

**BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
STATE OF HAWAII**

IN THE MATTER OF

Contested Case Hearing Re Conservation District
Use Application (CDUA) HA-3568 For the Thirty
Meter Telescope at the Mauna Kea Science
Reserve, Ka'ohē Mauka, Hamakua, Hawai'i
TMK (3) 4-4-015:009

CASE NO. BLNR-CC-16-002

**FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND
DECISION AND ORDER**

Certificate of Service

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND
DECISION AND ORDER**



Received
Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands
Department of Land and Natural Resources
State of Hawaii
2017 September 28 7:48 am

PREFACE

The Board adopts the hearing officer's recommended findings of fact, conclusions of law, and decision and order, with modifications, including additional conditions. The Board commends the hearing officer's thorough, comprehensive and well-considered report, prepared after 44 days of hearings. The Board's modifications are consistent with the hearing officer's factual findings and legal conclusions. Along with minor corrections, the changes mostly give further explanations for some aspects of the decision.

Because of the length of this document, the Board thought it would be useful to the parties and public to give a brief summary. This Preface cannot describe fully how the Board considered various factors. It is not intended to replace or supplement the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and decision and order, and they prevail in case of any perceived conflict between them and this Preface.

The TMT is a very large structure, 180 feet tall, proposed near the top of a culturally important and magnificently beautiful mountain. This project is not, however, on an untouched landscape. Mauna Kea now hosts twelve observatories, including six that are between 100 and 151 feet tall. The first large telescope on Mauna Kea was completed forty-seven years ago.

The TMT will not pollute groundwater, will not damage any historic sites, will not harm rare plants or animals, will not release toxic materials, and will not otherwise harm the environment. It will not significantly change the appearance of the summit of Mauna Kea from populated areas on Hawai'i Island.

The TMT site and its vicinity were not used for traditional and customary native Hawaiian practices conducted elsewhere on Mauna Kea, such as depositing *piko*, quarrying rock for adzes, pilgrimages, collecting water from Lake Waiau, or burials. The site is not on the summit ridge, which is more visible, and, according to most evidence presented, more culturally important than the plateau 500 feet lower where TMT will be built.

Some groups perform ceremonies near the summit. The evidence shows that these ceremonies began after the summit access road and first telescopes were built, but, in any case, the TMT will not interfere with them.

Individuals testified that seeing the TMT will disturb them when they are doing ceremonies or other spiritual practices. The TMT cannot be seen from the actual summit or from many other places on the summit ridge. Where it would be visible, other large telescopes are already in view. It will not block views from the summit ridge of the rising sun, setting sun, or Haleakalā.

Some native Hawaiians expressed that Mauna Kea is so sacred that the very idea of a large structure is offensive. But there are already twelve observatories on Mauna Kea, some of them almost as large as the TMT. They will remain even if the TMT is not built. No credible evidence was presented that the TMT would somehow be worse from a spiritual or cultural point of view than the other large observatories. Each observatory received a permit after a process allowing public participation and judicial review, over a period spanning three decades.

To the extent that the belief that Mauna Kea is too sacred to allow large structures is a religious one, under the federal and state constitutions a group's religious beliefs cannot be given veto power over the use of public land.

Other witnesses, including some native Hawaiians, embrace a different way of thinking and feeling about the TMT: as a project that honors Mauna Kea rather than injures it. After a worldwide search, scientists found that Mauna Kea is the best site on earth for the most advanced telescope ever built. Mauna Kea will forever be known throughout the world as the site of profound discoveries about the universe. These witnesses see TMT and the other telescopes, not as objects spoiling the landscape, but as portals to discovery placed in this site made ideal for them.

To these witnesses, respect for Mauna Kea can be reconciled with modern astronomy. When ancient Hawaiians found a resource valuable to them – the densest rock in Hawai'i – near the summit of Mauna Kea, they made use of it, quarrying hundreds of acres. Ancient Hawaiians intensely studied the stars in ways consistent with their technology. Traditional Hawaiian navigation depended upon knowledge of the stars.

King David Kalākaua enthusiastically supported astronomy in Hawai'i. He wrote: "It will afford me unfeigned satisfaction if my kingdom can add its quota toward the successful accomplishment of the most important astronomical observation of the present century..."

TMT will contribute \$1 million a year toward education, and has signed a sublease agreement committing \$300,000/yr. at first, increasing to \$1 million/yr., for conservation on Mauna Kea. No existing observatory makes any such contributions.

Astronomy directly supports about 1,000 jobs in Hawai'i. TMT will employ about 140 people. The decision contains 43 special conditions to ensure that the project lives up to its environmental commitments, that the educational fund will help the underserved members of the community, that TMT will train and hire local workers, and that the native Hawaiian cultural presence at Hale Pōhaku will be enhanced.

Astronomers discovered that the earth goes around the sun; that we live in one of more than 100 billion galaxies; that our universe expanded from a single point 13.7 billion years ago. These discoveries shape how we see our place in the universe. Other telescopes on Mauna Kea have already contributed to human knowledge. TMT, if built, will do the same.

One native Hawaiian story about the origin of Mauna Kea is that Wakea, "Sky Father", and Papa, "Earth Mother", created a child, Hawai'i Island. Mauna Kea is the highest summit of the island, this union of heaven and earth. Today, Mauna Kea is the best place on earth to study the heavens.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. THE PARTIES.....	2
II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: PRE-HEARING	7
A. PRIOR CONTESTED CASE, REMAND, AND APPOINTMENT OF HEARING OFFICER.....	7
B. FIRST PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE, RECORD ON REMAND, SCHEDULING MOTIONS TO INTERVENE.....	9
C. STANDING	11
D. PRE-HEARING PLEADINGS.....	12
E. SETTING THE ISSUES.....	12
F. SITE VISIT	14
G. THE PRIOR CDUP WAS VOIDED BY THE BLNR	14
H. SCHEDULING THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING	14
III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: EVIDENTIARY HEARING	16
IV. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: POST-HEARING.....	18
FINDINGS OF FACT.....	20
I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN ASTRONOMY ON MAUNA KEA.....	20
A. THE GENERAL LEASE, THE MAUNA KEA SCIENCE RESERVE AND THE UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT AREA	20
B. DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN ASTRONOMY FACILITIES ON MAUNA KEA PRIOR TO 2000	21
C. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2000 MASTER PLAN AND THE OFFICE OF MAUNA KEA MANAGEMENT.....	22
D. DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ITS SUB-PLANS.....	25
E. CURRENT AND FUTURE DECOMMISSIONING.....	30

F.	ASTRONOMY DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE MASTER PLAN	31
G.	BLNR ONGOING JURISDICTION	34
H.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT EFFORTS	35
II.	THE PROPOSED PROJECT	36
A.	HISTORY OF THE TMT PROJECT	36
B.	FORMATION OF TIO	40
C.	SUBLEASE BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND TIO	41
D.	CONSULTATION FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT	41
E.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	44
F.	THE UNIQUE COMBINATION OF CONDITIONS THAT MAKES MAUNA KEA A PREMIER LOCATION FOR ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORIES	49
G.	THE SCIENTIFIC VALUE OF THE TMT OBSERVATORY.....	50
H.	ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF THE TMT OBSERVATORY.....	52
I.	TMT PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES	52
J.	EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.....	53
	<i>i. The Need for Educational Opportunities</i>	<i>53</i>
	<i>ii. Native Hawaiians and Astronomy</i>	<i>54</i>
	<i>iii. Community Benefits Package.....</i>	<i>57</i>
	<i>iv. Workforce Pipeline Program.....</i>	<i>58</i>
K.	TMT PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES	59
L.	TMT PROJECT DECOMMISSIONING	66
M.	FUNDING.....	67
N.	THE OCCL REPORT RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF CDUA	68
III.	MAUNA KEA CONSIDERED SACRED	69

IV.	HAWAI‘I ADMINISTRATIVE RULE § 13-5-30(C): THE EIGHT CRITERIA	77
A.	CRITERION ONE, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(1): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE OF THE CONSERVATION DISTRICT[.].....	77
B.	CRITERION TWO, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(2): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE SUBZONE OF THE LAND ON WHICH THE USE WILL OCCUR[.]	82
C.	CRITERION THREE, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(3): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE COMPLIES WITH PROVISIONS AND GUIDELINES CONTAINED IN CHAPTER 205A, HRS, ENTITLED ‘COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT’, WHERE APPLICABLE[.].....	86
D.	CRITERION FOUR, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(4): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE WILL NOT CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT TO EXISTING NATURAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE SURROUNDING AREA, COMMUNITY, OR REGION[.]	89
	<i>i. Biologic Resources</i>	91
	<i>ii. Archaeological and Historic Resources</i>	98
	<i>iii. Cultural Resources and Practices</i>	116
	<i>iv. Visual and Aesthetic Resources</i>	155
	<i>v. Hydrology and Water Resources</i>	158
	<i>vi. Hazardous Waste, Solid Waste, and Wastewater</i>	164
E.	CRITERION FIVE, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(5): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE, INCLUDING BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES, AND FACILITIES, SHALL BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE LOCALITY AND SURROUNDING AREAS, APPROPRIATE TO THE PHYSICAL CONDITIONS AND CAPABILITIES OF THE SPECIFIC PARCEL OR PARCELS[.]	167
F.	CRITERION SIX, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(6): "THE EXISTING PHYSICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF THE LAND, SUCH AS NATURAL BEAUTY AND OPEN SPACE CHARACTERISTICS, WILL BE PRESERVED OR IMPROVED UPON, WHICHEVER IS APPLICABLE[.].....	170

G.	HAR § 13-5-30(C)(7), CRITERION SEVEN: "SUBDIVISION OF LAND WILL NOT BE UTILIZED TO INCREASE THE INTENSITY OF LAND USES IN THE CONSERVATION DISTRICT... ..	177
H.	CRITERION EIGHT, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(8): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE WIL NOT BE MATERIALLY DETRIMENTAL TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE	179
V.	PETITIONERS’ AND OPPOSING INTERVENOR’S ARGUMENTS THAT UHH FAILS TO MEET CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF PERMIT.....	189
VI.	PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE	192
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	194
I.	INTRODUCTION.....	194
II.	JURISDICTION AND STANDING.....	195
A.	JURISDICTION	195
B.	STANDING OF THE PARTIES	196
C.	TIO’S STANDING.....	197
D.	HEARING OFFICER WITNESSES	197
III.	DENIAL OF OUTSTANDING MOTIONS	198
IV.	AUTHORITY OF HEARING OFFICER	199
V.	EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS.....	200
VI.	CROSS EXAMINATION PROCEDURES.....	202
VII.	REBUTTAL WITNESSES	203
VIII.	OFFICIAL NOTICE	204
IX.	LEGAL FRAMEWORK.....	204
A.	BURDEN OF PROOF	204
B.	STATE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY	205
C.	STATUTE AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES	206
D.	CASE LAW	208

i.	<i>PASH</i>	208
ii.	<i>Hanapi</i>	209
iii.	<i>Pratt</i>	210
iv.	<i>Ka Pa‘akai</i>	210
v.	<i>Morimoto</i>	211
vi.	<i>Mauna Kea Anaina Hou</i>	211
vii.	<i>Kilakila ‘O Haleakalā</i>	211
X.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	213
A.	THE TMT PROJECT SATISFIES THE EIGHT CRITERIA OF HAR § 13- 5-30(C)	213
i.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the First Criterion</i>	214
ii.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the Second Criterion</i>	215
iii.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the Third Criterion</i>	218
iv.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the Fourth Criterion</i>	219
v.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the Fifth Criterion</i>	225
vi.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the Sixth Criterion</i>	226
vii.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the Seventh Criterion</i>	230
viii.	<i>The TMT Project Satisfies the Eighth Criterion</i>	234
B.	THE TMT PROJECT SATISFIES THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE, AND ART. XI, SEC. 7 OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND CUSTOMARY AND TRADITIONAL NATIVE HAWAIIAN RIGHTS ARE APPROPRIATELY PROTECTED	237
i.	<i>The Public Trust Doctrine</i>	237
ii.	<i>The Protection of Customary and Traditional Native Hawaiian Rights</i>	244
a.	<i>Article XII, Section 7 of the Hawai‘i Constitution and the Ka Pa‘akai Analysis</i>	244

b.	<i>Religious Freedom / Religious Establishment</i>	249
c.	<i>Contemporary Practices</i>	254
C.	PETITIONERS' AND OPPOSING INTERVENORS' OTHER ARGUMENTS.....	254
i.	<i>Insufficient Consultation</i>	254
ii.	<i>Waiver of Challenges to the FEIS</i>	255
iii.	<i>Alleged Desecration</i>	255
iv.	<i>Vacatur of Consent to Sublease</i>	258
v.	<i>UH Hilo Authority to Execute CDUA</i>	259
vi.	<i>CDUA Reference to TMT Corporation and TIO</i>	260
vii.	<i>NHPA Section 106 Review / National Environmental Policy Act</i>	260
XI.	SUMMARY	262
	DECISION AND ORDER.....	265
	INDEX OF SELECT DEFINED TERMS	272
	APPENDIX A – Pre-Hearing Filings filed by July 18, 2016	276
	APPENDIX B – Pre-Hearing Filings filed after July 18, 2016	283
	APPENDIX C – Hearing Filings (Not Including Motions to Admit Evidence)	296
	APPENDIX D – Post-Hearing Filings (Including Motions to Admit Evidence)	301
	APPENDIX E – Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order	315

INTRODUCTION

This contested case hearing involves a Conservation District Use Application (the "**CDUA**") submitted by the University of Hawai'i at Hilo for the Thirty Meter Telescope Project (the "**Project**" or "**TMT Project**") to be located in the Mauna Kea Science Reserve ("**MKSR**"), District of Hamakua, Island and County of Hawai'i.

The following Findings of Fact ("**FOF**"), Conclusions of Law ("**COL**"), and Decision and Order are based on the records maintained by the Department of Land and Natural Resources ("**DLNR**") in CDUA HA-3568 and the witness testimonies and exhibits presented during the evidentiary hearing for this contested case. The hearing was held from October 20, 2016 through March 2, 2017. Exhibits were received into evidence after the hearing.

If any statement denominated a COL is more properly considered an FOF, then it should be treated as an FOF. Conversely, if any statement denominated as an FOF is more properly considered a COL, then it should be treated as a COL.

Any proposed finding of fact submitted by the parties which is not specifically incorporated is rejected for one or more of the following reasons:

- They are repetitious or similar to the Board of Land and Natural Resources ("**BLNR**") or the Hearing Officer's own findings of fact or conclusions of law or decision and order, and/or
- They are not supported by reliable and/or probative evidence, and/or
- They are in whole or in part not supported by and/or are contrary to the facts or law, and/or
- They are immaterial, superfluous, and/or irrelevant to the material facts, issues, and/or law of this case.

Certain facts set forth within specified criteria addressed below may apply to one or more criteria, issue, or legal standard. To the extent such facts or findings are addressed within a particular heading or section below does not limit it to that heading or section, but instead all such facts or findings are incorporated by reference for each applicable criteria section, as if specifically set forth within that heading or section.

The Hearing Officer and the BLNR considered the testimony of all witnesses at the evidentiary hearings and all exhibits received into evidence. The mere fact that a particular witness testimony or exhibit may not be specifically referred to below does not and shall not be construed to mean that said testimony or exhibit was not considered. Rather, specific reference to said witness testimony or exhibit was excluded because, after due consideration of said testimony or exhibit, it was determined to be: (i) immaterial, (ii) irrelevant, (iii) contrary to law, (iv) less credible or persuasive, and/or (v) cumulative of other testimonies or exhibits specifically referred to below.

I. THE PARTIES

1. The University of Hawai‘i ("**University**") was originally established as the state university of the State of Hawai‘i and constitutes a body corporate under Hawai‘i law. The University of Hawai‘i has ten campuses statewide, one of which is the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo ("**UH Hilo**" or "**UHH**"). The UH Hilo, on behalf of the University, is the Applicant of the CDUA for the TMT Project. The University of Hawai‘i and UH Hilo may be referred to interchangeably, and sometimes collectively, as the "University" herein. During the contested case proceeding, the University was represented by Carlsmith Ball LLP.
2. Mauna Kea Anaina Hou ("**MKAH**") is an organization of native Hawaiian cultural practitioners who have genealogical ties and/or who engage in traditional and customary practices related to Mauna Kea. It is also an unincorporated association that participated in the prior contested case proceeding involving the UH Hilo’s CDUA for the TMT Project under DLNR Docket No. HA-11-05 ("**Prior Contested Case**"). From the beginning of this contested case until October 10, 2016, MKAH was represented by Richard Wurdeman, Esq. ("**Wurdeman**"). From October 11, 2016 through the present, MKAH was represented by non-lawyer Kimberly "Kealoha" Pisciotta ("**Pisciotta**"), who is the current president of MKAH. Tr. Vol. viii, 10/17/16 at 4:16-17; WDT of Ms. K. Kealoha Pisciotta, Exh. B.01a.
3. In addition to representing MKAH, Pisciotta represented herself in her individual capacity in this proceeding. She is a native Hawaiian practitioner of traditional and customary cultural and religious practices relating to Mauna Kea. Her other cultural practices include those relating to la`au lapa`au (medicinal practices) with ocean and some land plants and also Palaoa (Marine Mammals). WDT of Ms. K. Kealoha Pisciotta, Exh. B.01a. from the beginning of the contested case until October 10, 2016, Pisciotta was represented by Wurdeman. From October 11, 2016 through the present, Pisciotta represented herself *pro se*.
4. Clarence Kukauakahi Ching ("**Ching**") is a native Hawaiian cultural, spiritual and religious practitioner on Mauna Kea. WDT for Clarence Kukauakahi Ching, Ex. B.19a. Ching participated in the Prior Contested Case. From the beginning of the contested case until October 10, 2016, Ching was represented by Wurdeman. From October 11, 2016, until the present, Ching represented himself *pro se*.
5. The Flores-Case ‘Ohana is an unincorporated, family association consisting of E. Kalani Flores ("**Flores**"), B. Pualani Case ("**Case**"), and their two children. They reside in Pu‘ukapu, Waimea, Kohala Waho, Mokupuni o Hawai‘i. Flores is a Kanaka Maoli (also identified as a Native Hawaiian, he hoa‘āina o Moku o Keawe, he ‘ōiwi o ka pae ‘āina Hawai‘i, an indigenous person of the archipelago of Hawai‘i) and a descendent of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778 as established through his genealogical lineage of Hukiku and Keulua. He is a cultural practitioner with substantial interest in Mauna a Wākea (also referred to as Mauna Kea), who continues to exercise his traditional and customary Native Hawaiian cultural, spiritual, and religious practices and who continues to engage in cultural practices, protocols, and ceremony gatherings

connected to and on Mauna a Wākea. WDT of E. Kalani Case, Ex. B.02a. Case is a Kanaka Maoli (also identified as a Native Hawaiian, he hoa‘āina o Moku o Keawe, he ‘ōiwi o ka pae ‘āina Hawai‘i, an indigenous person of the archipelago of Hawai‘i) and a cultural practitioner with connections to Mauna a Wākea, Kumu Hula, chanter, and most importantly a parent of two daughters who are passionately connected to their culture and traditions. WDT of B. Pualani Case, Ex. B.21a. The Flores-Case ‘Ohana participated in the Prior Contested Case. From the beginning of the contested case until October 10, 2016, the Flores-Case ‘Ohana was represented by Wurdeman. From October 11, 2016 until the present, the Flores-Case ‘Ohana was represented by Flores and Case.

6. Deborah J. Ward ("**Ward**") is a graduate of the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, with Bachelor and Master of Science degrees. She served for twenty-three years as a faculty member of the University of Hawai‘i Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management. She has been a member, and has served in leadership positions within Sierra Club (SC), Conservation Council of Hawai‘i (CCH), and Big Island Invasive Species Committee for many years. She has administered grants and served as Quality Control Officer for the Hawai‘i Organic Farmers Association. She has been growing and marketing organic fruit and foliage in upper Puna for fifteen years, and has lived in Hawai‘i for more than fifty years. Much of her adult life has been directed to protection and conservation of natural habitats unique to Hawai‘i. Her involvement in issues regarding the management of Mauna Kea began in the early 1970’s. As a recreational hiker, she visited Mauna Kea with her father, a physicist and astronomer. She is a recreational user of Mauna Kea lands and participated in the Prior Contested Case. WDT of Deborah J. Ward, Ex. B.17a. From the beginning of the contested case until October 10, 2016, Ward was represented by Wurdeman. From October 11, 2016 until the present, Ward represented herself *pro se*.
7. Paul Neves ("**Neves**") is a Kumu Hula since October 23, 1999 and a member of the Royal Order of Kamehameha I. His position in the Order is Ali‘i Noeau Loa, which is a position given to one that has previously served as Ka Lai Moku (or one who has held the 2nd highest position). He can now consult at the highest level. WDT of Mr. Paul K. Neves, Ex. B.18a. He is a native Hawaiian Cultural Practitioner who participated in the Prior Contested Case. From the beginning of the contested case until October 10, 2016, Neves was represented by Wurdeman. From October 11, 2016 until the present, Neves was represented by Pisciotta without objection. Notwithstanding the BLNR's determination in Minute Order No. 52, [Doc. 650] filed May 26, 2017, at page 1, footnote1, the Hearing Officer acknowledges that no objections were made to Pisciotta’s representations for and on behalf of Neves throughout this contested case hearing and therefore, accepted said representation throughout this hearing.
8. KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance ("**KAHEA**") is a domestic nonprofit organization, incorporated in Hawai‘i in 2001, that participated in the Prior Contested Case. KAHEA’s mission is to advocate for the protection of environmentally significant and culturally sacred places in Hawai‘i. From the beginning of the contested case until October 10, 2016, KAHEA was represented by Wurdeman. From October 11, 2016 until the present, KAHEA was represented by Yuklin Aluli, Esq. ("**Aluli**") and Dexter Kaiama, Esq. ("**Kaiama**").

