforts Are Costly and Overreaching

Climate change policies in the plan impose expensive regulations without clear economic benefits:

- **Sea Level Rise Restrictions Hurt Property Owners:** Over-regulating coastal development diminishes property rights and land values.
- **Renewable Energy Transition Increases Costs:** Shifting rapidly to renewables raises electricity prices and risks reliability issues.
- **Disaster Preparedness Funding Is Unclear:** Climate adaptation measures require significant public spending without clearly defined funding sources.

Conclusion: A More Balanced Approach Needed

The General Plan 2045 prioritizes idealistic goals over practical solutions. A more balanced approach should:

1. Focus on essential infrastructure first, ensuring roads, utilities, and housing affordability before investing in speculative technology.
2. Encourage private-sector solutions rather than increasing government intervention in housing and economic development.
3. Make climate policies cost-effective, ensuring that taxpayers are not burdened by aggressive renewable energy mandates.

While the plan's vision is commendable, its execution threatens affordability, economic stability, and individual property rights. A more pragmatic approach is necessary to ensure growth without overregulation and excessive public spending.