

From: [ianice glennie](#)
To: [LPCtestimony](#)
Cc: [Planning Internet Mail](#); [Surprenant, April](#); [Villegas, Rebecca](#)
Subject: General plan comments
Date: Friday, November 1, 2024 12:25:09 PM

Aloha Leeward Planning commissioners,

Mahalo for taking our testimony today. Hopefully you and staff will understand more deeply the frustrations being expressed about the process that continues to leave interested members of the public unwilling to devote more time to learning a platform that's been beyond glitchy, sometimes not opening depending on the day and, in my case, none of my comments included after I'd typed them in. In 40 years of political engagement in this county, this last two has been the most frustrating as far as feeling uninclusive.

Housekeeping: in order to watch the video from today, one must sign up for google rather than access it through the county website which would be more Akamai and not require signing up to yet another email-generating website.

Other issues:

Today's meeting was cut short despite it being meant to cover such an important topic. Having to ask ommissioners to individually ask staff to further explain the konveio platform rather than do it at the meeting was a missed opportunity that could've given commissioners and the general public a shared experience learning to understand its use. That kind of activity would help the public feel more included in what's been a mystifying process. Sending everyone off on their own to make their way through the existing weeds hasn't been and isn't helpful and is, again, one of the main reasons this plan is receiving such unfavorable public reaction. It also takes staff time to answer the same questions over and over in a vacuum of two (email of phone) instead of doing it in a group setting — which is exactly how this all process should've been done from 2020 when this administration took the reigns.

Please hear me: I'm not asking to start the process over. However, I am asking, and have continued to ask from the beginning of this process, for there to be charette-style meetings where the public, as a group, could engage to discuss the plan, ask questions, and provide fresh ideas *with planners without constant overlap and confusion of having to do it on-the-fly or in a vacuum*. The public should've been taught and practiced using whatever platform was going to be used to take comments interactively in a large, public group setting (aka charette). Time and again I tried the platform, contacted April about issues, couldn't see my comments on the maps, etc., etc.. Those interactions made me feel even more separate as well as guilty for taking up April's time which is already too stretched.

Not having any guarantee that the public can initiate and expect substantive changes to the GP at council level is another reason for public feelings of disenfranchisement. We're sitting on pins and needles waiting to see if councilman Inaba's bill passes. Even if it does, it may not insure that the public will be heard. (And by "be heard", no one expects that everything they want to be included in the plan will be; But we do expect some substantive changes where needed as there are lots of changes being made by the administration.)

As I testified, just adding new zones to the GP and LUPAG is a big deal. It's another perfect example of where an interactive-type public meeting was/is needed — not with 3-minute, staid

testimony requirements — so that people are brought into the fold and are on the same page with understanding and a modicum of agreement.

As far as eliminating mapping, we know what side of the development paradigm Mr Fuke and select private landowners he represents embrace (more, more more development and less, less regulations). Maps are a tool for the public to see, visualize, and learn what's happening with our lands. They're necessary for better clarity and less fighting at permitting level about what's meant in the plan.

At this point, you and the administration can keep all or nothing of the plan as you choose though, as you indicated, you're not going to toss it out. The sense that this process is as far along as it is without the public feeling at all certain that their voice is being incorporated into the plan — where comments made don't even show up on the interactive maps — is demoralizing and makes the public feel that disenfranchisement has been part of the administration's goal from Day 1. This is exacerbated by the mayor coming out of the gate speaking negatively about the importance of the CDPs.

Speaking of mayor's comments...please omit "nimbyism" from the plan. The word and concept is divisive and misleading. As captain of the planning ship, that kind of characterization of community members who've taken the time to learn and speak up about how they want to protect communities and resources only creates more feelings of public disenfranchisement and, in fact, anger.

And speaking of being free to say what our political leaders have said and written...it's a breach of free speech for testifiers not to be able to point out where our leaders are being wrong-headed or even corrupt. Already being limited 3 minutes testimony when someone like Chuck Flaherty or the man speaking about Hawaiian Homes concerns — people with reams of crucial information to share — is tough enough, and wasn't always county protocol. And sending it as written testimony isn't the same as having it heard in person. Again, I feel that letting the public have their say is a way to show inclusivity, to create better relationships and good will between government and the People, and to get things done in the future without constant fighting and ill-will.

Will public testimony be taken at the November 4th meeting?

Mahalo for your volunteerism and for taking what could be a lot of time getting the hang of the Konveio platform. I don't feel I have enough hours or weeks left in my life to spend them trying to decipher glitchy technology (I actually spent weeks), but I sure hope commissioners do.

Best regards,
Janice Palma-glennie
Kailua-kona

Cc: April Suprenaut, Council rep Villegas