9. TMT International Observatory, LLC ("**TIO**") is a nonprofit organization comprised of the Regents of the University of California, the California Institute of Technology ("**Caltech**"), the National Institutes of Natural Sciences of Japan, the National Astronomical Observatories of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Department of Science and Technology of India, and the National Research Council of Canada. TIO is a different entity from the TMT Observatory Corporation ("**TMT Corporation**"). During the contested case proceeding, TIO was represented by Watanabe Ing LLP. [Doc. 2].
10. Perpetuating Unique Educational Opportunities, Inc. ("**PUEO**") is a nonprofit organization formed by native Hawaiians that support the pursuit of educational opportunities for children of Hawai'i. PUEO was formed to, *inter alia*, share the interaction of Hawaiian culture and science and to research and educate the public on the interaction of Hawaiian culture and science and to inspire exploration. PUEO's purposes include furthering educational opportunities for the children of Hawai'i in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Its board members and beneficiaries include native Hawaiians that reside in the Keaukaha-Pana'ewa Hawaiian Homesteads located in Hilo, Hawai'i. PUEO's board members include native Hawaiians who seek knowledge and understanding and exercise customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights on Mauna Kea. During the contested case proceeding, PUEO was represented by Torkildson, Katz, Moore, Hetherington & Harris. [Doc. 33].
11. Mehana Kihoi ("**Kihoi**") is "a Native Hawaiian cultural and spiritual practitioner. I am a Native Hawaiian beneficiary as defined by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921, and a beneficiary of the Ceded Lands Trust under Section 5(f) of the Admissions Act. I am a descendant of Native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778 as established through my genealogical lines of Pa'ao and Hewa Hewa Nui. My ancestors and subsequent generations, gathered adze only found on Mauna Kea, to build their voyaging canoes. My ancestors honored Mauna Kea as a place of spiritual worship, where they would offer their deepest prayers to our creators Papa and Wakea." Pre-Hearing Statement of Mehana Kihoi, Ex. F-1. During the contested case proceeding, Kihoi represented herself *pro se*.
12. Chase Michael Kaho'okahi Kanuha ("**Kanuha**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. In his words: "I lived on Mauna a Wakea for four months in 2015 just as my ancestor had done over 400 years ago. Mauna a Wakea is my kuleana. I am a descendent of 'Umiailoa, ke ali'i noho mauna, and I have been given the sacred responsibility to protect the sacred lands of my ancestors." [Doc. 24] During the contested case proceeding, Kanuha represented himself *pro se*.
13. Harry Fergerstrom ("**Fergerstrom**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. He is a "fully trained practitioner in Hawaian Religion, Trained by Tahuna Nui Sam Hoopi Lono." [Doc. 20] During the contested case proceeding, Fergerstrom represented himself *pro se*.
14. Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara ("**Camara**") resides with his ohana in the wao maukele of Kaumana on the slopes of Mauna Kea. In his words, "Our wai is Wailuku Stream. I am a lineal descendant of Kukahauula of Mauna Kea (Exhibit H-8). This ancestor lived

as a Kanaka (man), and also remains with us today on Mauna Kea as a Puu, an elemental deity or akua, and a vessels for the Wai Kapu A Kane. The remains, the iwi of Kukahauula and many more of my kupuna (ancestors) rest on Mauna Kea and need vigilant care to prevent desecration. I, like many Hawaiians am a descendant of Umi a Liloa. Umi placed a kapu on Mauna Kea and part of his vast legacy was to protect the sacred Mauna Kea from desecration. This legacy and kuleana are now mine to uphold. I am a Native Hawaiian and my family's history is woven into the landscape of Mauna Kea. My ancestry documents the un-severable bond that I have with this sacred mountain."[sic] WDT of Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara, Witness Statement 1 filed 10/10/16. During the contested case proceeding, Camara represented himself *pro se*.

15. Jennifer Leina'ala Sleightholm ("**Sleightholm**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. In her words: "I come from the 'ohana Keli'ipio, and Kuamo'o. I am a kanaka 'oiwi and can trace my genealogy back to the Battle of Kuamo'o in 1819. I am a 42 year old wife, and mother of 6 children of which I birthed 5. I was born in Wahiawa, O'ahu and moved to Pahoa, Moku o Keawe in 1978 with my parents, and younger sister. At the age of five, we moved to the wahi of Keahuolu where my father was the caretaker. In 1988 we moved to Ka'awaloa, Kona Hema where my parents remain today. I currently reside in Waikoloa, Kohala Hema, Moku o Keawe." WDT of Leina'ala Sleightholm, Ex. F-3. During the contested case proceeding, Sleightholm represented herself *pro se*.
16. Maelani Lee ("**Maelani Lee**") is a native Hawaiian, descended of the native inhabitants of Hawai'i prior to 1778 (King Kamehameha the Great and Queen Ka'ahumanu) and has lived in Hawai'i for 37 years. She supports and conducts traditional and customary practices consisting of chants and spiritual connection. [Doc. 39]. During the contested case proceeding, Lee represented herself *pro se*. On December 7, 2016, Lee filed a Notice of Withdrawal from this contested case. [Doc. 421].
17. Richard Maele DeLeon ("**DeLeon**") is a kahu, "ordained my practices of spiritual healing of enlightenment, I am a Ho'opa'a a chanter of prayers that log back to 1553, I am also a Olapa, a dancer of ancient Hula, TMT will impact my spiritual enlightenment for being in a scared grounds of alignment with Akua, I am also a lineal decedents of 7 generation of the house of Keawe of Liloa of Kamehameha, which holds title to Mauna A Wakea." [Doc. 22] During the contested case proceeding, DeLeon represented himself *pro se*. On August 30, 2016, prior to the start of the evidentiary portion of the contested case hearing on October 20, 2016, DeLeon filed a Motion to Withdraw from Contested Case. [Doc. 249]. On September 1, 2016, DeLeon also filed a Motion to Withdraw Richard Maele DeLeon as a Party to the Contested Case and Witness Under my Name. [Doc. 251].
18. Cindy Freitas ("**C. Freitas**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. In her words: "I am a Native Hawaiian, descended of the native inhabitants of Hawai'i prior to 1778 and born and raised in Hawai'i my entire life. I learned my cultural religion practices though [sic] my families Lineage. My grandmother and grandfather is the strongest mentor for me in my growing up and raised me in a traditional cultural way. We would go to the mountain and do prayers ("Pule") for many different things." Cindy Freitas Amended Written Direct Testimony, Ex. S-2. During the contested case proceeding, C. Freitas represented herself *pro se*.

19. William Freitas ("**W. Freitas**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. In his words: "I William Freitas, a practitioner of many Cultural Hawaiian Religious Traditions of the practices of our Hawaiian people that I have engage in and are taught to me by my Kupuna, Uncles' Aunties and my Mother and Hawaiian family's that live these traditions and shared hands on knowledge passed to them from beyond 1778. I am a Pohaku Kane (stone missionary). My experience started at a young age of 5 years old with my mother as we were picking kukui nuts to make Ina Mona. I found a stone under the kukui leaves in the dirt. My mother said it was a special stone use for food and medicine. Then she chanted with prayers for protection and permission to malama (care for). This special Stone which is still in my possession, is the connection to my heritage as a Kanaka Maoli Ko Pae Aina and the journey that directs me to protect my birth right for the future of myself and family." [sic] William Freitas WDT, Ex. T-3. During the contested case proceeding, W. Freitas represented himself *pro se*.
20. The Temple of Lono ("**Temple**") is an unincorporated association. It is "a traditional faith in the Hawaiian Civilization with an unbroken practice extending to this time..." [Doc. 50] Lanny Alan Sinkin ("**Sinkin**") was a lay representative for the Temple. He is "an attorney admitted to the Federal Bar in the State of Hawai'i" but is not licensed to practice law in the State of Hawai'i. [Doc. 74] During this contested case proceeding, the Temple was represented by Sinkin.
21. Kalikolehua Kanaele ("**Kanaele**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. He is a cultural practitioner who practices and will continue to practice/ exercise his traditional and customary cultural and religious practices on and around the summit and slopes of Mauna Kea, Hawai'i. He is a ranking Chief of the Royal Order of Kamehameha I, Heiau Mamalahoa, Helu 'Elua and a Kanekoa, Priest of I'o Kalanainuiilamamao of Mauna Kea, and a descendant of Kamehameha I. Petition For A Contested Case Hearing filed 2/26/17 (WDT of Kalikolehua Kanaele in Documents Library). During the contested case proceeding, Kanaele represented himself *pro se*.
22. Stephanie-Malia:Tabbada ("**Tabbada**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. During the contested case proceeding, Tabbada represented herself *pro se*. Despite being admitted as a party, Tabbada's last appearance in this case was on October 17, 2016 [Tr. Vol. viii, 10/17/16]; she did not physically appear during the evidentiary portion of the contested case hearing which commenced on October 20, 2016 and ended on March 2, 2017.
23. Tiffnie Kakalia ("**Kakalia**"), in her own words: "Ka mauna a Wākea has been the piko of my existence throughout many lifetimes. My kupuna hail from the cardinal points of moku o Keawe, North Kohala, KailuaKona, Pahala-Ka'u and Hilopaliu. Like many others from this island, I know this mountain intimately. I was raised on the slopes of Maunakea in the same community as my mother, her father and paternal grandparents. I have raised my children to know her as family and now raise 'ohana keiki (nieces and nephews) and mo'opuna (grandchildren) in the same manner. We are kalo keiki o ka 'āina, Natives of this land for generations back." [Pre-hearing Statement filed 10/11/2016] During the contested case proceeding, Kakalia represented herself *pro se*.
24. Glen Kila ("**Kila**") is a worshiper and kahu, priest of Kanenuiakea, a Hawaiian

indigenous religion recognized by the United Nation's NGO, the International Association for Religious Freedom (IARF). He worships Mauna Kea as an Akua, God and he and other members of Kanenuiakea, go to their akua Mauna Kea, to also worship our ancestral goddesses Poliahu, Lilinoe and Waiau. [Doc. 56] During the contested case proceeding, Kila represented himself *pro se*. Despite being admitted as a party, his last appearance in this case was on August 5, 2016 [Tr. Vol. iv, 8/5/16]. Kila never appeared during the evidentiary portion of the contested case hearing which commenced on October 20, 2016 and ended on March 2, 2017.

25. Dwight Vicente ("**Dwight Vicente**") is a native Hawaiian and holds himself out to be representing the Hawaiian Kingdom. In his words: "I have the a right and a duty to protect the crown and government lands." [Doc. 57] During the contested case proceeding, Vicente represented himself *pro se*.
26. Brannon Kamahana Kealoha ("**Kealoha**") is a native Hawaiian practitioner. In his words: "I am a lineal descendant to Lilinoe and Kūkahau'ula (explicitly delineated herein) and have a living custom which requires I be buried in my traditional burial grounds (also delineated explicitly herein). My "credibility" and experience as a traditional Hawaiian practitioner and contemporary living cultural steward also relies on how I operate and live that culture in this western world." Kamahana Pre-hearing Statement, filed 10/11/2016. During the contested case proceeding, Kealoha represented himself *pro se*.
27. MKAH, Pisciotta, Ching, the Flores-Case 'Ohana, Neves, Ward, and KAHEA are referred to collectively herein as "**Petitioners**."
28. Kihoi, Kanuha, Fergerstrom, Camara, Sleightholm, Maelani Lee, C. Freitas, W. Freitas, Temple, Kanaele, Tabbada, Kakalia, Kila, Dwight Vicente, and Kealoha are referred to collectively herein as the "**Opposing Intervenors**."

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: PRE-HEARING

A. PRIOR CONTESTED CASE, REMAND, AND APPOINTMENT OF HEARING OFFICER

29. Unless otherwise explicitly indicated or clear from the context, "**Board**" and "**BLNR**" shall mean the Board of Land and Natural Resources; "**Chairperson**" shall mean the Chairperson of the Board of Land and Natural Resources; and "**Department**" or "**DLNR**" shall mean the Department of Land and Natural Resources.
30. This contested case is before the BLNR pursuant to the Hawai'i Supreme Court's ("**Supreme Court**") December 2, 2015 opinion in *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. Board of Land and Natural Resources*, 136 Hawai'i 376, 363 P.3d 224 (2015) ("**MKAH I**") and the Circuit Court of the Third Circuit, State of Hawai'i's Order for Remand filed February 22, 2016, in Civil No. 13-1-0349.
31. On September 2, 2010, UH Hilo submitted its Cдуа for the TMT Project to the DLNR. The Cдуа was designated Cдуа HA-3568. Ex. A-1/R-1.

32. On December 2 and 3, 2010, the BLNR held public hearings on the CDUA in Hilo and Kailua-Kona, respectively. *MKAH I*, 136 Hawai‘i at 381, 363 P.3d at 229.
33. On February 25, 2011, at its regular meeting, the Board approved the CDUA. Exs. A-7/R-7, A-8/R-8, A-24, A-25. At that same meeting, the Board ordered that a contested case hearing be held on the CDUA. *See* Ex. A-27.
34. On February 25, 2011, the Board, at its regular sunshine meeting held pursuant to HRS chapter 92, voted unanimously to grant the CDUA on the condition that, "If a contested case proceeding is initiated, no construction shall occur until a final decision is rendered by the Board in favor of the applicant or the proceeding is otherwise dismissed." At the same meeting, the Board voted unanimously to hold a contested case hearing. *MKAH I*, 136 Hawai‘i at 383, 363 P.3d at 231.
35. Beginning in August 2011, a hearing officer appointed by the Board, presided over a contested case, during which written direct testimony was admitted, and twenty-six witnesses testified and were cross-examined. *MKAH I*, 136 Hawai‘i at 385, 363 P.3d at 233.
36. On November 30, 2012, the hearing officer issued a 124-page Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order granting the CDUA. *MKAH I*, 136 Hawai‘i at 387, 363 P.3d at 235.
37. The Board issued its 126-page Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order (hereinafter, the "Board's Order") on April 12, 2013, granting the CDUA and issuing a Conservation District Use Permit ("CDUP"). *Id.*
38. The MKAH, Ching, the Flores-Case 'Ohana, Ward, Neves and KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance, appealed the Board's Order to the circuit court. On May 4, 2014, the circuit court entered a decision and order affirming the Board's Order and entered final judgment. *MKAH I*, 136 Hawai‘i at 388, 363 P.3d at 236.
39. The MKAH Petitioners appealed the circuit court's order and final judgment and sought a transfer to the Hawai‘i Supreme Court, which was granted. *Id.*
40. On December 2, 2015, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court vacated the circuit court's order and final judgment because the Board acted improperly when it issued the CDUP before holding the contested case hearing. *MKAH I*, 136 Hawai‘i at 399, 363 P.3d at 247. The matter was remanded to the circuit court to further remand to the Board "so that a contested case hearing can be conducted before the board or a new hearing officer, or for other proceedings consistent with this opinion." *Id.*
41. On February 22, 2016, the Third Circuit Court issued its remand order, remanding this matter to the Board. Doc. 3 (Minute Order No. 2).
42. On February 26, 2016, the Board delegated the conduct of the contested case hearing to a Hearing Officer, pursuant to Hawai‘i Administrative Rules ("**HAR**") § 13-1-32(b). Minute Order No. 2. [Doc. 3].

43. On March 31, 2016, the Board issued Minute Order No. 1, providing notice that Judge (Ret.) Riki May Amano ("**Judge Amano**" or "**Hearing Officer**") had been selected to serve as the Hearing Officer of this contested case proceeding. This contested case proceeding was designated as BLNR-CC-16-002. Minute Order No. 1 set a deadline of April 15, 2016 for any comments and objections to Judge Amano's appointment. Minute Order No. 1. [Doc. 1].
44. On April 8, 2016, TIO filed a Motion to have TMT International Observatory, LLC Admitted As A Party In The Contested Case Hearing. [Doc. 2].
45. As summarized in Appendices A and B, several motions were filed objecting to the Hearing Officer selection process and seeking to disqualify the Hearing Officer. These motions were denied for the reasons stated in Minute Order Nos. 4 [Doc. 14]; 9 [Doc. 63]; 14 [Doc. 124]; 17 [Doc. 245]; and 39 [Doc. 406].

B. FIRST PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE, RECORD ON REMAND, SCHEDULING MOTIONS TO INTERVENE

46. On May 9, 2016, Minute Order No. 5 was issued to UHH and the MKAH Petitioners, setting a pre-hearing conference on May 16, 2016. [Doc. 16]. The purpose of the pre-hearing conference was to discuss the record, parties, anticipated pre-hearing motions, a motions hearing(s) schedule, and other procedural and logistical matters.
47. UHH and the MKAH Petitioners were parties to the first contested case in 2011. *MKAH I*, 136 Hawai'i at 376, 363 P.3d at 224.
48. Counsels for the UHH, Tim Lui-Kwan, Esq. and Gary Takeuchi, Esq. and MKAH Petitioners, Wurdeman, participated in the May 16, 2016 pre-hearing conference, held at the DLNR office in the Kalanimoku Board Room located on the first floor, Makai side, of the Kalanimoku Building at 1151 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawai'i. Items discussed included continuing the conference to a future date in Hilo, the record on remand, location of future conferences and the contested case hearing, and setting motions to intervene. No objections to the pre-hearing conference or timeliness of notice were raised. Vol. i, Tr. 5/16/16.
49. A deadline of May 31, 2016 was set for applications, motions, or requests to intervene. A hearing on the applications, motions, or requests was set for June 17, 2016. Minute Order No. 7 [Doc. 44].
50. From April 8, 2016 through June 13, 2016, requests to intervene as a party in this contested case proceeding were filed by the following parties/entities: TIO, Edward Akiona, Waiala Ahn, Fergerstrom, Ana Nawahine-Kahoopii, DeLeon, Kihoi, Kanuha, Camara, Halonaikaiopuna Mikala-Jiro Fukutomi, Crystal West ("**West**"), Ivy McIntosh ("**McIntosh**"), Wilma Holi ("**Holi**"), Moses Kealamakia, Jr. ("**Kealamakia**"), Michael Kumukauoha Lee ("**Michael Lee**"), PUEO, Ricky Cassiday, Keahi Tajon ("**Tajon**"), Eric Hansen ("**Hansen**"), Patricia Ikeda ("**Ikeda**"), Sleightholm, Lee, Michelle Cabalse, Linda Namauu, Dr. Maile Taulii ("**Dr. Taulii**"), Danelle Cooper ("**Cooper**"), Temple,

- Kanaele, Tabbada, Kakalia, Kila, Dwight Vicente, Joy Keahipuakauikawekiu Mills--Ferren, Kealoha, C. Freitas, and W. Freitas. [Doc. 2, 18-30, 32-40, 46-48, 50-54, 56-59, 64, 68].
51. On June 13, 2016, Dr. Tualii and Cooper filed a request to be withdrawn as a party. [Doc. 67].
 52. On June 13, 2016, Petitioners filed a Memorandum in Opposition to PUEO's Motion to Intervene. [Doc. 69].
 53. On June 17, 2016, a hearing was held on the pending motions, applications and/or requests for admission or intervention as a party or parties. The following applicants were not present at the hearing, and their applications were thus dismissed for lack of prosecution: Ana Nawahine-Kaho'opi'i, Edward Akiona, Wai'ala Ahn, Holonaikaipuna Mikala-Jiro Fukutomi, Michael Lee, Tajon, Hansen, Rick Cassiday, Linda Namauu, Joy Keahipuakauikawekiu Mills-Ferren, and Michelle Cabalse (collectively, the "**Non-Appearing Applicants**"). Minute Order No. 13. [Doc. 115].
 54. At the June 17, 2016 hearing, a deadline of August 1, 2016 was set for the Non-Appearing Applicants to file a motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of the motions/requests for intervention. Minute Order No. 13. [Doc. 115]. None of the Non-Appearing Applicants filed a motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of their motions/requests to intervene or otherwise requested to participate in the contested case hearing.
 55. At the June 17, 2016 hearing, the following individuals voluntarily decided to be Hearing Officer witnesses, rather than parties, in the contested case hearing: West; McIntosh; Holii; Kealamakia; and Ikeda. Minute Order No. 13. [Doc. 115].
 56. All remaining applicants for intervention had standing to participate in the contested case as parties and their motions to intervene were granted. Minute Order No. 13. [Doc. 115].
 57. On August 17, 2016, Shelley Stephens ("**Stephens**") filed a request to intervene. [Doc. 213]. Her request came on for hearing on August 29, 2016. Stephens failed to appear at the hearing. On October 10 and 13, 2016, Minute Order Nos. 21 and 35, respectively, were issued denying Stephens' Request. Minute Order Nos. 21 and 35. [Docs. 344 and 365].
 58. On August 29, 2016, Ikeda withdrew as a Hearing Officer Witness. Tr. 08/29/16 at 6:15-7:4. Ikeda re-confirmed her withdrawal as a Hearing Officer Witness on October 17, 2016. Tr. 10/17/16 at 8:3-6.
 59. On November 14, 2016, Maelani Lee informed BLNR in writing that she would not be attending any of the evidentiary hearings. On November 25, 2016, Maelani Lee further requested that she no longer receive service of the pleadings and orders in this proceeding. [Doc. 421].
 60. On December 7, 2016, Stephens again filed a Motion to be a Party. [Doc. 420]. The

hearing on Stephens' second request to be a party was held on December 12, 2016. Stephens was present at the hearing and her motion was orally denied because it was untimely and she failed to meet the criteria for intervention set out in HAR § 13-1-31(c). Tr. Vol. 15 12-12-16, 8:10-16:25. On June 4, 2017, the Hearing Officer issued Minute Order No. 64 (Order Denying Motion to be a Party to the TMT Case by Shelley Stephens (Mahi-Hanai) (Doc. 420)). Stephens was given five business days to file a motion for reconsideration. She failed to file any motion to reconsider. [Doc. 687]

61. Although intervenors Tabbada, Maelani Lee, DeLeon, and Kila's respective motions to intervene were granted, these individuals did not physically appear at the evidentiary portion of the contested case hearing as parties or otherwise participate in the proceedings.

C. STANDING

62. Following the Second Pre-Hearing Conference on June 17, 2016, the Hearing Officer found that the following people and entities had standing to participate as parties in the contested case hearing:

University of Hawai'i-Hilo
Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotta
Clarence Kukauakahi Ching
Flores-Case `Ohana
Deborah J. Ward
Paul K. Neves
Kahea: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance
TMT International Observatory, LLC
Perpetuating Unique Educational Opportunities, Inc.
Mehana Kihoi
C.M. Kaho'okahi Kanuha
Harry Fergerstrom
Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara
Jennifer Leina'ala Sleightholm
Maelani Lee
Cindy Freitas
William K. Freitas
Richard Maele Deleon
Temple of Lono by Lanny Sinkin
Kalikolehua Kanaele

Stephanie-Malia Tabbada
Tiffnie Kakalia
Glen Kila
Dwight J. Vicente
Brannon Kamahana Kealoha
Doc. 115 (Minute Order No. 13).

D. PRE-HEARING PLEADINGS

63. During the June 17, 2016 hearing, July 18, 2016 was set as the deadline for filing pre-hearing motions and witness lists. August 1, 2016 was set as the deadline for filing responses to pre-hearing motions, objections to witness lists, and motions to reconsider dismissal. A hearing on pre-hearing motions was scheduled for August 5, 2016. Minute Order No. 13. [Doc. 115].
64. See Appendix A for a summary of all pre-hearing motions filed by July 18, 2016.
65. See Appendix B for a summary of all pre-hearing motions filed between July 19, 2016 and October 20, 2016.
66. On August 5, 2016, a second pre-hearing conference was held. Minute Order No. 16. [Doc. 238]. Represented were the following parties: UH Hilo, Petitioners, TIO, Fergerstrom, DeLeon, Kihoi, Kanuha, Camara, PUEO, Sleightholm, Maelani Lee, the Temple, Kanaele, Kakalia, Dwight Vicente, Kealoha, C. Freitas, and W. Freitas. Argument was held on the timely pre-hearing motions filed by the Temple, the Petitioners, Lee, Kihoi, Tabbada, Kanaele, Fergerstrom, and Dwight Vicente.
67. Certain pre-hearing motions could not be heard during the August 5, 2016 hearing so it was continued to August 12, 2016. Minute Order 15 [Doc. 185].
68. On August 12, 2016, following a hearing on several timely pre-hearing motions filed by Petitioners, the Temple and Fergerstrom, a third pre-hearing conference was held. Represented were the following parties: UH Hilo, Petitioners, TIO, Kihoi, Kanuha, Fergerstrom, Camara, Sleightholm, PUEO, C. Freitas, W. Freitas, Kanaele, Tabbada, Kakalia, Dwight Vicente, Kealoha, and the Temple.
69. Certain timely pre-hearing motions could not be heard during the August 12, 2016 hearing, so they were orally continued to August 29, 2016. Tr. 8/12/16 at 71:11-72:3.
70. On August 29, 2016, following a hearing on the timely pre-hearing motions filed by Kihoi, Fergerstrom, TIO, the Temple, and PUEO, a fourth pre-hearing conference was held. Represented were the following parties: UH Hilo, Petitioners, TIO, Fergerstrom, Kihoi, Kanuha, Camara, PUEO, Kanaele, Kakalia, Dwight Vicente, Sleightholm, the Temple, W. Freitas, and C. Freitas.

E. SETTING THE ISSUES

71. On July 18, 2016, PUEO filed a Motion to Set the Issues, requesting that the Hearing Officer identify the specific issues to be addressed during the contested case hearing. [Doc. 99]. As summarized in Appendix A, multiple pleadings were filed both opposing and supporting PUEO's motion.
72. During the August 29, 2016 motion hearing, PUEO's Motion to Set the Issues was heard. Minute Order No. 21 [Doc. 344]. The Hearing Officer requested that PUEO submit a Proposed Minute Order Granting PUEO's Motion to Set Issues setting forth the issues to be addressed and issues not to be addressed in the contested case hearing, as ruled upon at the hearing. Tr. 8/29/16 at 83:5-19.
73. PUEO was given a deadline of September 9, 2016 by which to submit its Proposed Minute Order Granting PUEO's Motion to Set Issues. All other parties could submit responses or objections by September 19, 2016. Minute Order No. 21 [Doc. 344]. A summary of those pleadings is contained in Appendix A.
74. On September 23, 2016, Minute Order No. 19 was issued granting PUEO's Motion to Set Issues. [Doc. 281]. A summary of pleadings filed in response is contained in Appendix B.
75. Minute Order No. 19 limited the issues to be addressed in the contested hearing to the following inquiries:
 - a. Is the proposed land use, including the plans incorporated in the application, consistent with Chapter 183C of the Hawai'i Revised Statutes, the eight criteria in HAR § 13-5-30(c), and other applicable rules in HAR, Title 13, Chapter 5 Conservation District?
 - b. Is the proposed land use consistent with Article XII, Section 7 of the Hawai'i State Constitution and *Ka Pa'akai O Ka'aina v. Land Use Comm'n. State of Hawai'i*, 94 Hawai'i 31, 7 P.3d 1068 (2000)?
 - c. Is the proposed land use consistent with Article XI, Section 1 of the Hawai'i State Constitution and the public trust doctrine?
76. Minute Order No. 19 also specifically ruled that the following issues were not to be addressed in the contested case hearing because they were not germane to the CDUA and/or within the subject-matter jurisdiction of this contested case proceeding:
 - a. The sovereignty of the Kingdom of Hawai'i or any other issues relating to the purported existence of the Kingdom of Hawai'i;
 - b. Challenges to the legal status of the State of Hawai'i; and
 - c. Challenges to the State's ownership and title to the

lands related to this contested case hearing.

F. SITE VISIT

77. During the hearing on August 12, 2016, a site visit to Mauna Kea was scheduled for September 26, 2016. Minute Order No. 16. [Doc. 238]. Parties were given ten days from August 23, 2016 to respond to the proposed site visit.
78. On August 17, 2016, the following parties submitted site visit proposals and/or designations: W. Freitas, UH Hilo, Sleightholm, TIO, Petitioners, Fergerstrom, and C. Freitas. [Doc. 214-220]. On August 22, 2016, TIO filed Objections to the Petitioners' and C. Freitas' site visit recommendations. [Doc. 229 and 230]. On September 9, 2016, PUEO filed its site visit designation. [Doc. 255]. On September 14, 2016, Kihoi filed her site visit proposal. [Doc. 260].
79. At the August 29, 2016 pre-hearing conference, September 26, 2016 was set as the date for the Mauna Kea site visit. Minute Order No. 21 [Doc. 344].
80. On September 19, 2016, Minute Order No. 18 was issued which designated the individuals approved to attend the site visit to Mauna Kea, as well as the logistics for the site visit. Minute Order No. 18 [Doc. 274]. A summary of the multiple pleadings that were filed in response to Minute Order No. 18 is contained in Appendix B.
81. A site visit to Mauna Kea took place on September 26, 2016. Minute Order No. 16 [Doc. 238]. The site visit was conducted pursuant to an order regarding site visit. Minute Order No. 18 [Doc. 274]. The following sites were visited: the Batch Plant; the proposed Thirty-Meter Telescope site; and the Summit Loop road near the Keck Observatory. At the proposed Thirty Meter Telescope site, there was a demonstration of a red helium balloon attached to a 187-foot rope.
82. The Hearing Officer had a reasonable period of time and conditions for viewing the general landscape and areas proposed for the TMT Project, and the site visit is considered reasonable and appropriate for the purposes of the case.

G. THE PRIOR CDUP WAS VOIDED BY THE BLNR

83. On October 14, 2016, the Board issued Minute Order No. 36, formally voiding the previously issued CDUP. Minute Order No. 36 [Doc. 376].

H. SCHEDULING THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING

84. On July 21, 2016, Minute Order No. 13 was issued to inform the parties that the evidentiary hearing for this contested case proceeding would commence in October 2016. [Doc. 115].
85. During the August 5, 2016, August 12, 2016, and August 29, 2016 hearings, the parties were repeatedly informed by the Hearing Officer that the evidentiary hearing would likely be scheduled for several weekdays during October 2016. There were no objections

raised at any time. Minute Order No. 16. [Doc. 238]. Tr. Vol. iv, 8/5/16 at 117:11-14; Tr. Vol. v, 8/12/16 at 118:25-119:1; Tr. Vol. vi, 8/29/16 at 99:21-100:6.

86. On September 8, 2016, Wurdeman filed a request to: (1) set a staggered briefing schedule for opening briefs, witness lists, written direct testimony, exhibit lists and exhibits; and (2) set the evidentiary hearing for some time after November 10, 2016, excluding certain dates for which Wurdeman represented that he had scheduling conflicts. [Doc. 254].
87. On September 20, 2016, a Notice of Contested Case Hearing was issued, informing the parties that the hearing would commence on October 11, 2016. [Doc. 276].
88. On September 23, 2016, Wurdeman submitted correspondence advising that he was unavailable on October 11, 2016. [Doc. 282]. Wurdeman represented that he would be out of state on matters for a client that was "set a number of months ago," and also to inquire whether the evidentiary portion of the hearing would begin as noticed on October 11, 2016. [Doc. 282].
89. On October 3, 2016, a fifth pre-hearing conference was held – where all parties were verbally ordered to submit final witness lists, exhibit lists, prehearing statements ("PHS"), and any subpoena requests by October 11, 2016. Tr. 10/3/16 at 78:19-21.
90. During the hearing on October 3, 2016, Wurdeman was advised by the Hearing Officer that "you were on notice, considerable notice that the hearing is going to be in October. You didn't say anything." Tr. 10/3/16 at 103:12-14. Nevertheless, the commencement of the evidentiary portion of the contested case hearing was moved from the originally-scheduled date of October 11, 2016 to October 18, 2016, to accommodate Wurdeman's schedule, including a trip to a conference in Las Vegas. *Id.* at 21:20-24:12.
91. On October 6, 2016, an Amended Notice of Contested Case Hearing was issued, informing parties that the hearing would commence on October 18, 2016. [Doc. 325].
92. On October 10, 2016, Wurdeman filed a Notice of Withdrawal of Counsel. [Doc. 341]. As such, also on October 10, 2016, Petitioners' filed a List of E-Mail Addresses for Service of Process. [Doc. 342]. On October 11, 2016, Yuklin Aluli, Esq. and Dexter Kaiama, Esq. filed a Notice of Appearance of Co-Counsel on behalf of KAHEA. [Doc. 362].
93. On October 13, 2016, UH Hilo filed a Statement of Position. [Doc. 369]. On October 17, 2016, the Temple filed a Response to the UH Hilo's Statement of Position. [Doc. 386].
94. On October 17, 2016, a sixth pre-hearing conference was held. Wurdeman was not present and the Petitioners entered their own appearance as *pro se* parties, except for KAHEA, which was represented by Ms. Yuklin Aluli. Tr. 10/17/16 at 4:6-5:11.
95. Each of the Petitioners was questioned regarding Wurdeman's Notice of Withdrawal. Tr. 10/17/16 at 19:10-44:23. The Petitioners each confirmed that they had no objection to

Wurdeman's Notice of Withdrawal and that they were each prepared to proceed *pro se*. Tr. 10/17/16 at 19:10-45:3.

96. Given Wurdeman's last minute withdrawal, commencement of the evidentiary hearing was continued to October 20, 2016. Tr. 10/17/16 at 111:9-111:12.

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: EVIDENTIARY HEARING

97. The evidentiary hearing for this contested case proceeding commenced on October 20, 2016. *See* Appendix C for a summary of all motions filed between October 20, 2016 and March 2, 2017.
98. Testimony was taken during the following forty-four days:
- October 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 2016;
November 2, 15, 16, 2016;
December 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20, 2016;
January 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 2017;
February 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 2017; and
March 1, 2, 2017.
99. At an October 17, 2016 pre-hearing conference, the parties were advised that each witness would be allowed up to 10 minutes to summarize his or her written direct testimony at the commencement of testimony. The elective summary would be followed by any cross-examination and re-direct examination of the witness. Vol. viii, Tr. 10/17/16 at 64:12-64:23.
100. On October 20, 2016, UH Hilo offered Perry White as an expert in land use planning and analysis. Vol. 1, (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 45:5-45:7. After hearing objections from Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors, the Hearing Officer determined that no parties or witnesses would be formally designated as experts and that the witness's credentials will simply go to the weight to be given his or her testimony. Vol. 1, (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 52:24-53:21.
101. Based on the length of the cross-examinations conducted by the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors over the first five days of the evidentiary hearing, and pursuant to HAR § 13-1-32(h), on October 31, 2016, a 30-minute time limit was imposed on cross-examinations, subject to extensions of time for good cause shown. Tr. 10/31/16 at 11:23-12:6. Throughout the proceeding, the Hearing Officer would warn parties when they had reached or exceeded the 30-minute limit. Upon a showing of good cause, the Hearing Officer would afford extensions of time for further cross-examination. *See, e.g.*, (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 172:18-22 (giving W. Freitas approximately an hour and a half to cross-examine Rechtman); *see also* Tr. 11/16/16 at 209:13-209:14; Tr. 12/1/16 at 142:22-144:7, 150:21-150:25; Tr. 12/2/16 at 85:10-85:13, 89:5-89:11; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 157:14-159:13, 221:18-221:24; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 31:17-31:21, 39:15-

41:22.

102. UH Hilo presented its case-in-chief from October 20, 2016 through December 13, 2016. UH Hilo presented the following witnesses: Perry White ("**White**"), James Hayes ("**Hayes**"), Dr. Günther Hasinger ("**Dr. Hasinger**"), Chad Baybayan ("**Baybayan**"), Dr. Robert McLaren ("**Dr. McLaren**"), Wallace Ishibashi ("**Ishibashi**"), Dr. Clifford Smith ("**Dr. Smith**"), Hon. Walter Heen ("**Judge Heen**"), Fritz Klasner ("**Klasner**"), Richard Nees ("**Nees**"), Stephanie Nagata ("**Nagata**"), and Tom Nance ("**Nance**"). The written direct testimony of each of those witnesses was admitted into evidence and fully considered, as well as the curriculum vitae of White, Dr. Hasinger, Hayes, Dr. McLaren, Baybayan, Nees, Dr. Smith, and Nance. Minute Order No. 44; Exs. A-30, A-32, A-35, A-127, A-120, A-119, A-37, A-43.
103. On November 2, 2016, Fergerstrom requested that he be allowed to recall White as a witness, claiming that he was previously unable to effectively cross-examine White due to his purported lack of exhibits. Vol. 7, Tr. 11/2/16 at 242:10-243:13. See Fergerstrom's *Opposition to University of Hawai'i Confirmation of Exhibits and Direct Written Testimonies of Witnesses to be Entered into Evidence; Motion to Recall Mr. Perry White*.
104. On January 11, 2017, Fergerstrom withdrew his motion to recall White. He also noted that he was simultaneously withdrawing a prior oral request to recall Dr. Gary Sanders ("**Dr. Sanders**"). Tr. 1/11/17 at 13:22-14:2.
105. TIO presented its case from December 16, 2016 through January 5, 2017. TIO presented the following witnesses: Professor David Callies ("**Prof. Callies**"), Naea Stevens ("**N. Stevens**"), Dr. Ed Stone ("**Dr. Stone**"), Robert Rechtman ("**Rechtman**"), Dr. Sanders, Dr. Heather Kaluna ("**Dr. Kaluna**"), and Dr. Paul Coleman ("**Dr. Coleman**").
106. A deadline to submit notice of subpoenas was set for one week after the close of TIO's case ((Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 231:7-231:12).
107. On January 8, 2017, the Temple filed a Request to Subpoena David Lassner, President of the University of Hawai'i System ("**President Lassner**") and DLNR Employee, to Testify on Whether DLNR has a Form to Fill Out Requesting Permission to Build an Altar on Mauna Kea. [Doc. 438 and 439].
108. On January 12, 2017, the Flores-Case 'Ohana served a Request for Witness Subpoena for "John Doe" and for a Subpoena Duces Tecum to disclose unidentified Mauna Kea Observatories Support Services employee involved with the destruction of ahu (shrine) on Mauna Kea in August of 2015. [Doc. 447]. The Flores-Case 'Ohana also served a Request for Witness Subpoena for Samuel Lemmo ("**Lemmo**"), Administrator, Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands ("**OCCL**"), DLNR, State of Hawai'i. [Doc. 448]. The Flores-Case 'Ohana subsequently filed its Requests with OCCL on January 25, 2017.
109. On January 19, 2017, UH Hilo filed its Objections to the Requests for Subpoenas for "John Doe," Lemmo, and President Lassner. [Docs. 443, 444, 445].

110. A hearing on the requests for subpoenas was held on January 25, 2017 (Tr. 1/25/17 at 215:22-243:10), on January 26, 2017 (Tr. 1/26/17 at 12:12-15:25), and on January 30, 2017 ((Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 14:21-29:11). The requests for subpoenas for President Lassner and "John Doe" were denied as the offers of proof for the proposed testimony of both witnesses were considered to be irrelevant and immaterial. Tr. 1/26/17 at 12:12-13:10. The Flores-Case 'Ohana's Request for Subpoena for Samuel Lemmo was granted for the reasons stated in Minute Order No. 42 [Doc. 464].
111. The Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors presented their combined case from January 9, 2017 through March 2, 2017. They presented the following witnesses: Dr. Ku Kahakalau ("**Dr. Kahakalau**"), Professor Candace Fujikane ("**Prof. Fujikane**"), Marti Townsend ("**Townsend**"), Laulani Teale ("**Teale**"), David Frankel ("**Frankel**"), Case, Professor Jonathan Osorio ("**Prof. Osorio**"), Narissa Spies ("**Spies**"), Dr. Kehaunani Abad ("**Dr. Dr. Abad**"), Hansen, Diana LaRose ("**LaRose**"), Michael Lee, Fergerstrom, Dr. Taulii, Ku'ulei Kanahale ("**Kanahale**"), Ching, Professor Peter Mills ("**Prof. Mills**"), Davin Vicente ("**Davin Vicente**"), Dr. Manulani Aluli Meyer ("**Dr. Aluli Meyer**"), Flores, Ward, Neves, Pisciotto, Sleightholm, Kihoi, Sara Kihoi ("**S. Kihoi**"), Ruth Aloua ("**Aloua**"), Hawane Rios ("**Rios**"), Professor Gregory Johnson ("**Prof. Johnson**"), Nanci Munroe ("**Munroe**"), Susan Rosier ("**Rosier**"), C. Freitas, Nelson Ho ("**N. Ho**"), N. KaopuaGoodyear ("**Prof. Kaopua-Goodyear**"), Professor Joseph Keaweaimoku Kaholokula ("**Prof. Kaholokula**"), Tammie Noelani Perreira ("**Perriera**"), Tajon, Kakalia, Lemmo, Brian Cruz ("**Cruz**"), Mililani Trask ("**Trask**"), Kahuna Frank Nobriga ("**Nobriga**"), Kanaele, Wiremu Carroll ("**Carroll**"), Ronald Fujiyoshi ("**Fujiyoshi**"), and W. Freitas.
112. On January 23, 2017, Fergerstrom called Professor Williamson Chang ("**Prof. Chang**") to testify regarding challenges to the State of Hawaii's title to Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/23/17 at 156:18-166:25. Based upon the offer of proof submitted by Fergerstrom, Prof. Chang's testimony was excluded on the grounds that it was irrelevant and immaterial to the issues in this proceeding. Tr. 1/23/17 at 167:1-11; Minute Order Nos. 14 [Doc. 124], 17 [Doc. 245], 19 [Doc. 281], 25 [Doc. 348], and 29 [Doc. 352].
113. PUEO presented its witnesses on February 15, 2017 and February 21, 2017. PUEO presented the following witnesses: Keahi Warfield ("**Warfield**"), Richard Ha ("**R. Ha**"), Elroy Osorio ("**E. Osorio**"), and William Brown ("**Brown**").
114. On February 23, 2017, Holi testified as a Hearing Officer witness.
115. No other witnesses were called or scheduled for testimony other than those set forth above.

IV. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: POST-HEARING

116. On March 1, 2017, a deadline of March 9, 2017 was set for parties to file written motions to move Written Direct Testimonies and exhibits into evidence that had already been introduced or referred to in the evidentiary portion of the contested case hearing. No new exhibits were to be included if not previously introduced or referred to before the close of

the evidentiary hearing on March 2, 2017. March 16, 2017 was set as the deadline for any objections if a party believed the exhibits sought to be moved into evidence were not "appropriate, or grounded, or relevant". Tr. 3/1/17 at 253:10-253:21. See Appendix D for a summary of all evidentiary motions and post-hearing filings.

117. On March 1, 2017, a discussion about the availability of copies of the transcripts of the proceedings in select libraries was held. In addition, the Hearing Officer advised that the parties would be required to submit any proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law within thirty days from when the transcripts were made available. Tr. 3/1/17 at 256:2-256:9.
118. On April 19, 2017, Minute Order No. 43 was issued informing parties that complete copies of the transcripts were available for reviewing at five locations. Minute Order No. 43 [Doc. 552]. Minute Order No. 43 established the deadline of May 30, 2017 for any proposed decision and order, findings of fact and conclusions of law. Minute Order No. 43 [Doc. 552].
119. Multiple motions for reconsideration of Minute Order No. 43 were filed and subsequently denied by Minute Order No. 50 [Doc. 646]. See Appendix D.
120. On April 20, 2017, Minute Order No. 44 was issued, ruling on all submitted motions to admit evidence. Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553].
121. Multiple motions for reconsideration of Minute Order No. 44 were filed and subsequently addressed by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647]. See Appendix D. On May 26, 2017, Amended Minute Order No. 44 was issued. [Doc. 649].

V. PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND DECISION AND ORDER

122. The Hearing Officer issued her Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order ("FOF, COL, D&O") on July 26, 2017. [Doc. 783].
123. Exceptions to the Proposed FOF, COL, D&O were filed on August 21, 2017, and briefs responding to the exceptions were filed on September 11, 2017. See Appendix E. [Doc. 803, 805-831, 835-846, 848-857].
124. The BLNR heard oral arguments on the parties' exceptions to the Proposed FOF, COL, D&O on September 20, 2017.
125. During the oral arguments, several parties asked the BLNR to stay the CDUP, if granted, pending appeal. The Chairperson instructed the parties to submit their motions in writing.
126. On September 20 and 21, 2017, the Temple, the Flores-Case 'Ohana, C. Freitas, W. Freitas, Ching, MKAH, Pisciotto, Neves, and Fergerstrom, filed motions to stay the CDUP, if granted, pending appeal. [Doc. 866-867, 869-871, 873].

127. See Appendix D, starting at Doc. 785 filed on July 27, 2017, for a summary of all motions filed after the Proposed FOF, COL, D&O.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN ASTRONOMY ON MAUNA KEA

A. THE GENERAL LEASE, THE MAUNA KEA SCIENCE RESERVE AND THE UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT AREA

128. In 1968, the State of Hawai‘i, through the BLNR, entered into a lease with the University of Hawai‘i for the Mauna Kea Science Reserve ("**MKSR**"), General Lease No. S-4191 (the "**General Lease**"). By its terms, the General Lease terminates on December 31, 2033. Written Direct Testimony ("**WDT**") Nagata at 1; Ex. B.17f; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 179:20-23.
129. The General Lease allows the University to use the leased land as follows:
4. Specified Use. The land hereby leased shall be used by the Lessee as a scientific complex, including without limitation thereof an observatory, and as a scientific reserve being more specifically a buffer zone to prevent the intrusion of activities inimical to said scientific complex.
- Activities inimical to said scientific-complex shall include light and dust interference to observatory operation and certain types of electric or electronic installation on the demised lands, but shall not necessarily be limited to the foregoing.
- Ex. B.17f at 3-4.
130. The MKSR includes approximately all of the land on Mauna Kea above the 12,000-foot elevation, except for certain portions that lie within the Mauna Kea Ice Age Natural Area Reserve ("**NAR**"). WDT Nagata at 1; Ex. A-9 at 6-1.
131. The entire MKSR is designated as part of the State of Hawai‘i Conservation District Resource Subzone. Uses on the land are subject to the DLNR’s Conservation District Rules (HAR Chapter 13-5) and any associated permit conditions. WDT Nagata at 1; Ex. C-2 at 2 (WDT Dr. Sanders).
132. The MKSR is administered by the DLNR as State land under the authority and direction of the BLNR. The MKSR is comprised of 11,288 acres, which the University’s Master Plan describes as a 10,763-acre cultural and natural preserve and a 525-acre Astronomy Precinct. The University manages the MKSR, the Hale Pōhaku mid-level facilities, and the Summit Access Road (between Hale Pōhaku and the MKSR, including 400 yards on either side of the road, excluding the NAR). Collectively, those areas are referred to as the "**UH Management Area**." WDT Nagata at 1, 4-5.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN ASTRONOMY FACILITIES ON MAUNA KEA PRIOR TO 2000

133. The first road to the summit area of Mauna Kea – referred to as the Mauna Kea Access Jeep Trail – was established in 1964 to support astronomical testing. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-208.
134. The University began operating an observatory on Mauna Kea in 1968. Thereafter, a series of world class astronomical observatories were built in the summit region of Mauna Kea:
 - a. The University 2.2-meter Telescope, which became operational in 1970;
 - b. The United Kingdom Infrared Telescope ("**UKIRT**"), which became operational in 1979;
 - c. The NASA Infrared Telescope Facility ("**IRTF**"), which became operational in 1979;
 - d. The Canada-France-Hawai'i Telescope ("**CFHT**"), which became operational in 1979;
 - e. The Caltech Submillimeter Observatory ("**CSO**"), which became operational in 1986;
 - f. The James Clerk Maxwell Telescope ("**JCMT**"), which became operational in 1986;
 - g. The Very Long Baseline Array ("**VLBA**"), which became operational in 1992;
 - h. The W. M. Keck Observatory, the first phase of which ("**Keck I**") became operational in 1992, and the second phase of which ("**Keck II**") became operational in 1996;
 - i. The Subaru Observatory ("**Subaru**"), which became operational in 1999;
 - j. The Gemini North Observatory ("**Gemini**"), which became operational in 1999; and
 - k. The Submillimeter Array ("**SMA**"), which became operational in 2002. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-208 to 3-210.
135. The past construction of these observatories has had cumulative impacts on cultural, archaeological, and historic resources that are considered substantial, significant, and adverse. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-214.
136. Existing astronomical observatories are prominent visual elements in the summit area of Mauna Kea. At least one of the existing observatories on the summit ridge is visible from approximately 43 percent of Hawai'i Island. According to 2000 U.S. Census data, 72 percent of the Island's population reside within that viewshed area. At the summit ridge, the existing observatories obscure portions of the 360-degree panoramic view from the summit area. Overall, the existing level of the cumulative visual impact from past

observatory construction projects at the summit ridge area has been considered to be substantial, significant, and adverse. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-217 to 3-218; Tr. 11/15/16 at 24:1-8; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. M at 50-54; Ex. A-54 at 50-54.

137. Development of the existing observatories also significantly modified the preexisting terrain. The tops of certain pu‘u, or cinder cones, were flattened to accommodate the foundations for observatory facilities. Some materials removed from the pu‘u were pushed over the sides of the cinder cones, creating steeper slopes that are more susceptible to disturbance. Consequently, the existing level of cumulative impact from preexisting observatories on geology, soils, and slope stability is considered to be substantial, significant, and adverse. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-218 to 3-219.

C. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2000 MASTER PLAN AND THE OFFICE OF MAUNA KEA MANAGEMENT

138. In response to the concerns raised in an audit performed in 1998 that was critical of the University’s management of the cultural and environmental resources in the MKSR, the University began preparing a new master plan for the MKSR. Ex. B.17e. On June 16, 2000, after nearly two years of work by an advisory committee and two series of public meetings, the University Board of Regents ("**BOR**") adopted the Mauna Kea Science Reserve Master Plan ("**Master Plan**"), which established management guidelines for the UH Management Area. The process reflected the Hawai‘i Island community’s deeply rooted concerns over the use of Mauna Kea, including respect for Hawaiian cultural beliefs and practices, protection of environmentally sensitive habitat, recreational use of the mountain, as well as astronomical research. The Master Plan is an internal policy and planning guide for the University to promote the goal of balanced stewardship of the UH Management Area through on-island community based management. WDT Nagata at 2; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 27:6-8, 28:3-9; WDT Judge Heen at 1; Ex. A-48 at Chapter XII.
139. The purpose of the Master Plan is to guide the University towards achieving the Plan’s goals, which include: (1) preserving and protecting the cultural, natural, educational/scientific, and recreational resources in the managed areas of Mauna Kea; (2) preserving and protecting the cultural and natural landscape; (3) preserving and managing the cultural resources for future generations, protecting opportunities to engage in cultural practices; (4) defining areas for the use of cultural, natural and recreational resources; (5) protecting the right to exercise traditional cultural practices; (6) allowing for sustainable, integrated planning and management; and (7) protecting and enhancing astronomy research. The Master Plan recognized Mauna Kea as a community resource and that community involvement should be part of the management of Mauna Kea. A major feature of the Master Plan was the establishment of a community-based management entity to achieve the plans’ goals. WDT Nagata at 2; Ex. A-48 at X-7 to X-8.
140. The Master Plan’s community-based management entity is composed of the Office of Mauna Kea Management ("**OMKM**"), the Mauna Kea Management Board ("**MKMB**"), and Kahu Kū Mauna ("**KKM**") ("Guardians of the Mountain"). The Master Plan recognized the need for a single entity to manage the MKSR and suggested the name OMKM and that it be housed in UH Hilo under the Chancellor. MKMB and Kahu Kū

Mauna are composed of volunteers who live on the island of Hawai‘i with a strong desire to see that the lands under the University responsibility are properly managed. Both the MKMB and Kahu Kū Mauna advise OMKM and the UH Hilo Chancellor. The management entity oversees the management of the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea. WDT Nagata at 2-3; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 28:3-9; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 101:3-102:6, 105:9-105:14; WDT Judge Heen at 1-3; Ex. A-9 at 3-9 to 3-11; Ex. A-48 at X-3 to X-8.

141. Judge Walter Heen (ret.) was the first Director of the OMKM, appointed by Chancellor Rose Tseng in the summer of 2000. He is a retired Judge of the Hawai‘i State Intermediate Court of Appeals and, subsequent to his one year at OMKM, served as a trustee of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs ("**OHA**") from November 2006 to November 2010. WDT Judge Heen at page 1. Judge Heen describes his work at OMKM as: "The OMKM staff, with advice from the Mauna Kea Management Board ("MKMB"), immediately began developing a program to carry out the provisions of the 2000 Mater [sic] Plan. Our subsequent planning was consistent with the legal framework set out by the Hawai‘i Supreme Court for identifying cultural and natural resources, assessing the potential impacts to those resources by existing and proposed uses, and considering feasible measures to mitigate such impacts to significant resources. Close contacts were established with the astronomy community on the mountain and at UH Manoa, as well as with the Native Hawaiian and environmentally concerned communities." WDT Judge Heen at page 1. Since leaving OMKM in 2001, Judge Heen has maintained close contact with office personnel and the UHH Administration, and he is "satisfied [sic] that UH Hilo and OMKM continue to accord theutmost [sic] concern for the protection of Native Hawaiians` access to Mauna Kea and the mountain’s environment." WDT Judge Heen at page 3.
142. The MKMB is comprised of seven members of the community. It conducts regular meetings using the state’s sunshine law as guidelines for noticing of meeting agendas six days prior to the meeting. Written minutes are taken and approved at subsequent meetings. In carrying out its advisory function, the MKMB, with input from Kahu Kū Mauna, reviews and approves management policies, programs and actions, and makes recommendations to the UH Hilo Chancellor on proposed major projects. WDT Nagata at 3; Tr. 12/8/2016 at 185: 25-187: 23; Ex. A-9 at 3-11; Ex. A-111; Ex. A-62; Ex. A-133.
143. Kahu Kū Mauna is an assembly of native Hawaiians who advise OMKM, MKMB and the Chancellor of UH Hilo on cultural matters pertaining to the UH Management Area. Kahu Kū Mauna serves as important advisors on matters affecting the cultural integrity of Mauna Kea, including land uses on Mauna Kea and assists with the development of rules and management guidelines, and developing programs to educate visitors about the cultural, historical, spiritual and archaeological values of Mauna Kea. Kahu Kū Mauna conducts regular monthly meetings. Written minutes are taken and then approved at subsequent meetings. In addition to these regular meetings, the members of Kahu Kū Mauna attend retreats and visit specific sites. Tr. 2/27/17 at 117:20-119:7. OMKM includes input from Kahu Kū Mauna in its recommendations to the MKMB for decision making. WDT Nagata at 2-3; Tr. 12/2/16 at 80:3-80:8; Ex. A-9 at 3-9, 3-11; A-11 at 3-3; Ex. A-48 at X-8, XI-4; A-52; A-62 at 4; A-133 at 4; Tr. 11/16/16 at 133:4-133:8; 12/2/16

at 41:15-41:19; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 102:12-102:18, 105:9-105:14, 249:6-249:9; Tr. 12/12/16 at 203:18-204:4, 208:8-208:10; WDT Judge Heen at 2; Tr. 10/27/16 at 215:3-216:15 and 326:16-327:1, 328:9-331:7; Tr. 2/27/17 at 119:14-120:22.

144. There are no *per se* qualifications to be a member of Kahu Kū Mauna. Applicants are interviewed by Kahu Kū Mauna council members. Council members look for individuals with love and connection to Mauna Kea and the Hawaiian community. Members also have an awareness of Hawaiian cultural practices, traditions and significant landforms as applied to traditional and customary use of Mauna Kea. There is a conscious effort to have island-wide representation. Council members present selected candidates to MKMB, which then confirms membership on the Kahu Kū Mauna council. (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 102:12-20; Tr. 12/12/16 at 203:18-24; Tr. 2/27/17 at 119:20-120:7; A-9 at 3-11
145. Kakalia, who served as a member on Kahu Kū Mauna for two 4-year terms, vouched for the integrity of Kahu Kū Mauna and expressed her opinion that Kahu Kū Mauna was formed with high integrity and has evolved into a council that has discussions and provides recommendations about appropriate cultural and native Hawaiian issues affecting Mauna Kea. PHS/WDT Kakalia at 1; Tr. 2/27/19 at 148:4-148:8. Nevertheless, Kakalia is opposed to the TMT Project being built on Mauna Kea. She believes that the mountain is sacred and that there will be irreversible damage to an area in which deities reside. Vol. 41, Tr. 2/27/17 at 209:8-210:8.
146. In addition, an environmental advisory group was established by MKMB which provides input and guidance on environmental issues and management. In particular, the Environment committee was instrumental in assisting with the development of the Natural Resources Management Plan ("**NRMP**") and the Mauna Kea Invasive Species Management Plan ("**MISMP**"), sub-plans of the CMP. WDT Judge Heen at 2; Tr. 1/31/17 at 59:17-59:20; A-9 at 3-11; Ex. A-10 at Acknowledgements; Ex. A-40 at 4; Ex. A-48 at X-7; Ex. A-133 at 5; Ex. A-136; WDT Ward at 4-5. Ward testified that she was a member of the Environment Committee. Tr. 1/31/17 at 32:6-32:9.
147. OMKM's primary mission is the protection, preservation, and enhancement of cultural and natural resources in the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea. WDT Nagata at 2-3; Ex. A-9. OMKM is charged with and concerned about how to reasonably and rationally protect Mauna Kea from uncontrolled and unwarranted intrusion and how to preserve native Hawaiian traditional and customary rights and the mountain's natural environment, as required by the Hawai'i State Constitution, state statutes, and court decisions. OMKM's activities have sought to conform to the DLNR's laws, rules and regulations. WDT Judge Heen at 1; Ex. A-9.
148. After adoption of the Master Plan, OMKM, with guidance from MKMB, developed a program to carry out the provisions of the Master Plan. OMKM and MKMB's subsequent planning was guided by cases from the Hawai'i Supreme Court to identify cultural and natural resources, assess potential adverse impacts to those resources by existing and proposed uses, and consider feasible measures to those mitigate impacts. WDT Judge Heen at 1.

149. The management entity's roles and responsibilities include: (1) implementing the Master Plan and the CMP and its sub-plans; (2) developing and implementing management policies; (3) reviewing project proposals; and (4) overseeing day-to-day management of public activities, commercial tours, filming, research, and outside-the-dome observatory activities within the UH Management Area. WDT Nagata at 3; Ex. A-52; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 28:10-28:19; Tr. 10/27/16 at 215:3-216:18, 326:16-327:1, and 328:9-331:7.
150. The management entity is also responsible for reviewing project proposals including major projects such as the TMT Project. The MKMB, with input from Kahu Kū Mauna, makes recommendations to UH Hilo Chancellor to approve or disapprove major projects presented to them by OMKM. WDT Nagata at 2-3; WDT: Judge Heen at 2; Ex. A-62 at 2-6; Ex. A-133 at 3-5; Ex. 111; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 105:9-105:14; Tr. 128/2016 at 249: 6 to 249:9; Ex. A-9 at 39 to 3-11.
151. The University recognizes the importance of maintaining compatibility and consistency of recommendations between the Master Plan and the Comprehensive Management Plan ("CMP") and subplans, which is described in greater detail below. Ex. A-9 at 7-58; A-73. Provisions of the Master Plan that were subsequently incorporated by reference into the CMP and its sub-plans. For example: the management structure including OMKM, MKMB, and the native Hawaiian advisory council, Kahu Kū Mauna; conditions for siting telescopes; allowable development; and major project review process. Ex. A-9 at 3-9 and 3-11; A-13 at D-2; A-60 Ex. A-9 at 7-43 to 7-44, Table 7-11 at 7-45, and 7-46 to 7-47. The BLNR has approved the CMP and sub-plans in full. WDT Nagata at 4; Ex. A-9, A-11, A-12, A-13, A-50, A-60.

D. DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ITS SUB-PLANS

152. In the summer of 2005, UH Hilo began developing the CMP to govern its internal management of the MKSR. The CMP contains:
- (1) a summary of the description of the resources within the UH Management Area;
 - (2) identification of uses and activities;
 - (3) identification of threats to Mauna Kea's resources; and
 - (4) a total of 103 management actions and associated reporting requirements to mitigate threats and to protect various resources in the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea.

The CMP is an integrated planning guide for resource management that is designed to promote the protection of Mauna Kea's unique cultural, natural, recreational, educational, and scientific resources. The CMP describes and identifies the resources, uses, and activities that occur on the mountain. The CMP also identifies threats to resources and provides management actions that would help mitigate the help preserve and protect the resources. Ex. A-9; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 28:23-29:17. The CMP is an adaptive

management plan that provides general management guidelines and does not provide full or complete details on all projects contemplated. WDT Nagata at 3-4; Ex. A-9 at 2-3; Ex. A-50.

153. The University presented the draft CMP to Kahu Kū Mauna for the council's comments and input on the document. Tr. 2/27/17 at 108:7-108:22. Pursuant to the University's review process, the CMP was thereafter submitted to MKMB for review, and then to the BLNR for approval. Ex. A-9 at A4-17.
154. On April 8 and 9, 2009, the BLNR held its regular meeting in Hilo to consider the CMP. BLNR approved the CMP on April 9, 2009, on the condition that the University submit for approval four (4) additional sub-plans, a Project Development Framework, annual status reports on the development of each sub-plan, and status reports on the development of the various management actions. WDT Nagata at 3-4; Ex. A-9; Ex. A-50.
155. Some of the Petitioners requested that a contested case hearing be held on the BLNR's decision to approve the CMP. After that request was denied, Petitioners appealed to the Third Circuit Court. *See Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. Board of Land and Natural Resources*, Civ. No. 09-1-336, in the Circuit Court of the Third Circuit, State of Hawai'i. The Court ruled that Petitioners had failed to show that their rights, duties, and privileges had been adversely affected by the acceptance and adoption of the CMP. As a result, the Court had no jurisdiction under Haw. Rev. Stat. § 91-14 to hear the appeal and dismissed the appeal. Ex. A-98. The Petitioners then appealed that ruling to the Intermediate Court of Appeals on the limited question of whether the BLNR and the Third Circuit Court had correctly ruled that Petitioners were not entitled to a contested case hearing. The Intermediate Court of Appeals affirmed the Third Circuit Court's decision in *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. University of Hawai'i*, 126 Hawai'i 265, 269 P.3d 800 (App. 2012).
156. To satisfy the conditions imposed by the BLNR, the University developed and submitted its Project Development Implementation Framework and the four sub-plans to the BLNR. OMKM held open houses in Waimea, Kona and Hilo on September 1, 2, and 3, 2009, respectively, presenting the Cultural Resources Management Plan ("**CRMP**") and the NRMP. Exs. A-92, A-93. The four sub-plans – the CRMP, the NRMP, the Decommissioning Plan for the Mauna Kea Observatories ("**Decommissioning Plan**"), and the Public Access Plan for the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea ("**PAP**") – were each approved by the BLNR on March 25, 2010. WDT Nagata at 4; Ex. A-52, Ex. A-60, WDT Dr. McLaren at 1; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 161:12-17, 180:17-182:2; Exhibits A-10 to A-13; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 29:18-30:8 WDT Nees at 2; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 24:12-16.
157. The CRMP was developed as part of OMKM's efforts to create a comprehensive management plan for the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea. The CRMP provides OMKM and the University with the tools needed to meet their cultural resource management responsibilities and objectives in several ways, including:
 - (1) promoting a greater understanding of the rich cultural heritage of Mauna Kea;

- (2) preserving and managing cultural resources in a sustainable manner so that future generations will be able to share in and contribute to a better understanding of the historic properties that exist in the summit region, which is of major cultural significance to Hawaiians;
- (3) maintaining opportunities for native Hawaiians to engage in cultural and religious practices; and
- (4) preserving the cultural landscape for the benefit of cultural practitioners, researchers, recreationalists, and other users.

WDT Nagata at 4; Ex. A-11 at i-ii.

- 158. Cultural resource management under the CRMP involves archaeological inventory surveys of historic properties (archaeological sites including burials), development and implementation of a plan for long term monitoring of historic properties; development and implementation of a burial treatment plan; implementation of management actions related to access in general and specifically for cultural practices; education and outreach activities; and compliance with applicable state, federal rules and regulations. Ex. A-11 at Chapter 4; Ex. A-21 at 4, App. A at 11; Ex. A-22 at 8; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 177:2-7, 210:16- 22.
- 159. The CRMP considers specific activities in terms of the potential threats or impacts that each may have on historic sites and properties as well as objects of contemporary value, and presents appropriate management measures to avoid or minimize impacts. Consultation for the CRMP has focused on native Hawaiian organizations, including the Kahu Kū Mauna Council, Hawaiian Civic Clubs in Waimea, Kona, Hilo, and Pahala on Hawai‘i Island, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs ("**OHA**"), Historic Preservation Committee, the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council ("**HIBC**"), and Royal Order of Kamehameha ("**ROOK**"). Ex. A-11 at ii, 6-1.
- 160. The focus of the NRMP is the protection and preservation of natural resources in the UH Management Areas on Mauna Kea. The NRMP provides detailed information on threats to natural resources and development of a management program to conserve these resources. The NRMP is based on a scientific framework that includes a comprehensive review of existing scientific studies, biological inventories, and historical documentation that identifies the current state of knowledge of resources and management activities as well as the effectiveness of current management actions. Community consultation is part of the process, with consultation done through surveys, email and phone interviews, and meetings held in Hilo and Honolulu to gather input from scientific experts, natural resource managers, and concerned members of the public. Ex. A-10 at i.
- 161. The NRMP examines human uses of Mauna Kea, with particular emphasis on their current and potential impacts on natural resources. The NRMP offers specific management actions to reduce the identified threats to natural resources and to guide adaptive responses to future threats. It also details a process for establishing and implementing a natural resources management program. The overarching goal of the NRMP is to help OMKM achieve its mission by providing natural resource management goals, objectives, and activities that protect, preserve, and enhance the natural resources

of Mauna Kea. Ex. A-10 at i.

162. One of OMKM's primary areas of concern and one that is addressed in the NRMP is the prevention and control of invasive species. To that end, OMKM developed the MISMP. Ex. A-40. The plan was reviewed by both the Kahu Kū Mauna and MKMB and its implementation is supported by the Hawai'i Ant Lab and Big Island Invasive Species Committee. WDT Klasner at 5; Ex. A-40; Ex. A-10 at 4.2:21-36.
163. As part of the MISMP, all vehicle operators are asked to inspect their vehicles daily. Tr. 12/6/16 at 17:3-17:8; Ex. A-40 at 20. If a vehicle is observed having mud on the flaps or on the tires, rangers will identify the vehicle operator and, if it is someone operating under a permit, the operator is sent down the mountain immediately, not allowed to return until the vehicle has been cleaned and is banned for that same day. Tr. 12/6/16 at 17:9-17:22.
164. A DLNR-approved biologist inspects all large vehicles, meaning vehicles with three or more axles. The biologist inspects the undercarriage and wheel wells. The biologist inspects inside the vehicle, underneath the floor mats, under the seats, and behind the seats. The biologist inspects for any sign of biological material, plant, soil, seed, and/or insects. If any is found that cannot be remedied on the spot, the vehicle is rejected and the operator is told to clean the vehicle and reschedule an inspection. Tr. 12/6/16 at 54:18-55:4. These inspections take place below Pu'u Huluhulu in either an observatory baseyard, transportation company baseyard, or at the OMKM office. Ex. 48 at 7-15; Tr. 12/6/16 at 63:11-63:22.
165. The PAP provides a set of principles and policies to guide OMKM in the development of management actions relating to public and commercial activities and to regulate those activities in the UH Management Area. The PAP provides a summary of current public activities, including cultural, commercial, and public visitation, snow play, hunting and hiking. The recommended policies are based, in large part, on data collected by the OMKM Rangers, information from interviews with community members, and guidance obtained during round table discussions with members of the various constituencies interested in and involved with Mauna Kea. WDT Nagata at 4; Ex. A-12 at i; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 29:24-30:2.
166. The PAP recognizes that native Hawaiians have the right to exercise their customary and traditional practices on Mauna Kea subject to reasonable regulation as provided by law. Ex. A-12 at 5-3; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 61:4-61:13.
167. The Decommissioning Plan establishes a process framework for eventual removal of observatories and the restoration of sites. The Decommissioning Plan can be used by both existing and future observatories on Mauna Kea to ensure that the DLNR as the landowner, the University as the lessee, and the observatories as sublessees have clear expectations of the observatory decommissioning and restoration process. WDT Nagata at 4; WDT Dr. McLaren at 1; Ex. A-13 at i; Tr. 11/15/16 at 66:12-66:22; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 30:3- 30:8. The specifics of decommissioning for a facility can vary by location and community input. Tr. 11/15/16 at 137:21-138:2; Ex. A-13.

168. The decommissioning process begins with the submission of a Notice of Intent ("NOI"), followed by review and comment at several stages by OMKM, Kahu Kū Mauna, MKMB and the Environment Committee. Ex. A-38. The Decommissioning Plan recognizes the need for cultural sensitivity and calls for cultural considerations to be included as part of the deconstruction and restoration activities. Ultimate approval of the individual observatory's decommissioning plan rests with the University President and BOR. Review at the MKMB level provides an opportunity for community involvement and comment. WDT Dr. McLaren at 1; Ex. A-13 at 1-2, 18-33; Ex. A-38.

169. The Decommissioning Plan includes the Master Plan's general criteria for the siting of observatory facilities, including:

- (1) minimizing the impact on wēkiu bug habitat;
- (2) minimizing the visual impact from towns and significant cultural resources;
- (3) avoidance of archaeological sites, and
- (4) proximity to roads so as to minimize disturbance to the natural terrain.

Ex. A-13 at D-2; A-48 at 129-130.

The Decommissioning Plan also cites factors for limiting observatory development including technical factors such as wind direction and view obscuration, and physical factors such as avoidance of biological, archaeological and geological features. Ex. A-13 at D-1.

The Decommissioning Plan also summarizes the Master Plan's five types of observatory development that could be considered for development including Type IV, the next generation large telescope such as the TMT Observatory. Ex. A-48 at IX-37 to IX-39; A-13 at 31-33.

The Decommissioning Plan also addresses the future of astronomy on Mauna Kea, including the University's expectation that by the end of the current lease there will be fewer telescopes than existed at the time the plan was developed.

Section 5 of the Decommissioning Plan states the University's long-term goal of having fewer observatories in the summit region, while maintaining a world-leading observatory complex for education and research in ground-based astronomy.

WDT Dr. McLaren at 2; Ex. A-13 at i, 28-33; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 161:5, 18, 24.

170. The Decommissioning Plan is consistent with Governor Ige's directive that the TMT Project site should be the last new site developed on the mountain and that any future development occur on already existing sites. The University confirmed that the TMT Project site is the last new area on the mountain where a telescope will be built. Ex. A-39; WDT Dr. McLaren at 3; Tr. 11/2/2017 at 164:13-164:22; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 205:9-13, 206:9-13.

171. The Decommissioning Plan calls for all new telescopes and existing telescopes that

renegotiate their subleases to develop a decommissioning funding plan. The purpose of the funding plan is to provide assurances that there will be sufficient funds available to finance the removal of a facility and restore the site when the time to decommission arises. Included in the funding plan is a cost estimate, and financial assurances mechanisms. A funding plan should be established prior to the commencement of permitted activities, incorporated into sublease terms and maintained until the sublease expires. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 32:13-32:21; Ex. A-13 at 13-17.

172. While none of the subleases executed before the completion of the CMP and Decommissioning Plan are bound by the Decommissioning Plan, the sublessees are bound to any decommissioning and restoration terms set forth in their subleases or operating and site development agreements (*e.g.*, restore to even grade, remove all structures and visible improvements). Tr. 11/15/16 at 108:22-109:12; Exs. B.03k & B.03l; Tr. 11/15/16 at 123:11-14. While partial restoration could be contemplated, when the CMP was completed in 2009, the University asked for and received a commitment and understanding from the observatory sublessees to achieve decommissioning (including information indicating how the respective observatory would fund the decommissioning). Tr. 11/15/16 at 107:19-108:17; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 232:15-233:3; *see, e.g.*, Ex. A-9 at App. A-9.
173. Whether or not a CDUP will be required to decommission a given telescope is to be determined by DLNR. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 212:19-213:9. The University, as the applicant, along with each facility, would prepare a project-specific environmental assessment to identify concerns and develop mitigation for decommissioning. Tr. 11/15/16 at 146:6-13.
174. Under the Decommissioning Plan, planning for decommissioning begins about 5 years prior to anticipated decommissioning. Tr. 11/15/16 at 158:22-159:22.

E. CURRENT AND FUTURE DECOMMISSIONING

175. TIO has committed to performing under the Decommissioning Plan. TIO formation documents include commitments by each of the members to be responsible for decommissioning. Tr. 1/3/2017 at 32:13-32:21, 55:1-55:6. The TMT Initial Decommissioning Funding Plan (Ex. C-39) is a commitment by the members of TIO to its decommissioning obligations. The plan calls for a sinking fund of a million dollars per year with adjustments for inflation commencing upon observatory operation to fund eventual decommissioning. The sinking fund will be fully funded and sufficient up to the end of the 50-year useful life of the TMT Project. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 40:14-41:16, 147:20- 148:1; Ex. C-39.
176. The University is responsible for funding and executing the decommissioning of its own facilities. The University owns four telescopes on Mauna Kea: UKIRT, JCMT, Hoku Ke‘a, and the University 2.2-meter Telescope. The University operates the University 2.2-meter Telescope and Hoku Ke‘a; UKIRT and JCMT are operated by other organizations. Tr. 11/15/16 at 112:11-114:16. Prior to transferring ownership of the UKIRT and JCMT facilities to the University, the University secured \$2.5 million for

each telescope from the United Kingdom to defray the anticipated costs of decommissioning those telescopes. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 227:15-228:16; Tr. 11/15/16 at 65:21- 66:16, 158:4-21. The IRTF is owned by NASA and operated by the University. The other 8 telescopes are both owned and operated by non-University entities. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 161:25-162:6.

177. The University has committed to reducing the number of telescopes on Mauna Kea. Tr. 2/28/17 at 70:12-70:22. The University plans to decommission three (3) telescopes before the TMT Project is operational. WDT Dr. McLaren at 3; Ex. A-39; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 164:13-165:5, 205:20-22; Tr. 11/15/16 at 118:25-119:14, 171:22-175:6. Two of these telescopes are confirmed: CSO and Hoku Ke‘a both submitted their NOI to decommission. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 164:23-165:5. The University also committed to decommission UKIRT by the time TMT Project becomes operational. WDT Dr. McLaren at 3-4; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 162:7-10; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 164:23-165:5; Tr. 11/15/16 at 119:6-14.
178. In addition, VLBA and either JCMT or the SMA will likely be decommissioned by the end of 2033. Ex. A-13 at 34; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 225:19-25; Tr. 11/15/16 at 121:14-122:7, 169:6-170:23.
179. The decommissioning of CSO, UKIRT and Hoku Ke‘a could be achieved by the time the TMT Project becomes operational. Tr. 11/15/16 at 119:25-120:11.
180. The decommissioning of CSO, UKIRT and Hoku Ke‘a will help to offset the impact created by the TMT Project. Tr. 11/15/16 at 142:16-143:11.
181. The CSO decommissioning will be done on Mauna Kea under the auspices of the Decommissioning Plan. Exact estimates on how long a facility will take to be decommissioned and what the exact process will be are not yet developed, but are expected to be reasonable and occur as promised. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 216:19-217:7.
182. It is unlikely that the CSO site could be recycled as the site for the TMT project. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 189:24-190:1. The TMT Project is not being proposed to be built on the UKIRT site because UKIRT is on the summit ridge, a more sensitive cultural area, and due to height restrictions. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 193:13-194:3. For the same reasons, and although it could theoretically be built at these locations with extensive grading, the TMT Project is not being proposed to be built on any other existing site on the Kūkahau‘ula Ridge. Instead, the TMT Project is being proposed to be built off the summit ridge area. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 194:19-195:4.

F. ASTRONOMY DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE MASTER PLAN

183. The Master Plan delineates and identifies an area within the MKSR referred to as the Astronomy Precinct where astronomy-related development will be consolidated to maintain a close grouping of astronomy facilities, roads, and support structure, to minimize the potential impacts to natural and cultural resources in the summit region. Ex. A- 48 at IX-20 to IX-26; Tr. 12/12/16 at 168:15-169:14.

184. The Master Plan identifies five types of astronomy development and their locations (described as Areas A – F) that are allowed within the Astronomy Precinct. These include the redevelopment or expansion of existing observatory facilities or sites, and the development of a next generation large telescope such as the TMT Project. Ex. A-48 at IX-27 to IX-28. Under the Master Plan, new facilities proposed within the Astronomy Precinct are to be designed to:

- (1) avoid disturbing existing habitat areas and archaeological sites;
- (2) limit the extent of visual impacts from existing cultural sites and from downslope communities;
- (3) avoid the scattering of facilities by clustering within the development area, avoid impacts to other facilities including obscuration and wind flow patterns;
- (4) implement design measures to blend with the landscape; and
- (5) minimize development of new infrastructure by locating astronomy facilities near existing roads and utilities.

Ex. A-48 at IX-20 to IX-23; WDT Nagata at 6; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 32:7-32:21.

185. As described in the Master Plan, "Area E" within the Astronomy Precinct was identified as the anticipated location for a next generation large telescope such as the TMT. See Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-6 & n.5; Ex. A-48 at IX-37 to IX-39 & Figure IX-15 at IX-25. The 13 North ("13N") site is located on the northwest slope area below the summit ridge in a location known as Area E. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-12, Figure 1.7. This site was recommended for a variety of reasons, as it would:

- (1) situate the observatory at a significant distance from historical and cultural sites including Kūkahau‘ula and Lake Waiau;
- (2) minimize visibility of the observatory from significant cultural areas on the summit and from Waimea and Honoka‘a;
- (3) reduce wind shear forces; and
- (4) minimize the potential to obscure the views of existing observatories.

The proposed location for the TMT Project in Area E will take advantage of the northerly extension of the summit ridge and ensure that the TMT Project will not be visible from the Hilo area. Furthermore, Area E is not considered good wēkiu bug habitat and Project-related disturbance will be minimized by using an existing roadway for access and installation of utilities. Tr. 11/15/16 at 41:20- 22, 43:14-16; WDT Nagata at 9-10; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 34:18-35:4; Ex. A-48 at IX-25, IX-35, IX-39; Ex. A-68.

186. Although the Master Plan does not discuss the EIS process, it is included in the review of a major project. There are four processes involved in the review and approval of a major project such as the TMT:

- (1) Master Plan Design Review;
- (2) EIS;
- (3) the University's approval process; and
- (4) submittal of a Conservation District Use Application (CDUA) to DLNR.

The MKMB developed a framework for project development in the form of a flowchart. This framework illustrates the integration of the Master Plan's Design Review, EIS, the University's approval of the project, and submittal of the CDUA to DLNR. The MKMB approved the flowchart on October 14, 2009. As a condition of the approval of the CMP the BLNR required the University to submit this framework for approval. This flowchart was approved by the BOR on February 18, 2010, followed by the BLNR on March 25, 2010. WDT Nagata at 6; Exhibit A-48 at XI-4 to XI-12; Ex. A-52; Ex. A-58; Ex. A-59; Ex. A-60; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 33:7-33:15; Ex. 111. The BLNR has therefore formally approved the Master Plan's major project review process. Ex. A-60.

187. The Master Plan's Design Review evaluates a project's design to ensure that a project:

- (1) conforms to the Master Plan's goals and objectives;
- (2) is consistent with the Master Plan's design guidelines;
- (3) relates harmoniously with the summit environment;
- (4) promotes resource conservation; and
- (5) does not contribute significantly to cumulative impact.

WDT Nagata at 7; Ex. A-48 at XI-7 and XI-9; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 33:16-33:23.

188. The Design Review is also intended to ensure that future projects in the MKSR conform to and implement the concepts, themes, and development standards and guidelines set forth in the Master Plan. The Master Plan contains a set of Design Guidelines to help direct development in a manner which integrates a facility into the summit environment. See Ex. A-111. Design Guidelines includes topics relating to facility siting; scale, heights and widths; color, roof (dome), and surface textures and materials; parking, roadway and utility development, and walls and signage. Ex. A-48 at XI-4 to XI-13; WDT Nagata at 6-8.

189. To assist the University with its Design Review, the Master Plan calls for the establishment of a Design Review Committee comprised of, but not limited to, professionals in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, and engineering. In addition, MKMB and Kahu Kū Mauna, the developer and the Institute for Astronomy all have a representative on the Design Review Committee. WDT Nagata at 7; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 33:24-34:2. For major projects such as the TMT Project, the Design Review Committee follows the Master Plan's Design Review process using the Design

Guidelines for guidance in its examination of the overall design of the proposed observatory facility. Ex.t A-48 at XI-4 to XI-13.

190. The Design Review process involves four phases. Under Phase I, the developer is provided an orientation of the Master Plan's goals and objectives, overview of the design review process, and design guidelines. Under Phase II, schematics or conceptual drawings of the proposed project's design are reviewed (Schematic Design). MKMB as a whole reviews the outcome of Phase II, and, if it has no objections, the process is allowed to move to Phase III (Design Development). Under Phase III, a review of detailed drawings is performed, including, site plans, floor plans, and elevation plans. MKMB reviews the design outcome of Phase III. If there are no objections, the developer can move to Phase IV (Construction Documents Review) and begin preparing its construction drawings. WDT Nagata at 7; Exhibit A-48 at XI-10 to XI-39; Exhibit A-52; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 34:9-34:17.
191. The second process in the review and approval of a major project is the preparation, review and approval of an EIS under Chapter 343, Hawai'i Revised Statutes. The preparation of an EIS begins with the public scoping process followed by OMKM's review of the Draft EIS, a public comment period, responses to comments received, and preparation of a Final EIS. The MKMB reviews the Final EIS for the project and makes a recommendation to the appropriate University office or to the Governor on whether to accept the Final EIS. WDT Nagata at 8; Ex. A-52.
192. The third process is the University's approval process. In this stage, MKMB, with input from Kahu Kū Mauna, reviews and recommends approval or disapproval of the project to UH Hilo Chancellor, who in turn makes a recommendation to the University President and the BOR. The BOR makes the decision whether or not to proceed with the project. WDT Nagata at 8; Ex. A-52.
193. The fourth process involves the designation of the appropriate University agency to submit a CDUA to the DLNR. Upon approval of the project by the BOR, a CDUA is prepared. The MKMB reviews and approves the CDUA and recommends which agency within the University should submit the CDUA. A CDUA is then submitted to the DLNR. WDT Nagata at 8-9; Ex. A-52.
194. The TMT Project is currently in the fourth phase of the design review process. WDT Nagata at 10.

G. BLNR ONGOING JURISDICTION

195. The Board has jurisdiction over Conservation District lands and regulates and administers land uses in those lands – including the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea. With respect to the UH Management Area, the BLNR has repeatedly exercised its authority by approving the CMP, sub-plans, and the University's project review and approval process. WDT Nagata at 11; Ex. A-50; Ex. A-60.
196. As a condition of the Board's approval of the CMP, it designated the BOR, the highest authority within the University, with the responsibility of implementing the CMP and

sub-plans. The Board requires the University to provide annual reports in writing and in person on the status of implementation of the CMP management actions. Every year since the Board approved the CMP in 2009, OMKM has prepared and submitted annual reports, beginning in 2010, on the status of the implementation of the CMP. WDT Nagata at 11- 12; Ex. A-60; Exs. A-15 to A-22; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 35:12-35:17.

197. The Board also retains jurisdiction over Conservation District lands on Mauna Kea through HAR Chapter 13-5, *et seq.* Proposed astronomy development is a land use on Conservation District lands on Mauna Kea and requires a Board-issued permit. Based on this, the Board retains authority over Conservation District lands on Mauna Kea. WDT Nagata at 11-12.
198. For the TMT Project, the Board's authority is further reflected in the BLNR considering the CDUA, directing that this contested case proceeding be held, and retaining responsibility for reviewing and accepting, rejecting, or modifying the Hearing Officer's recommended FOF and COL and accompanying decision and order. WDT Nagata at 12.

H. DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT EFFORTS

199. Gunther Hasinger is an astronomer and the Director of the Institute for Astronomy ("IfA") at the University of Hawai'i. He received his Ph.D. in Astronomy in 1984 from Ludwig Maximilian University specializing in compact objects, the X-ray background and cosmology, and management expertise over a large spectrum of scientific institutions, including instrumentation and telescopes. He is of the opinion that "Hawai'i is one of the best places on Earth to observe the heavens and hosts arguably the premier observatory in the Northern Hemisphere." UHH Witness Statement 6, WDT of Gunther Hasinger.
200. Management efforts have evolved and developed significantly over the last 15 years under OMKM. The most recent Hawai'i State audit report on the Management of Mauna Kea and the MKSR in August 2014 states: "we found that [the University] and DLNR have addressed many of our recommendations, including developing and implementing management plans for Mauna Kea's natural, cultural, and historic resources. The result is an improved and more comprehensive framework that coordinates the agencies' efforts to manage and protect Mauna Kea while balancing the competing interests of culture, conservation, scientific research, and recreation." Ex. A-34 at 36; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 6.
201. Most management actions contained in the CMP have either been implemented by OMKM or are in progress. Many actions are considered "ongoing" as they are long term, continuous land management responsibilities. Mauna Kea's historical sites have been extensively surveyed and identified. The natural resources found in the summit region have been substantially surveyed and identified. OMKM continues implementation of baseline inventories of the natural resources on UH Management Area on Mauna Kea. Ex. A-22.
202. In 2012, OMKM hired Klasner as its first Environmental and Natural Resource Program

Manager as part of its on-going efforts to fulfill its long-term commitment to preserve and protect the natural resources found within the MKSR. He is responsible for all the natural resource programs on the mountain, including developing programs and identifying collaborative partnerships that will help OMKM best achieve its overall goal to manage and protect lands managed by the University. WDT Klasner at 1; (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 38:1-19.

203. OMKM is continually in the process of removing fireweed and other invasive species from the Hale Pōhaku area road and summit areas. Rangers remove fireweed when they find it along the road and summit areas. In 2012, OMKM created a volunteer program to remove fireweed and other invasive weeds. To date, the program has engaged over 1,000 volunteers, who collectively have worked over 7,000 hours, removed over 1,500 bags of invasive weeds, and planted several hundred Mauna Kea Silversword plants. WDT Klasner at 5.
204. OMKM is working on restoring native vegetation, focusing on common native species, such as māmane, aweoweo, and puakala. OMKM is working with both botanists and entomologists to understand and restore the basic habitat of some of the rarer species. Tr. 12/6/16 at 72:14-73:7.
205. The testimony of Nelson Ho, a witness for Opposing Intervenor Sleightholm, focused on what he believes has been a misplaced emphasis upon astronomy over environmental and cultural resources, as well as past issues relating to the management of the mountain and the politics affecting said management. Ho has been involved in the controversy on the mountain since 1995. He believes the TMT should be built but not on Mauna Kea. *See generally* Ex. J-8 (Amended WDT Ho). Nelson Ho acknowledged that the follow-up to the 1998 State Auditor's Report indicated that most of the auditor's concerns were addressed. Tr. 2/22/17 at 32:12-38:14, 102:21-103:7.
206. The annual reports to the BLNR, beginning in 2010 to the most recent 2016, cite the management accomplishments that OMKM has done over the years. The 2016 report states that most of the CMP management actions have been implemented or are in progress. Many of the actions are described as "ongoing" as they are long term, continuing land management responsibilities. All of the reports provide details on the implementation status with explanations for individual CMP management actions. The 2016 report includes details on the cumulative annual progression of the implementation status from 2010. Ex. A-22. In addition, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service references OMKM's efforts and the adoption of the CMP and sub-plans and a procedure for formal review of projects all contribute to the protection and conservation of the wēkiu bug as such were reasons for removing the wēkiu bug from the candidate species list under the Federal Endangered Species Act. Ex. A-134a at 66377.

II. THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. HISTORY OF THE TMT PROJECT

207. Edward C. Stone ("**Dr. Stone**") is the Executive director of TMT International

Observatory, LLC. He received his Ph.D. in physics at the University of Chicago before joining the staff of Caltech as a research fellow in 1967. In 1976, he was named professor of physics and Chairperson of the Division of Physics, Mathematics, and Astronomy from 1983 to 1988. He has served as vice president for Astronomical Facilities from 1988 to 1990 and as director of Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California from 1991 to 2001. In the late 1980s through 2009, he served as chairperson and vice chairperson of the Board of Directors of the California Association for Research in Astronomy, which has been responsible for building and operating the W.M. Keck Observatory with its two ten-meter telescopes on Mauna Kea, Hawai'i. WDT of Edward C. Stone, Ex. C-1

208. According to Dr. Stone: "TMT is just the next step in the 400-year-old journey of discovery of the universe. The journey first began in 1610 when Galileo turned his newly developed telescope on the planet Jupiter and saw that there were moons orbiting the planet.

At the time everything was assumed to be orbiting the earth. The earth being the center of the universe. We now know that that was completely wrong. And that was the first major step in this journey of discovery that continues.

Today, the latest step in the journey is what's on Mauna Kea, that is the Subaru Telescope, the Gemini Telescope, the two Keck 10-meter telescopes are the current generation of seeing the most distant objects in the famous objects that have been seen, and have made discoveries using the telescopes on Mauna Kea.

For instance, there's been discovered that there is a giant – a massive hole at the center of the Milky Way Galaxy, four million suns of mass are in that black hole.

And another that was a prize winning discovery. Another prize winning discovery is that the universe is expanding at an accelerating rate indicating there's some form of dark energy, and it's called dark energy because we can't see it. We don't know what it is, but there is no doubt that there is something pushing the universe apart at an increasing rate.

Why do we need still another generation? We need it in order to see the very first stars that formed in the universe 13.4 billion years ago. We believe that's when the first stars were created, and there was first starlight, but it's very faint because it's very far away.

And we also know there are lots of planets orbiting other stars in our own Milky Way Galaxy. And there many planets orbiting the stars, but they're very faint because they're small. And so again, we need to collect even more light than the mighty telescopes on Mauna Kea do today. And that's where the in Thirty Meter Telescope comes in. It's mirror is three times the diameter of the Keck mirror. Thirty meters, that's 98 feet compared to the ten meter Keck telescopes. That factor of three, though, and that diameter means nine times more light is collected because that's nine times more area, and that light is focused on a spot on the camera of 1/9th the area. So it's 81 times brighter with the Thirty Meter Telescope than it is with the Keck, which is currently the best in the world.

That factor of 81 should allow us to see the first stars and galaxies as they formed great distances from here, and to study the other worlds orbiting nearby stars in our own Milky Way Galaxy.

One night on a thirty meter telescope would take 81 nights on the Keck telescopes and would never be done, that's just too much time. And so there's another great leap in the journey." Vol. 18, Tr. 12-19-16 at 6:17-9:2.

209. The National Academy of Sciences recommended that "there is a priority for a 30-meter segmented mirror telescope in the year 2000." (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 9:3-6.
210. In 2003, Caltech and the University of California formed the TMT Corporation, a California non-profit public benefit corporation, for the purpose of fostering astronomy through the building and operation of a thirty meter telescope. (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 9:6-12, 11:15-24.
211. The proposed location for the TMT Project at the 13N site was based on "guidelines for siting a next-generation telescope (such as the TMT) in Area E as set forth in the Master Plan. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 163:9-11; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-6 & n.5; Page A-4 & Figure A-1 of App. A to Ex. B of Ex. A-1/R-1; Ex. A-48 at IX-37 to IX-39. Site testing of the "seeing" conditions, such as turbulence and the impact on image quality at this site was conducted from 2003 through 2008. The results of the testing showed that this site is a world class site and possibly the best site in the world for an optical infrared telescope using adaptive optics. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 01/04/17 at 30:16-31:7; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 2-11.
212. In 2008, the TMT Corporation in consultation with the University began assessing the development of the TMT Project in a location identified as "Area E" on the Northern Plateau of the summit of Mauna Kea. Pursuant to Chapter 343 of the Hawai'i Revised Statutes, the University commenced environmental scoping activities for the TMT Project. WDT Hayes at 2; Tr. 10/25/16 at 118:14-23.
213. Advertisements were placed in the local papers notifying interested persons and organizations that an Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice/Environmental Assessment ("**EISPN/EA**") for the TMT Project was forthcoming. Interested persons and organizations – specifically including Petitioners KAHEA, MKAH, and Neves – were sent advance copies of the EISPN/EA. WDT Hayes at 2.
214. On September 23, 2008, an EISPN/EA for the TMT Project was officially published. The publication was announced that day by the State of Hawai'i Department of Health's Office of Environmental Quality Control ("**OEQC**") in the *Environmental Notice*. Public scoping meetings were held throughout the State in October 2008. WDT Hayes at 2; Tr. 10/25/16 at 118:17-23.
215. On May 23, 2009, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("**DEIS**") for the TMT Project was published in the *Environmental Notice*. KAHEA, MKAH, and Neves submitted written comments on the DEIS. Ward submitted written comments on the

DEIS on behalf of the Sierra Club's Hawai'i Chapter. WDT Hayes at 2-3; Ex. A-76; Ex. A-77; Ex. A-78; Ex. A-80; Exs. A-82 to A-85; Exs. A-88 to A-91; Tr. 2/13/17 at 203:1- 203:11.

216. The TMT Project's Final EIS ("**FEIS**"), which was prepared following the review of comments received during the DEIS review period, was issued on May 8, 2010. WDT Hayes at 2; Exs. A-2/R-2 to A-6/R-6.
217. On April 21, 2010, the MKMB reviewed the FEIS and recommended that the UH Hilo Chancellor approve and sign it; that occurred on April 26, 2010. Ex. A-61; Ex. A-102. The Governor of the State of Hawai'i accepted the TMT FEIS on May 19, 2010. WDT Nagata at 10-11; WDT Hayes at 2; Tr. 10/25/16 at 118:24-119:1; Ex. A-52; Ex. A-62 at 2-6; Ex. A-6/R-6.
218. The time to legally challenge the formal acceptance of the FEIS is set out in HRS § 343-7; to wit:

§ 343-7 Limitation of actions. (a) Any judicial proceeding, the subject of which is the lack of assessment required under section 343-5, shall be initiated within one hundred twenty days of the agency's decision to carry out or approve the action, or, if a proposed action is undertaken without a formal determination by the agency that a statement is or is not required, a judicial proceeding shall be instituted within one hundred twenty days after the proposed action is started. The council or office, any agency responsible for approval of the action or the applicant shall be adjudged an aggrieved party for the purposes of bringing judicial action under this subsection. Others, by court action, may be adjudged aggrieved.

(b) Any judicial proceeding, the subject of which is the determination that a statement is required for a proposed action, shall be initiated within sixty days after the public has been informed of such determination pursuant to section 343-3. Any judicial proceeding, the subject of which is the determination that a statement is not required for a proposed action, shall be initiated within thirty days after the public has been informed of such determination pursuant to section 343-3. The council or the applicant shall be adjudged an aggrieved party for the purposes of bringing judicial action under this subsection. Others, by court action, may be adjudged aggrieved.

(c) Any judicial proceeding, the subject of which is the acceptance of an environmental impact statement required under section 343-5, shall be initiated within sixty days after the public has been informed pursuant to section 343-3 of the acceptance of such statement. The council shall be adjudged an aggrieved party for the purpose of bringing judicial action under this subsection. Affected agencies and persons who provided written comment to such statement during the designated review period shall be adjudged aggrieved parties for the purpose of bringing judicial action under this subsection; provided that the contestable issues shall be limited to issues identified and discussed in the written comment.

219. None of the Petitioners challenged the approval of the FEIS. There were no challenges to the TMT Project's FEIS ever filed. Tr. 10/25/16 at 119:1, 131:15-17; Tr. 2/13/17 at 171:4-171:10.
220. Cruz, a rebuttal witness called by KAHEA and one of the authors of a preliminary draft of the Cultural Impact Assessment ("**Preliminary Draft CIA**"), claimed that the DEIS did not comply with HRS Chapter 343 because his recommendation that project proponents should strongly consider no further development atop Mauna Kea was not included in the Draft CIA that was attached to the DEIS. Tr. 2/28/17 at 123:24-124:1.
221. The Executive Summary in the beginning part of the DEIS specifically identifies and discusses a no action alternative to the building of the TMT Project. Ex. A-148a at S-9; *see also* Ex. A-148. The no action alternative is also identified and discussed in other parts of the DEIS. Ex. A-148a at 1-2, 4-5 through 4-7.
222. On May 19, 2010, MKMB reviewed the project, including TMT's scientific potential, project design, impacts (both positive and negative), and mitigation measures described in the TMT FEIS. MKMB, with input from Kahu Kū Mauna, recommended to the UH Hilo Chancellor that she submit a recommendation to the University President and the BOR to approve the TMT Project. The BOR approved the TMT Project on June 28, 2010. WDT Nagata at 11; Ex. A-52; Ex. A-64.
223. Following the approval of the project by the BOR, the University prepared a CDUA for submittal to the DLNR. On September 1, 2010, the MKMB reviewed the CDUA, recommended that the UH Hilo Chancellor accept it, and requested the University President to designate UH Hilo as the appropriate agency within the University to submit the CDUA to the DLNR. The University President accepted this recommendation, and the UH Hilo Chancellor submitted the CDUA to the DLNR on September 2, 2010. Ex. A-1; WDT Nagata at 11; Ex. A-52; Ex. A-65; A-47.

B. FORMATION OF TIO

224. TIO was formed on May 6, 2014 as a Delaware limited liability company. (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 11:16-19; Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 1. TIO is a not-for-profit entity and an exempt organization under IRS regulations. TIO is comprised of the University of California, Caltech and governmental institutions from China, Japan, India and Canada. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 1. Over time, TMT Corporation's role in the project has been reduced and transitioned to TIO. Tr. 1/4/17 at 77:11-20.
225. Upon its formation on May 6, 2014, TIO succeeded the TMT Corporation as the owner of the TMT Project. (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 13:15-20. TIO was formed so that the voting power (and telescope observing time) could vary amongst the members and be proportionate to their respective contributions to the TMT Project. (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 10:9-20. In comparison, the TMT Corporation, a California corporation, did not allow for such unequal voting power. The TMT Corporation only allowed each member to have the same voting power. (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 10:3-14.

C. SUBLEASE BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND TIO

226. On July 28, 2014, the University executed a written sublease ("**TIO Sublease**") for a portion of the UH Management Area to TIO. Ex. B.02f. Under the TIO Sublease, TIO agreed to pay rent on a graduated schedule that will eventually be approximately \$1 million per year in about eight to ten years. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 39:17-23; B.02f at 4-5. The TIO Sublease also requires TIO to decommission, remove its improvements, and restore the site at the end of the useful life of the proposed TMT Observatory, or in the event the General Lease between the University and BLNR is not extended or renewed. Ex. B.02f at 5-6, 8; Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 38:3-11, 165:21-25; Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 70:6-11.
227. The Flores-Case 'Ohana introduced the TIO Sublease and moved it into evidence in this proceeding as Ex. B.02f. It was received into evidence on April 20, 2017 as part of Minute Order No. 44.

D. CONSULTATION FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT

228. Advertisements were placed in local newspapers notifying interested parties that the EISPN/EA for the TMT Project was forthcoming. KAHEA, MKAH, and Neves were among the individuals sent advanced copies of the EISPN/EA. WDT Hayes at 2.
229. Advertisements were also placed to solicit participation and input from lineal descendants in the cultural consultation process, as contemplated by the CRMP. Vol. 7; Vol 12, (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 134:2-24; Vol. 15, Tr. 12/12/16 at 44:21-45:4.
230. As part of the preparation of the development of a burial treatment plan for burials that may be found in the UH Management Area, in 2012, public burial notices were placed in the newspapers and in OHA's monthly publication, Ka Wai Ola. The advertisements sought individuals with knowledge about the identity and history of the burials on Mauna Kea and the appropriate treatment of unmarked burials. Ex. A-138, Appendix B. In 2004, burial notices were also placed in newspapers pertaining to the burial treatment plan for the Keck Outriggers Telescope project. Ex. A-11 at 4-47.
231. On May 8, 2010, the FEIS was published. WDT Hayes at 2. Approximately 780 Federal, State, and County agencies, organizations and individuals were on the mailing list for FEIS. Ex. A-5/R-5 at A-1 to A-10. Amongst those sent copies of the FEIS were: MKAH, Fergerstrom, Temple of Lono, KAHEA, Sierra Club, and ROOK I. *Id.* Other organizations and individuals who were mailed copies of the FEIS included Keomailani Von Gogh, Townsend, Nelson Ho, and Richard Ha. *Id.*
232. The State Historic Preservation Division ("**SHPD**") of DLNR and OHA were consulted on which groups and individuals should be contacted for consultation on the CIA. Vol. 8, Tr. 11/15/16 at 53:4-13. Approximately 64 individuals and organizations were contacted for consultation on the CIA for the TMT FEIS, including Flores, Ching, Neves, MKAH, Pisciotta, Fergerstrom, Kakalia, Kanaele, and KAHEA. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at 85-102; Vol. 8, Tr. 11/15/16 at 50:21-52:9; *see also* Vol. 34, Tr. 2/13/17 at 141:3-141:9, 141:16-142:14. Of those 64 organizations or individuals contacted, 25 responded and 18 people

- were interviewed. Vol. 8, Tr. 11/15/16 at 50:21-51:10. Baybayan and Dr. Aluli Meyer were also consulted as part of the CIA. *Id.* SHPD and OHA provided comments on the CIA in writing. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D. at ix-xi, 103-04; Vol. 15, Tr. 12/12/16 at 45:5-45:17. Though Flores was sent information about consultation, he did not respond or otherwise participate in that process. Vol. 32, (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 222:3-22; Ex. A-131.
233. Pisciotta testified that she made comments on behalf of MKAH, Neves, and Ching in 2009 that were included in the EIS process. Vol. 34, Tr. 2/13/17 at 170:20-171:3. She also testified that she participated in the scoping meeting for the TMT EIS, reviewed the TMT DEIS and commented extensively twice. Vol. 34, Tr. 2/13/17 at 203:1-203:11; Ex. C-43. Pisciotta acknowledged that she is aware that there is a time period to challenge an EIS that is approved by the Governor and that she did not challenge the FEIS for the TMT Project during this period. Vol. 34, Tr. 2/13/17 at 171:4-171:10.
 234. Ruth Aloua, a witness called by Petitioner Flores-Case 'Ohana, acknowledged that the consultation efforts described in Section 2.3 of Appendix G to the FEIS (the Archaeological Inventory Survey ("**AIS**") for the Mauna Kea Summit Area) can be considered consultation as defined in HAR Chapter 13-276. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 82:18-21; Ex. A-132.
 235. On September 2, 2010, the CDUA was submitted to DLNR. Ex. A-1/R-1; Ex. A-7/R-; Ex. A-8/R-8; Ex. A-23. On October 23, 2010, a notice of the application was published in OEQC's *Environmental Notice*. Ex. A-7/R-7 at 22. Copies of the CDUA were made available for review at the Hawai'i State Library, and the Kailua-Kona and Thelma Parker Public Libraries, as well as on OCCL's website. *Id.*
 236. Written comments on the CDUA were submitted by a number of agencies, organizations, and individuals, including comments on behalf of KAHEA (represented by its then-executive director, Miwa Tamanaha, and Townsend), MKAH (represented by Pisciotta), Neves (claiming to represent ROOK I), Sierra Club Hawai'i (represented by Ward), Ching, and the Flores-Case 'Ohana. Ex. A-8/R-8 at 187-204, 207-08, 219-21, 239-43.
 237. Extensive public hearings on the CDUA were held in Hilo and Kona. The hearings were noticed in the paper of record. Ex. A-7/R-7 at 37. The hearing in Hilo was held on December 2, 2010 at the Hawai'i County Council Room, 25 Aupuni Street in Hilo. Approximately 125 members of the public attended the Hilo meeting, with 51 persons providing oral testimony. *Id.* The Kona hearing was held on December 3, 2010 at the Natural Energy Laboratory in Kona. Ex. A-7/R-7 at 22. Approximately 78 persons attended the Kona meeting, with 33 members providing oral testimony. *Id.*
 238. MKAH, Neves, Ward, and Ching offered live testimony at the Hilo hearing on December 2, 2010. MKAH, Ward, Ching, and the Flores-Case 'Ohana testified at the Kona hearing on December 3, 2010. Ex. A-7/R-7 at 37-43. R. Ha and Baybayan testified in support of the TMT Project at both the hearings in Hilo and Kona. Ex. A-7/R-7 at 40, 43.
 239. Additional public meetings about the project were held and open to the public through

- MKMB and Kahu Kū Mauna meetings. Vol. 13, Tr. 12/6/16 at 37:5-37:22; Vol. 14, (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 74:8- 74:9.
240. Kahu Kū Mauna provided input on the TMT Project to MKMB. On May 19, 2010, Ed Stevens, on behalf of Kahu Kū Mauna, read a statement saying that the Council had reservations about the TMT project, but after considerable deliberations they felt that their reservations were not sufficient to stand against the project since the TMT Project had demonstrated an intention to provide responsible tenancy that strives to meet the standards established by OMKM, which made the project less objectionable. Ex. A-62 at 4; Vol. 41, Tr. 2/27/17 at 155:7-165:23; Ex. A-146 at 6.
241. Tajon, a witness for Kakalia and a member of Kahu Kū Mauna, testified that in his experience the astronomy community has truly expressed its interest in understanding and respecting the traditional Hawaiian faith. Vol. 41, Tr. 2/27/17 at 12:2-7; see Ex. A-144a.
242. Consideration of traditional and contemporary cultural and religious practices, and the impacts thereto, were specifically included in the CIA for the FEIS. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D; Vol. 8, Tr. 11/15/16 at 28:12-23, 45:2-47:7.
243. Dr. Hasinger testified that he personally consulted with various native Hawaiian practitioners throughout the CDUA process. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 81:18-83:9; 91:16-93:2.
244. Despite asking for more consultation in this process, Prof. Jonathan Osorio testified that building the telescope is a deal breaker and that in this situation, compromise is impossible because either the telescope will be built or it will not be built. Tr. 01/12/17 at 89:21-25, 116:20-25. Accordingly, no amount of consultation or mitigation would be satisfactory.
245. Spies testified that those opposed to the TMT Project will stand against any project on Mauna Kea no matter what. Vol. 25b, Tr. 01/12/17 at 179:24-180:2.
246. Prof. Johnson, witness for William Freitas, testified that he does not disagree with the CDUA's characterization of its goals to protect historic and cultural resources up to the point that it was published, but stated that the religious life of the mountain has been catalyzed, magnified and intensified since the time of the CDUA, which in his opinion, warrants review and revisions to the CDUA and the EIS with particular attention to consultation. Vol. 37, (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 17:1-17. Prof. Johnson testified that this contested case hearing is part of the consultation process and that he admires this process as a form of ongoing consultation. Vol. 37, (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 88:10-16.
247. Despite initially claiming that he was not consulted, Ching admitted during cross-examination that he was interviewed for the TMT Project. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 187:3-21, 226:24-227:20, 229:9-230:19, 238:15-240:10. The FEIS lists Ching as one of the individuals consulted and contains a written record of his views. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at A-5 (TMT EIS Vol. 3 at A-5). The CIA states that Ching was interviewed on three

separate occasions. Ex. A-5, App. D at 92. A full summary of the interviews with Ching is included as part of the CIA. Ex. A-5, App. D, § 7.13 at 169-71.

248. Nobriga testified that the Temple was never consulted about the TMT Project. However, comments captured in the TMT FEIS (Ex. A-4, Chapter 8) indicate that the Temple of Lono was consulted and a comment letter was received from Fergerstrom, who claimed to be the representative of the Temple, and considered as part of that cultural review process. Vol. 43, Tr. 3/1/17 at 23:1-14, 67:1-68:1; Ex. A-4, Chapter 8. Fergerstrom admitted that he was a member of the Temple and that the record speaks for itself as to whether the Temple was consulted. Vol. 28, Tr. 1/23/17 at 243:19-20.
249. Dr. Aluli Meyer testified that in her opinion, the University did its best in understanding and responding to cultural concerns, but ultimately did not make appropriate consultation efforts. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 34:1-35:2. Dr. Aluli Meyer testified that she had not read the CDUA and implied that she had not read any of the documents and studies related to the TMT Project. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 35:3-5.
250. Kanaele was extensively interviewed and consulted during the CIA process. Ex. A5, App. D, § 7.4 at 113-118. He testified that he read most of the FEIS, Kanaele was not aware that the CIA included a specific and separate section on his extensive interview and consultation. Vol. 44, Tr. 3/2/17 at 33:2-34:6.
251. Certain individuals, including parties to this proceeding, have actively boycotted the University's ongoing consultation efforts. For example, in 2015, the University held public open houses on the EISPN for the new master lease. Case, along with other members of the Flores-Case 'Ohana, Pisciotta, Ching, Ward, and Neves actively called for a boycott of the process. Ex. A-129; Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 212:3- 219:22.

E. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

252. The TMT Observatory will be located in the 525-acre Astronomy Precinct within the MKSR on Mauna Kea. The Astronomy Precinct is already home to eight optical and/or infrared observatories and three submillimeter observatories. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 2.
253. In 1964, an unpaved, 4-wheel drive Mauna Kea Access Jeep Trail was established to facilitate astronomy testing in the northwest slope area, and in particular at a location designated "13N." There are small foundations remaining on the site from that astronomical testing. Vol. 6, Tr. 10/31/16 at 132:10-133:6. The Mauna Kea Access Road extends near to the summit and loops along the Pu'u Kea, Pu'u Hau'oki, and an unnamed pu'u cinder cones to reach the existing observatories. The 4.6-mile segment of the Mauna Kea Access Road just past Hale Pōhaku is unpaved. The road is paved again above 11,600 feet. The existing observatories have mostly short paved or unpaved driveways off the main road. The unpaved SMA service roadways are the most extensive roads other than the main Mauna Kea Access Road. One branch of the SMA road extends toward Area E. Where the SMA road ends, the unpaved 4-wheel drive trail extends into and runs through the middle of Area E to the 13N site, where it ends. Ex. A-

1/R-1 at 3-4; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-165, 3-208 to 3-209.

254. Currently, utility services exist along the Mauna Kea Access Road Loop to a point near the intersection of the Mauna Kea Access Road Loop and the SMA building. There are electrical transformers at the Hale Pōhaku Substation, which is located approximately 2,000 feet southwest of the main headquarters building at Hale Pōhaku and about 1,000 feet from Mauna Kea Access Road. Utility lines run overhead from Saddle Road to near Hale Pōhaku and then underground from there to the summit area. There are conduits located approximately 50 feet west of the Mauna Kea Access Road for most of the distance to the summit area; one portion of the power line alignment follows a former access road alignment that is now within the NAR. Pull boxes are located approximately every 300 feet along the conduit. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-11 to 1-14; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-208 to 3-209.
255. The design guidelines from the Master Plan were conceptual and were incorporated into the design of the TMT Observatory. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 257:23-258:2. The proposed design for the TMT Observatory is based on balancing the technical requirements of the observatory and the goal of minimizing adverse impacts of the project. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 18:2-23:1, 258:8-262:5. The TMT Observatory design is therefore consistent with and in compliance with the 2000 Master Plan. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 14:2-10.
256. The TMT Project consists of the following components:
- a. **"TMT Observatory"** refers to the components of the TMT Project located at a site designated as "13N" within Area E on the upper elevations of Mauna Kea, but below the summit. The TMT Observatory generally consists of the 30-meter telescope, instruments, dome, attached building, and parking.
 - b. The **"Access Way"** refers to the road and other infrastructure improvements that will be provided to access and operate the TMT Observatory. Improvements in the Access Way will generally include a surface roadway and underground utilities.
 - c. **"Hale Pōhaku work"** refers to Hawai'i Electric and Light Company (**"HELCO"**) upgrades to existing electrical transformers at the HELCO substation located near the University's Mid-Level Support Facility known as Hale Pōhaku. The new transformers will replace the existing ones on a 1:1 basis, and the fenced substation compound will not be expanded.
 - d. **"Headquarters"** refers to the facility located in Hilo to manage activities at and support operation of the TMT Observatory. This includes an office building with a parking area.

Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 1-2; Vol. 3, Tr. 10/25/16 at 132:13-133:17.

257. The TMT Observatory will be the first optical/infrared observatory of its size to integrate Adaptive Optics (**"AO"**) into its original design. AO systems correct for the image

distortion that is caused by the atmosphere. The TMT AO system will project up to eight laser beams into the atmosphere to create an asterism, or group, of "guide stars" that are used to determine the atmospheric distortion of the visible and infrared light from distant objects and thus allow the telescope system to correct for it. The TMT AO system will generate each of these eight beams using a 25-watt laser; the laser light will appear yellow (0.589 microns – the sodium D2 line). The TMT AO system removes distortion caused by the atmosphere to create a very sharp image of celestial objects, allowing, for example, for highly accurate position measurements for moving objects. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 4; (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 243:15-245:19.

258. The TMT Observatory dome housing the telescope will be a Calotte-type enclosure with the following characteristics: (1) total height of roughly 180 feet above the current ground surface, with an exterior radius of 108 feet; (2) the dome shutter will be 102.5 feet in diameter and it will retract inside the dome when opened; (3) the dome will rotate on two planes, a horizontal plane and a second plane at 32.5 degrees to the horizontal plane. By rotating on both planes simultaneously, the dome will allow viewing of the sky from vertical to roughly 25 degrees above the horizon; and (4) the Calotte dome base, cap, and shutter structures will appear rounded and smooth and have a reflective aluminum-like exterior coating. This reflective aluminum-like coating was chosen to minimize the visual impacts of the dome; throughout the majority of the day, this coating will reflect the surroundings of the TMT Observatory. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 5; Vol. 3, Tr. 10/25/16 at 125:8-17, 133:21-134:3; Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 102:9-103:23. Ex. C-3.
259. The TMT dimensions complies with those set forth in the Master Plan because the 130 feet height limit in the Master Plan applies to facilities on the summit ridge, not the northwest slope in Area E. Vol.8, Tr. 11/15/16 at 196:6- 197:1; Ex. A-48 at XI-5.
260. The TMT design complies with the Master Plan because it calls for non-reflective to be used "as much as possible . . . to minimize glare and visibility from distant areas." Ex. A-48 at XI-6. As discussed above, TMT was designed to have a reflective coating in order to reduce visibility from distant areas. WDT White at 11; WDT Hayes at 20; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3- 103; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 7-13; Tr. 10/25/16 at 125:8-17. Accordingly, the design is consistent with the 2000 Master Plan's objective of reducing visibility of structures on Mauna Kea.
261. A support building will be attached to the TMT Observatory dome. The building will have a roof area of approximately 21,000 square feet, a total interior floor area of roughly 18,000 square feet, a flat roof, and be lava-colored. The support building will include the following spaces: (1) mirror coating and staging area; (2) laboratory and shop spaces, including a computer room, engineering and electronics laboratories, and mechanical shop; (3) utility spaces including electrical services, chillers, a generator, pumps for fire suppression and other non-potable water needs, restrooms, and fluid dynamic bearing pumps that control the movement of the telescope; (4) administration space, including offices and a kitchenette; and (5) visitor and public spaces, consisting of a lobby, restroom, and viewing platform. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 6.

262. A roughly 6,000 square foot exterior equipment area on the north side of the support building will include: two electrical transformers and electrical service switchboards; three 5,000-gallon underground storage tanks (one for water storage, one for domestic waste storage, and one double-walled for chemical waste storage); a 25,000-gallon underground storage tank for water storage as part of the fire suppression system; and one double-walled 2,000-gallon above-ground storage tank for diesel fuel to power the emergency generator. *Id.* at 6.
263. Up to 140 people will operate and maintain the Observatory. An average of 24 employees will work at the TMT Observatory during daytime operations, with a minimum of 15 persons and a maximum of 43 persons possible depending on activities. Fewer persons will be present at night. During darkness, typically 2 to 3 operators (but occasionally as many as 6) will be present at the TMT Observatory. Observers and support astronomers will view remotely from the Headquarters. All other members of the staff will work at the Headquarters. *Id.* at 11.
264. The parking area for TMT Observatory staff and delivery vehicles will be unpaved and located outside of the support facility. A guard rail will be placed along the top of the slope on the north and west sides of the graded area where there will be a drop-off. *Id.* at 7.
265. TIO does not anticipate constructing a construction camp. Workers will either be housed at Hale Pōhaku using the dormitories or transported from lower altitudes to the project site through a rideshare program. TIO anticipates that most of the construction workers will be local residents. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 43:23-44:19.
266. The footprint of the TMT Observatory dome, support building, parking area, and area disturbed during construction will be roughly five acres. A half-acre portion of this has previously been disturbed by the existing 4-wheel drive road and site testing equipment; the original disturbance occurred during site testing in the 1960s, and site testing was also performed in this area for the TMT Project in the 2000s. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 7. Additional areas (outside of the TMT Project site, the access way, and Hale Pōhaku) will be temporarily utilized for construction. Tr. 01/04/17 at 17:16-18:6; 36:3-15. The total construction acreage footprint for the TMT Project (including the TMT Project site, access way, Batch Plant, underground utilities, and use of the facilities at Hale Pōhaku) is approximately 12.5 acres. Tr. 01/04/17 at 50:11-51:3.
267. The deepest part of the foundation will be approximately 21 or 21.5 feet below the ground. Tr. 01/04/17 at 56:21-57:6.
268. The TMT Access Way will include a road and utility services to the TMT Observatory from existing services. Currently, utility services exist along the Mauna Kea Access Road Loop to a point near the intersection of the Mauna Kea Loop Road and the SMA road. The proposed Access Way will start at that point and extend to the TMT Observatory following either the existing 4-wheel drive road or the wider roads that serve the SMA facility. The Access Way that the TMT Project has proposed is limited to a single lane (reduced from a previous design of two lanes) over the southernmost portion

of the Access Way (i.e., the portion that crosses Pu‘u Hau‘oki and through the SMA); the remainder is two lanes. The vast majority of the Access Way route follows and goes over an existing single-lane, 4-wheel drive road that was previously developed for access to and testing of the 13N site in the 1960s. A portion of the route was graded during construction of the SMA facility as well. Construction will not require a widening of the access roads. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 8; Tr. 10/25/16 at 134:4-135:8, 178; (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 46:21-25.

269. The switch boxes needed to extend electrical power and communication service to the TMT Observatory will be placed above ground next to the existing ones across the road from the SMA facility. To the extent possible, utilities from that point northward to the TMT Observatory site will be placed beneath the road to reduce the footprint of disturbance, with pull boxes located to the side of the road in already disturbed locations where possible. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 8; Tr. 10/25/16 at 178:11-13.
270. Various elements have been incorporated into the Access Way design to minimize the visual impacts of the Access Way, including: (1) coloring the pavement of the Access Way so that it blends with the surrounding environment; (2) limiting the Access Way to a single lane in certain areas; and (3) minimizing the visual impacts of the Access Way guardrail so that it blends with the surrounding environment. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 8.
271. Two transformers within the HELCO substation will be upgraded by the local electrical utility company. The HELCO substation is located across Mauna Kea Access Road from Hale Pōhaku. The new transformers will be placed in the same location as the existing transformers and the existing fenced substation compound will not be expanded. *Id.*; Tr. 10/25/16 at 135:16-136:4.
272. In addition, HELCO will upgrade the electrical service from the transformer compound near Hale Pōhaku to the existing utility boxes across the road from the SMA building to support the TMT Observatory’s power requirements. This will be done by removing the existing conducting wire and placing a new electric conducting wire in existing underground conduits. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 8; *see also* Ex. A-3/R-3 at 2-26.
273. During construction, additional areas will temporarily be utilized and/or disturbed. Base yards required for the construction of the telescope and observatory will include the following:
 - a. Port Staging Area: An existing warehouse and/or yard near the port where the TMT Project components are received.
 - b. Batch Plant Staging Area: A roughly 4-acre area northwest of where the Mauna Kea Access Road forks near the summit that will primarily be used for storing bulk materials and a concrete batch plant, as this area has been used in the past during construction of other observatories.
 - c. TMT Observatory and Headquarters sites: The areas within the TMT Observatory and Headquarters sites not occupied by structures will also be

utilized as staging areas during construction of those facilities.

Id. at 10.

- 274. The CDUA for the TMT Project does not request subdivision approval, and UH Hilo does not intend to request or utilize subdivision of land as part of the Project. Ex. A-1; Ex. C-6 (WDT Callies) at 9.
- 275. TIO will pay rent as set forth in the TIO Sublease. Tr. 11/15/16 at 65:4-7; (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 39:17-23; Ex. B.02f at 5-6.

F. THE UNIQUE COMBINATION OF CONDITIONS THAT MAKES MAUNA KEA A PREMIER LOCATION FOR ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORIES

- 276. TIO identified Mauna Kea as the preferred site for the TMT Observatory after an extensive worldwide study to evaluate potential locations. Mauna Kea was and remains TIO's preferred site for several reasons. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 10.
- 277. Mauna Kea possesses a rare combination of many natural resources that, taken together, make it an outstanding location for astronomical research, including the TMT Project. Mauna Kea has:
 - a. generally little to no cloud cover;
 - b. a stable atmosphere;
 - c. low mean temperature and temperature variability;
 - d. low humidity;
 - e. low light pollution; and
 - f. a location at a favorable latitude.

See WDT Dr. Hasinger at 1; Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 88:15-89:13. Tr. 1/5/17 at 105:18-106:6.

- 278. In addition to its advantageous combination of natural resources, the presence of other astronomical facilities in close proximity creates the opportunity for many scientific synergies between the TMT Observatory and those facilities. Smaller optical/infrared observatories can provide observation targets for the TMT Observatory and carry out supporting science programs that do not require the large light-gathering power and fine diffraction limit of the TMT Observatory. Facilities that observe at radio wavelengths would also be able to provide targets for TMT observations and collect supporting complementary scientific information. These synergies increase productivity in conducting science when compared to a single observatory operating independently. Observatories that share common partners are more likely to collaborate and go to greater lengths to work together, including designing and installing complementary suites of

instruments on individual telescopes. See Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 116:1-119:12.

G. THE SCIENTIFIC VALUE OF THE TMT OBSERVATORY

279. Astronomy is one of the oldest of the sciences and its contributions to humankind are immeasurable. Many benefits of astronomy impact our daily lives. Among its many contributions, astronomical research has been the basis of timekeeping, navigation, and climate science. For example, quantum mechanics, which is the basis for computers and electronics, was discovered in astronomy. The physics of climate change was originally discovered through observations of the atmosphere on Venus. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 18:8-19:4. Various tools developed for astronomical research have also been the basis of many "spin-off" technologies such as Global Positioning Satellite ("GPS") systems and transition bifocal lenses. See Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 18:12-20:2, 341:13-21; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 4.
280. Observatories on Mauna Kea were involved in the majority of astronomical breakthroughs in the last 50 years. The yearly number of scientific publications from Mauna Kea observatories is greater than that from the Hubble Space Telescope or the European Southern Telescope. Observatories on Haleakalā are currently providing the world's best early-warning system for dangerous asteroids. TMT would be able to provide more detailed information about their orbits, composition, and ultimately the danger they pose. This would aid in predicting the path of the asteroid, and potentially aid in preventing an asteroid from impacting the Earth. Although there are telescopes planned for locations in the southern hemisphere that would have similar capabilities, those telescopes could not view asteroids approaching from the north, where TMT, being located in the northern hemisphere, could. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 3-4; Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 29:4- 30:5; Vol. 22, Tr. 1/5/17 at 201:19-202:12.
281. Astronomy on Mauna Kea has also led to the Mauna Kea Weather Center ("MKWC"), which was originally created to provide excellent custom forecasts for the observatories. However, MKWC recently adapted its computer programs to predict the dispersion of vog from the Kilauea volcano. This is a valuable service to the Hawai'i community at no cost. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 4. Similarly, 20 years ago, the Mauna Kea observatories contributed \$2 million to help expedite the installation of fiber-optics communications infrastructure on Hawai'i Island, and today, astronomy is leading the big data efforts in the State. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 4.
282. Modern astronomy was a key component in the revival of Hawaiian navigation. Nainoa Thompson and others used modern celestial maps at the Bishop Museum to reconstruct the Hawaiian star lines. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 181:14-182:11.
283. Without the development of the TMT project, many of the services could lose funding that is necessary for continued availability. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 167-168.
284. The TMT Project will allow Hawai'i to maintain its leading position in generating new knowledge about the universe and help to produce a new generation of leaders in science, technology and education. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 1; Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 16:3-11,

285. The addition of TMT is needed because it has capabilities that are unique from the existing telescopes. Telescopes commonly work together like instruments in a symphony, and more often than not, multiple telescopes work in unison to produce scientific discoveries. In this context, the TMT "instrument" would be a new and unique addition to the "symphony" of telescopes on Mauna Kea, which will open a completely new area of discovery that could not otherwise be reached. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 15:18-16:2.
286. The light collection power of TMT's larger aperture will be about ten times bigger than that of the largest telescopes today. The size of the aperture, combined with the excellent atmospheric conditions above Mauna Kea will yield about ten times sharper images than the Hubble Space Telescope. The mirror on the James Webb space telescope is only 6.5 meters, and the angular resolution is inferior to that planned for TMT. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 73:10-19. With the larger aperture and higher resolution, the stars will be 81 times brighter at TMT than at Keck, which is currently the best in the world. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 8:9-9:2, 15:1-16:17. In other words, one night at TMT is equivalent to 81 nights at Keck. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 15:6-7.
287. TMT's advanced capabilities will allow it to observe any class of astronomical objects much further than current telescopes. TMT will be sensitive enough to see things formed billions of year ago that could never be seen using Keck. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 8:9-9:2, 14:15-15:25. TMT's reach will enable it to essentially look back in time, which will enable astronomers to answer fundamental questions regarding the origins of the universe. TMT will enable discoveries about the nature and origins of the physical world, from the first formation of galaxies in the distant past and distant regions of the Universe to the formation of planets and planetary systems today in our Milky Way Galaxy. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 15:23-16:6. TMT may also aid in the quest to find and study Earth-like planets. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 2.
288. The United States has been the leader in astronomy research for the last 150 years, and locating the TMT Observatory in Hawai'i will maintain the nation's leadership in astronomy research, discovery, and innovation. For the past forty years, the State of Hawai'i, the University, and Mauna Kea have been at the forefront of terrestrial astronomy. The TMT Observatory will help to maintain this leadership by leveraging the capacity of the existing observatories on Mauna Kea, including the Keck Observatory, Subaru and the CFHT. The University will have approximately 7.5% of the observing time at TMT. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 45:12-17. While these observatories are world-leading observatories today, their future scientific productivity will be enhanced by co-location with a next generation observatory, such as the TMT Observatory. Ex. C-1 at 3; A-70.
289. Certain Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors dispute the scientific value or tangible benefits of the TMT Observatory. Petitioner Kealoha Pisciotta describes her history with Mauna Kea as three-fold: "I have a history of cultural and religious practice, I worked for the observatories for more than 12 years and I have been advocating for greater

protections of Mauna Kea for more than a decade." WDT of Ms. K. Kealoha Pisciotta, Ex. B.01a.

290. Pisciotta testified that in her opinion the benefits of astronomy are purely academic and the knowledge gained from astronomy will do nothing to change the lives of the people of Hawai'i. Ex. B.01a (WDT Pisciotta) at 5-6. Pisciotta opined that astronomy is not solving the cure for hunger, cancer or HIV, protecting our biodiversity by protecting rare, threatened or endangered species, providing people with clean water, reducing our energy consumption or inventing new forms of energy. WDT Pisciotta at 6.

H. ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF THE TMT OBSERVATORY

291. Astronomy has historically been an economic driver to the local community, as well as the state. After the devastating tsunami of 1960, the observatory on Mauna Kea and the IfA were founded with the explicit goal of producing educational opportunities to Hawai'i students, and to promote economic growth. A study by the University of Hawai'i Economic Research Organization ("**UHERO**") shows that in 2012 alone, astronomy had a total economic impact of \$168 million (with approximately \$91 million attributed to Hawai'i County), a job creation impact of 1,400, and generated State taxes of \$8.2 million. The TMT project will further contribute to these economic benefits. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 3; Ex. A-33 at 3.
292. Astronomy provides close to 1,000 quality jobs in clean high-tech activities that offer employment opportunities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics ("**STEM**") fields to local youth. These opportunities are not limited to astronomers, as most jobs are technical and administrative. The workforce currently has more than 50% local employees, but efforts are being made to increase this number because it is much better and more efficient to hire local residents instead of mainland residents, who typically leave after a few years of employment. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 4; Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 17:1-16, 390:16-391:9.
293. Additionally, astronomy has resulted in spin-off industries. For example, IfA innovation has spun off new Hawai'i businesses working in remote sensing and new technologies for solar power. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 19:11-13.
294. In addition to paying rent as set forth in the TIO Sublease, a staff of up to 140 employees is planned to work on the TMT Project in Hawai'i during operations. Many of the positions require specialized skills in computing, optical-mechanical engineering, and other technical areas. The availability of a local workforce with the requisite skills is a very strong plus for a site. The unique technical systems that comprise the Observatory make it desirable to have long-term employees. Thus, locating the TMT Observatory on Mauna Kea is favored in that the availability of housing, quality schools and medical care, and opportunities for spousal employment are important factors in attracting and retaining long-term employees. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 11.

I. TMT PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

295. The TMT Observatory construction crew will average 50 to 60 crew members through

the life of construction; during certain phases, a crew of more than 100 will be working at the site. Construction is expected to take place six days a week, 10 hours a day; however, some special operations or construction phases will require longer work hours. It is also expected that winter weather conditions at the TMT Observatory site will interrupt construction at times. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 11.

- 296. During construction of the TMT Project, as it has been used in the past for the construction of other observatories, the Batch Plant Staging Area will be used primarily for storing bulk materials and as a concrete batch plant. Roughly four acres of the Batch Plant Staging Area will be used by TMT construction activities. TMT construction activities at the Batch Plant will be done in compliance with all existing laws and regulations. Upon completion of construction of the TMT Observatory, the Batch Plant Staging Area will be partially restored. *Id.* at 10; Vol. 3, Tr. 10/25/16 at 136:5-24; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-13.
- 297. During all operations with heavy equipment, the TMT construction manager will monitor the weather and decide when any shutdowns will be necessary. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 35:19- 36:2. Crane operators will monitor all safety procedures and will be trained on proper operating methods. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 36:2-42:24.
- 298. Tests will then be conducted and adjustments to the telescope and instruments made for a period of time to gain optimum efficiency and viewing. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 11. The first scientific results using the TMT Observatory are expected, at the earliest, in 2024. During the life of the TMT Observatory, astronomical observations will be made by scientists from around the world.
- 299. No explosives will be used and no blasting will be done to construct the TMT Project. Vol. 21, Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 45:2-6.

J. EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

i. The Need for Educational Opportunities

- 300. The creation of educational and employment opportunities is an important and relevant factor in considering the CDUA permit.
- 301. PUEO was formed by native Hawaiians who support the pursuit of educational opportunities for the children of Hawai‘i. They intervened in this contested case proceeding to express their views that the TMT Project will greatly enhance the educational opportunities for Hawai‘i’s children. WDT Ha at 1-3; Tr. 2/15/17 at 196:3-197:25; Tr. 2/21/16 at 161:12-22, 21:12-15.
- 302. The testimony of PUEO members established that there is a need for educational opportunities in Hawai‘i, specifically on Hawai‘i Island. Warfield, the president of PUEO, testified as to his substantial experience working with children on Hawai‘i Island through public outreach programs. Warfield’s testimony evidenced the lack of educational opportunities for children on Hawai‘i Island. WDT Warfield at 1; Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 207:8-17, 214:3-215:14. Warfield also spoke of instances where native

Hawaiian children have expressed interest in astronomy, but were discouraged from pursuing this interest due to a lack of educational opportunities, as well as a lack of support from the local community. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 200:13-202:11, 230:14-231:3, Vol. 38, Tr. 2/21/17 at 260:4-261:15. PUEO's goal is to protect and foster such interest through educational opportunities, such as those provided by the TMT Project. WDT Warfield at 1; Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 200:13-202:11.

303. Warfield testified that Hawaiian culture and modern science can co-exist, as evidenced by his current efforts in the community. Warfield works to provide educational opportunities on Hawai'i Island, while at the same time fostering positive self-esteem and cultural identity in native Hawaiian children. WDT Warfield at 1.
304. PUEO members Richard Ha, Elroy Osorio, and Brown, also testified as to the need for educational opportunities in Hawai'i. Collectively, they assert that if TMT is not built, educational opportunities may be lost, thereby injuring the children of Hawai'i. WDT Ha at 1-3; WDT E. Osorio at 1-3; WDT W. Brown at 1-3; Vol. 38, Tr. 2/21/17 at 162:10-14, 179:9-15; 242:24-243:22.
305. PUEO Members support the TMT Project and its potential educational and community benefits, despite backlash from those who oppose the TMT Project. See Ex. C-48; Vol. 38, Tr. 2/21/17 at 210:17-212:12.
306. The testimony of PUEO members supports the idea that the TMT Project will present educational opportunities for the children of Hawai'i. Additionally, the testimony of PUEO members established that there are native Hawaiian children who are interested in the field of astronomy, but who lack the resources and support to pursue such interests.

ii. Native Hawaiians and Astronomy

307. King David Kalākaua was deeply interested in astronomy. During his trip around the world in 1881, he visited the site of the first permanently occupied mountaintop astronomical observatory, the Lick Observatory on Mount Hamilton, in California, which was under construction. Earlier, in 1880, he had written to Captain R. S. Floyd, President of Lick Trustees, "I must thank you sincerely for the pamphlet you sent me of the 'Lick Observatory Trust.' Something of this kind is needed here very much but we have so few people who take interest in scientific matters..." Ex. A-7 at p. 54.

King Kalākaua also wrote: "It will afford me unfeigned satisfaction if my kingdom can add its quota toward the successful accomplishment of the most important astronomical observation of the present century and assist, however humbly, the enlightened nations of the earth in these costly enterprises." Ex. A-48 (2000 MKSR Master Plan, cover)

308. Paul Coleman ("**Dr. Coleman**") is a native Hawaiian who holds a Ph.D. in Physics. He was called as a witness by TIO. Here is Dr. Coleman's story:

"My Hawaiian 'ohana comes from three main groups who were in Kohala, Hawai'i; Makua and Kahana, O'ahu; and Ka'anapali, Maui. If we follow my maternal line, we can trace back to Mele Makini (4th great tutu) who was related to Kalakaua and

Liliuokalani. Coincidentally, she married the Chinese entrepreneur and businessman Hu Pak Sing, who for a time owned one of the sugar mills on Hawai‘i, owned the ahupua‘a containing Kahana valley, and was the first association president of the Manoa Chinese Cemetery. As an astrophysicist who specializes in cosmology, this connection to the Kalakaua line afforded to me through tutu Mele, connects me to the Kumulipo and therefore back to the Big Bang! So for me, using the TMT which will allow us to look back in time as far as possible, is in the Hawaiian sense, literally investigating my ancestors.

When I graduated from St. Louis High School, there were two things I wanted to do – play football and study theoretical general relativity – the physics that Einstein invented. I knew that I would have to say goodbye to Hawai‘i as there was no option to do both here at the level I wanted. I went to the University of Notre Dame to accomplish both those goals.

I graduated with a BS in physics and a few broken fingers. Notre Dame won two national championships in football while I was there (no thanks to me). Next, I applied to the graduate program at the University of Pittsburgh where one of the true geniuses of Relativity (Professor Ezra "Ted" Newman) was a faculty member. He advised me that since I was a Hawaiian, perhaps I could shift my interests slightly to astrophysics and physical cosmology. He knew that new telescopes were being built on Maunakea and thought that this might give me the chance to go back home. He also confided in me that if he were just starting out in physics, as I was, he would do exactly this. Ted is one of the smartest men I have ever met – so of course I took his advice.

After earning my PhD in physics, I began applying for jobs back home in Hawai‘i. The Institute for Astronomy was moving along and becoming one of the best astronomy institutes in the world – this meant that I would have to do pretty well also in order to be considered for any jobs back home. There were six telescopes on Maunakea at that time and one of them (the James Clerk Maxwell Telescope – JCMT) was the only telescope in the world which could answer a problem in extragalactic astrophysics that I was interested in. Access to telescopes on Maunakea depends on your affiliation. If you are a member of an institute which has guaranteed time, you may apply for that time. You will, of course, have to beat the competition by having a highly rated observing proposal.

I didn't get either of the jobs I applied for in Hawai‘i back then, but I was hired as an Institute Postdoc at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands. What was originally supposed to be only a 2 year job turned into a permanent position which I left after 8 years. During those years, I unsuccessfully applied for jobs in Hawai‘i many, many times. As the years went by, my record of my work and experience, papers published, etc. got better and better.

Fortunately, the Netherlands is one of the partner countries in the UK telescopes on Maunakea which meant that I could also apply for time for those telescopes. I used to joke that I had to go almost to the other side of the Earth in order to be able to use the telescopes in Hawai‘i because the competition for telescope time was so tough. Since coming home to the IfA, the competition has gotten much less. I only have to compete

with the 40 plus astronomers here for telescope time – instead of the thousands in the rest of the world. Every second of time on Maunakea is used and I find it almost laughable when I hear people say that we don't use the time allocated for us. If they only knew how precious telescope time is on Maunakea (with typical oversubscription factors of five to ten – meaning that as many as ten different projects are applying for the same time on the telescope that you are)." WDT of Paul Coleman, pages 1-2; Ex. C-17, pages 1-2.

309. Dr. Coleman testified that he is aware of only four native Hawaiians in the world who currently hold astronomy degrees. Vol. 22, Tr. 1/5/17 at 97, 126:10-11. The TMT Project will allow the University to continue its astronomy outreach and teaching efforts, and aid in the quest to produce "home grown" astronomers. Ex. C-17 at 3.
310. The effort to produce "home grown" astronomers is important because astronomy is an essential part of the identity of the Hawaiian people. In fact, the defining characteristic of a Hawaiian is rooted in astronomy. The mastery of astronomy, and its application – long distance voyaging – is what separates Hawaiians from their Polynesian brothers and sisters. Embracing modern astronomy would represent Hawaiians coming full circle from being masters of astronomy in the past, to being masters of astronomy in the future. In Dr. Coleman's words: "I find this very appealing since I know that the defining characteristic of a Hawaiian is astronomy. Our mastery of astronomy, and its application – long distance voyaging – is the one thing that separates us Hawaiians from our other Polynesian brothers. It represents coming full circle from being masters of astronomy in the past to being the masters of astronomy in the future." Ex. C-17 at 3; Vol. 22, Tr. 1/5/17 at 92:10-17.
311. Outreach programs have been implemented by the observatory operators, including TIO, that are particularly effective in sparking interest in Hawai'i's youth for all types of STEM-related fields, not just astronomy. Every year the Journey Through the Universe program, a national program that focuses on science as a human endeavor, reaches over 7,000 elementary, middle, and high school students and is now well into its second decade. The HI-Star program trains local high school kids to participate in science fairs and go on to university careers in STEM fields. HI-Star alumni have received almost half a million dollars in prized fellowships and stipends, and have won local and national science fairs. The Akamai program provides internships, many of them for Native Hawaiians, in observatories and high-tech companies for jobs not just in astronomy, but across many industries. The Akamai program is designed to allow people to gain experience with different companies and different jobs. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 69:21-70:7. Akamai has a retention rate of close to 80% in STEM jobs, meaning 80% of the students are actually gaining employment at places where they apply. Vol. 5, Tr. 10/27/16 at 13:19-23.
312. The astronomy programs in the University System (undergraduate and graduate) are some of the finest and most attractive in the country. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 4-5; Tr. 10/27/16 at 12:2-14:4. University students currently have access to several of the existing telescopes on Mauna Kea. Tr. 01/12/17 at 55:15-20. The observatories recently added another element which is the Mauna Kea Scholars Program, where high school and middle school students can get viewing time on the telescopes for their projects. Tr.

10/27/16 at 12:25-13:3.

313. The University currently incorporates elements of Hawaiian navigation and astronomy into its outreach efforts. Tr. 10/27/16 at 110:7-111:21.
314. Heather Kaluna ("**Dr. Kaluna**"), a witness called by TIO, is a Native Hawaiian from the Big Island of Hawai'i who received her Ph.D in Astronomy in 2015. Here is her story:

"In 2002, I graduated from Pahoa High School and spent my first semester of college at the University of Hawai'i Manoa in the fall of 2002. After taking a pair of astronomy and physics courses that semester, I immediately fell in love with astronomy decided to pursue the astronomy degree at the University of Hawai'i at Hilo (which was the only place in the islands that offered an undergraduate degree at that time), and transferred the next semester. During my time at UH Hilo, I was an intern for the Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System (PanSTARRS) project and was tasked with leading public outreach efforts and educating the community about near-Earth asteroids. In the summer of 2007, I was also an Akamai intern at the University of California, Santa Cruz where I investigated far away galaxies and their companions. I also served as an intern under Dr. Marianne Takamiya for the Keaholoa STEM program, and studied the structures of galaxies. The Keaholoa STEM program was designed to provide research and training opportunities for minority students and also educated participants on local cultural perspectives. I received my Bachelors of Arts in Physics and Mathematics in the spring of 2008.

In 2008, I was accepted into the astronomy program at UH Manoa (IfA), where I spent seven years studying water on asteroids and trying to understand a possible source of Earth's water. Having such a strong connection to the ocean, I was very passionate about studying the evolution of water in our solar system. As a graduate student I conducted many observations using the UH 2.2m, Subaru, Keck, Gemini and IRTF telescopes. I applied for and utilized time that was appropriated to UH by each of the observatories. I completed my dissertation and received my PhD in 2015. I am now in a post-doctoral fellow at the Hawai'i Institute of Geophysics and Planetology. I am working with Paul Lucey on research conducted with the AEOS telescope on Haleakalā as well as data collected with NASA's Dawn spacecraft of the asteroids Vesta and Ceres." WDT of Dr. Heather Kaluna, page 1; Ex. C-8, page 1.

i. Community Benefits Package

315. The TMT Project has committed to a Community Benefits Package ("**CBP**"). A portion of the CBP funding commenced in 2014 upon the start of the TMT Project construction and was committed to continue throughout the TMT Observatory's presence, so long as the original CDUP was not invalidated or construction was not stayed by court order. However, even though the original CDUP has been invalidated, TIO has continued the CBP. As part of the CBP, TIO has provided \$1 million annually during such period to the THINK Fund; the dollar amount is adjusted annually using an appropriate inflation index. The funding is divided; \$750,000 is distributed through the Hawai'i Community Foundation and \$250,000 through the Pauahi Foundation. To date, TIO has remitted

\$630,000 to the Pauahi Foundation, and \$1.8 million to the Hawai‘i Community Foundation, a total of approximately \$2.5 million. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 13-14.

316. The \$2.5 million remitted to date has funded over sixty scholarships and \$100,000 in small grants for classroom projects for twenty-seven classrooms. The THINK Fund was the originator and initial contributor to the STEM Grant Learning Partnership program, giving \$400,000 in the first two years for this endeavor. Programs supported focus on key elements of building a strong STEM education system. Education initiatives are focused on K-5, 6-8, 9-12, and college. The program includes support for students to visit Imiloa Astronomy Center and the Mauna Kea observatories. *Id.* at 14. The CBP addresses concerns regarding providing educational opportunities and lack of resources, which were expressed by some members of the Native Hawaiian community. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 214:15-23.
317. The CBP helps to reduce the impact to cultural resources at the project site because it provides an understanding to the community about the values of Mauna Kea and science. Vol. 12, (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 22:20-23:15.
318. The Hawai‘i Community Foundation and the Pauahi Foundation decide which local organizations receive THINK Fund monies. TIO does not make this decision. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 237:2-8; Vol. 20, Tr. 1/3/16 at 58:8-11.

iv. Workforce Pipeline Program

319. The TMT Project is committed to partnering with UH Hilo, Hawai‘i Community College ("**HawCC**"), and the Department of Education ("**DOE**") to help develop, implement, and sustain a comprehensive, proactive, results-oriented Workforce Pipeline Program ("**WPP**") that will lead to a highly qualified pool of local workers who could be considered for hiring into most job classes and salary levels. Special emphasis will be given to those programs aimed at preparing local residents for science, engineering, and technical positions commanding higher wages. Therefore, there will be a significant component in the WPP for higher education on the Island of Hawai‘i. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 14.
320. In addition, the TMT Project is participating in a County of Hawai‘i Workforce Investment Board initiative with the Mauna Kea Observatories. The purpose of this initiative is to explore opportunities for marshaling existing community resources to introduce focused programs within the Hawai‘i Island community to provide the observatories with a broader and stronger qualified local labor pool, as candidates for careers in the local astronomy enterprise. *Id.*
321. Key elements of the WPP include:
 - (1) initiation of a TMT Project workforce committee including members from UH Hilo, HawCC, DOE, and Hawai‘i Island workforce development groups;
 - (2) identification of specific TMT Project job requirements that UH Hilo, HawCC, and DOE can use to create education and training programs, and ongoing support

for the identified programs;

- (3) earmarking of funds in the TMT Project's annual operations budget which can be used to support workforce development programs at suitable educational institutions;
- (4) TMT Project support for development and implementation of education and training programs, including at least 4 internships per semester, apprenticeships, and at least 10 summer jobs for students;
- (5) creation of a partnership between UH Hilo and the TMT Project's partner organizations, such as Caltech, the University of California system, and Canadian universities to attract and develop top talent;
- (6) support of, and active participation in, ongoing efforts to strengthen STEM education in Hawai'i Island K-12 schools and informal learning organizations; and
- (7) focusing the WPP program on long-term investments to strengthen the current STEM skills infrastructure, programs, and curricula at UH Hilo, HawCC, and Big Island K-12 education organizations, especially those serving lower income and first-generation college attending populations.

Id. at 13-14.

K. TMT PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES

322. Mitigation of impacts has been a fundamental component of the TMT Project from its inception and at all times thereafter. The TMT Project has already implemented and is committed to implementing a number of measures that are intended to mitigate the impacts of the Project. A comprehensive recitation of these measures can be found in the TMT FEIS, TMT CDUA and TMT Management Plan appended to the CDUA. Exs. A-1/R-1, A-3/R-3, A-4/R-4 and A-5/R-5.
323. The use of mitigation measures is a universally recognized and widely adopted means of lessening otherwise adverse impacts in land use projects. Ex. C-6 (WDT Callies) at 8.
324. The TMT Observatory has been sited at the 13N site, within Area E, north of and below the summit ridge. One of the principal reasons this location was chosen is to mitigate impacts on cultural and historic resources, viewplanes, and biological resources. As a direct result of locating the TMT Observatory at its chosen site, and although the TMT Observatory will be the largest dome and tallest built on Mauna Kea, as well as a new visual impact on the Northern Plateau, it: (1) will not be visible from culturally sensitive locations, such as the summit of Kūkahau'ūla, Lake Waiau, and Pu'u Līlīnoe; (2) is more than 200 feet from known historic properties; (3) will not be visible from Hilo and the southern portion of Hawai'i Island, including the Kona areas; and (4) is outside of the wēkiu bug's preferred habitat. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 15; Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 79:3-13; WDT Nagata at 9-10; Ex. A-48 at IX-37 to IX-39; Ex. A-68; Ex. A-69; Vol.

14, (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 34:24-35:4. Open space on the Northern Plateau would largely be preserved. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 79:14-80:12.

325. Petitioners contend that the location of the TMT Project on the Northern Plateau should not be considered a mitigation measure. *See, e.g.*, Ex. B.02a at 15-17; Ex. B.01a at 16; Ex. B.13a at 4; Vol. 24, Tr. 1/10/17 at 41:1-21; Vol. 27, Tr. 1/19/17 at 226:9-226:13, 226:9-226:13; Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 138:3-19; Vol. 32, (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 86:3-87:8.
326. Candace Lei Fujikane ("**Prof. Fujikane**"), a witness called by KAHEA, is an Associate Professor of English at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa where she has taught since 1995. Here is her story:

"I received a BA in English from UH Mānoa in 1990, and a Ph.D. in English from UC Berkeley in 1996. I am the Cultural Studies Concentration Advisor for the UH English Graduate Program, and I teach undergraduate and graduate foundations courses in literary and cultural studies, as well as classes on the literatures and mo'olelo (stories/histories) of Hawai'i, land struggles in Hawai'i and indigenous and critical cartography in Hawai'i. As an English professor, I teach the mo'olelo of Mauna a Wākea in my undergraduate courses and graduate seminars on the literatures of Hawai'i and literary and cultural studies. We trace the English translations back to the original Hawaiian texts in 'ōlelo Hawai'i, comparing the different versions and mapping them on the land.

I have published work on the mo'olelo (stories/histories) of Māui in Wai'anae, and my book manuscript examines indigenous and critical cartography in Hawai'i. I have been a board member of KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance since 2012.

I am also a member of Huaka'i i Nā 'Āina Mauna, a group led by Clarence Kūkauakahi Ching that has been walking the mountain lands since 2003. I have walked with Kū and others on the ancient kuamo'o (trails) of Mauna a Wākea since 2012. We have followed the path of Kāneikawaiola on Mauna a Wākea from Waiau down to the springs of Houpokāne, Waihūakāne, and Lilinoe, and we have walked Pōhakuloa at Pu'u Ke'ekē'e where the other springs Waiki'i, Anaohiku, and Kīpahe'ewai are said to have spread out from Mauna a Wākea to Hualalai, all the lands connected by the waters of Mauna a Wākea. This continuous path of water is recorded in the mo'olelo of Kamiki. We have walked the 'Umikoa-Ka'ula Trail from Pu'u Līlinoe to Pu'u Mākanaka, walking on the lands between Pu'u Poepoe, Pu'u Ala, Pu'u Hoaka, and Pu'u Māhoe. We have walked to the rim of Pu'u Kanakaleonui. We have also walked across the northern plateau, the proposed site of the TMT." WDT of Candace Fujikane, page 1. Ex. B.13a., page 1.

327. Prof. Fujikane opined that locating the TMT Project on the Northern Plateau should not be considered a mitigation measure because there was no room for the TMT Project on the summit anyway. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 225:25- 226:7.
328. Hayes testified that the TMT Project could have been considered for the summit. *See* Vol. 3, Tr. 10/25/16 at 209:21- 210:7. Further, the Master Plan specified Area E as a preferred location for a next generation large telescope because of the minimum impact on existing facilities, wēkiu bug habitat, archaeological sites, and viewplanes while

providing suitable observation viewing conditions. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 4.

329. Applicants assert that the Project location on the Northern Plateau was chosen in large part to avoid the most culturally sensitive areas of the summit ridge region, and supports the finding that the location of the TMT Project was intended to be, and is, a significant mitigation measure. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 15; WDT Nagata at 9-10; Ex. A-48 at IX-37 to IX-39.

330. The TMT Access Way's physical and visual impacts have been directly mitigated by:

- (1) designing the Access Way to reduce the potential for both physical and visual impacts to the historic properties and potential impacts to natural resources known to be in the vicinity;
- (2) limiting the southern 750-foot long portion of the Access Way to a single lane even though such a configuration is not desirable from an operational standpoint;
- (3) aligning most of the Access Way to follow an existing single-lane, 4-wheel drive road that was built in the 1960s for access and testing of the 13N site;
- (4) paving the portion of the Access Way within the boundaries of Kūkahau'ula on the flank of Pu'u Hau'oki to reduce dust;
- (5) coloring the pavement and guardrail a reddish color that blends with the surrounding area; and
- (6) placing the utilities to the TMT Observatory within the Access Way and beneath the paved roadway instead of on a different or parallel alignment that would cause more ground disturbance.

Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 15-16; Vol. 3, Vol. 3, Tr. 10/25/16 at 134:4-135:8; Ex. C-3.

331. The option selected for the placement of the TMT Access Way was the one recommended by SHPD of the DLNR to minimize adverse effects on Kūkahau'ula. Page 3-9 of Ex. B to Ex. A-1/R-1.

332. The TMT Observatory has been designed to mitigate its visual impact by:

- (1) reducing the size of the dome through the use of a Calotte-type dome;
- (2) designing the telescope to be much shorter than usual given its mirror size;
- (3) designing the dome to fit very tightly around the telescope;
- (4) finishing the dome with a reflective aluminum-like surface, which during the day reflects the sky and reduces the visibility of the structure; and
- (5) finishing the support building and fixed structure exterior with a lava color.

Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 19-21; Vol. 3, Tr. 10/25/16 at 124:24-125:17, 133:5-134:3.

333. While the design mitigation measures reduce certain costs, they also increase both cost and technical risk in other areas. The mitigation measures also will make maintenance of the observatory more difficult. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 70:11-71:16. For example, if the TMT telescope used the same f/1.75 design as the Keck Observatory, then the dome would be 256 ft. high and 261 ft. wide. To reduce the dome size, TMT will use an f/1 design so that the telescope will be shorter. Such a design requires more expensive mirrors, is harder to maintain, and creates more technical risk. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 18:2-19:25. The result is a dome that is 180 feet high. For reference, the Magellan Telescope, which has a smaller mirror measuring 24 meters in diameter, is 200 ft. high. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 21:24- 22:5; Ex. C-23.
334. The TMT Project will camouflage certain HELCO electrical pull-boxes and other utility boxes that are visually distracting or intrusive at the summit of Mauna Kea and other key locations visible from other portions of Kūkahau‘ūla. The method of camouflage will be determined through consultation with Kahu Kū Mauna and may include one of the following options: (1) painting the covers to match the surrounding natural colors; and (2) affixing stones and cinders from the vicinity to the exposed utility box. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 17; Page A-9 of App. A of Exhibit B to Ex. A-1/R-1.
335. A zero-discharge self-contained wastewater system will be installed at the TMT Observatory. All wastewater generated at the TMT Observatory will be transported off-site to an approved treatment facility for treatment and disposal. The discharge of wastewater within the summit region has been identified as an impact on cultural resources and is one of the reasons for this mitigation measure. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 21.
336. There will be three 5,000-gallon Underground Storage Tanks ("UST") to the northwest of the support building; one each for potable water, wastewater and chemical waste. There will also be a 25,000-gallon UST for fire suppression, and an above ground tank for diesel fuel for the emergency generators. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 84:8-15.
337. The TMT Project will install water efficient fixtures and implement water saving practices to reduce the demand for freshwater resources. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 22.
338. The TMT Project, including its USTs, is designed to survive conceivable seismic disturbances. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 79:10-15.
339. The TMT Project will implement a Waste Minimization Plan ("WMP") and institute an annual WMP audit, which will include an examination of: (1) waste produced by the TMT Project and how that waste could be reduced, reused, or recycled; (2) water use by the TMT Project and how that use could be reduced; and (3) energy use by the TMT Project and how that could be reduced. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 22.
340. The TMT Project will recycle solid and non-hazardous waste materials and reuse them to

the extent possible. *Id.*

341. The TMT Project will implement a Materials Storage/Waste Management Plan, including a Spill Prevention and Response Plan. This plan will require: (1) daily inspections of equipment handling hazardous materials; (2) mandatory training of all personnel handling hazardous materials and wastes; (3) regular inspections by a Safety and Health Officer; (4) that all solid waste be collected in secured and covered storage containers; and (5) that all waste be transported down the mountain for proper disposal at an off-site facility. *Id.*
342. The TMT Project will implement a mandatory Ride-Sharing Program for TMT Observatory employees to travel beyond Hale Pōhaku. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-25. This program will reduce the number of vehicle trips to the summit and, in turn, will also reduce the amount of noise and dust generated by vehicles. Ex. A-1/R-1 at Table 2.1, pp. 4-25 to 4-26.
343. At the conclusion of construction of the TMT Observatory, a portion of the Batch Plant Staging Area will be restored. Page A-9 of App. A to Ex. B of Ex. A-1/R-1; Vol. 12, (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 62:10-15.
344. The TMT Project will fund the restoration of the closed access road on Pu‘u Poli‘ahu in accordance with plans already submitted by the IfA and approved by the DLNR. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 16-17; Page A-9 of App. A to Ex. B of Ex. A-1/R-1.
345. The TMT Project will support, through financial contributions and utilization of its outreach office, the development of educational exhibits related to Mauna Kea. The exhibits will: (1) be developed in coordination with OMKM and UH Hilo’s ‘Imiloa Astronomy Center (“**‘Imiloa**”); (2) address the cultural, natural, and historic resources of Mauna Kea; (3) be developed for use at the Mauna Kea Visitor Information Station (“**VIS**”), ‘Imiloa, TMT Project facilities, and other appropriate locations; and (4) include informational materials that explore the connection between Hawaiian culture and astronomy. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 16
346. The CMP requires that all users on the mountain receive an orientation prior to going up the mountain for the first time and MKMB policy requires that all users receive that orientation at least every three years. Vol. 13, Tr. 12/6/16 at 88:13-90:7. Since the orientation began in 2013, 1,537 people have attended the orientation and, beginning in 2016, those who took the orientation in 2013 have begun their renewal process. Ex. A-22. The current focus is to incorporate contractors and vendors and ensure all observatory staff have taken the orientation within the past three years. WDT Klasner at 7.
347. The TMT Project will institute a Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program that all TMT Project staff and all construction workers will be required to attend annually. The training is approximately 1-hour and is considered sufficient to convey a sense of the need to be respectful to cultural and natural resources. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 63:14-22; 65:25- 66:5. The content of the training program will be determined by OMKM. The

program is intended to educate attendees on the sensitive natural, cultural, archaeological, and historic resources of Mauna Kea, the cultural practices exercised on Mauna Kea, and the measures to prevent potential impact to such resources. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 16; Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 210:23-211:1, 212:2-11. Workers who have not taken the training will not be allowed to work on Mauna Kea. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 212:12-16.

348. Kū Hinahinakūikahakai Kahakalau, a witness called by the Flores-Case `Ohana, is "a native Hawaiian educator, researcher, scholar, composer and recognized expert in Hawaiian language and culture." WDT of Kū Kahakalau; Ex. B.06a. Here is her story:

"I am Dr. Kū Hinahinakūikahakai Kahakalau. I was born in Honolulu, but have lived in Kukuihaele on Hawai‘i Island since 1991. My grandfather was William Keahonui Kahakalau. He was pure Hawaiian, born and raised in Kalihi, a native speaker of the Hawaiian language, and a talented Hawaiian musicians, entertainer and teacher. My Hawaiian family comes from the islands of Maui, Moloka‘i, O‘ahu and Hawai‘i Island.

I am a native Hawaiian educator, researcher, scholar, composer and recognized expert in Hawaiian language and culture. I hold a Bachelor’s in Secondary Education and a Professional Diploma in Hawaiian Language, and a Master’s Degree in European Languages and Literature (focusing on German literature about Hawai‘i). Moreover, I am the first person in the world to earn a Ph.D. in Indigenous Education. I have over 30 years of experience teaching Hawaiian language, history and cultural studies to learners of all ages and levels, in and outside of the classroom. I have developed and implemented multiple educational pilots and spent over two decades researching the impact of Hawaiian-focused education on native learners. I have lectured all over the world on diverse aspects of Hawaiian language and culture revitalization through culturally-driven models of education. I am also an active community leader, serving on multiple non-profit boards, representing Hāmākua for eight (8) years on the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council and currently serving as Chairperson of the Hawai‘i County Board of Ethics.

I began to pursue my academic study of everything Hawaiian in 1981 at Kapi‘olani Community College (KCC). I literally took every college class with the word "Hawai‘i" offered then at KCC and later at UH Mānoa. More importantly, I spent countless hours learning from esteemed kūpuna, many of whom were mānaleo, or native speakers, from Ni‘ihau to Ka‘ū about our language, our values, our daily practices and protocols, and our traditional ways, including our spiritual practices. In fact, my husband and I base our personal family practices on the mana‘o shared with us by highly knowledgeable kūpuna and cultural experts over the past three decades. In addition to kūpuna teachings, our practices are informed by primary sources like Malo’s Hawaiian Antiquities, which we have studied extensively individually and in various high level groups.

As cultural practitioners, our family regularly engages in Hawaiian ceremonies and protocol and we have raised our two daughters in these traditions, which include daily family protocols, healing rituals, monthly ceremonies based on the moon cycle, multiple yearly makahiki and other ceremonies like house blessings, graduations etc. We have

shared these practices with interested learners from youth to elders, and spearheaded a Hale Mua for kāne and a Hale Papa for wahine, focusing on our roles and responsibilities as kāne and wahine.

I am currently Program Director for Organizational Capacity at INPEACE, a Hawaiian nonprofit organization headquartered in Kapolei, as well as CEO of Kū-A-Kanaka, a native Hawaiian social enterprise providing Hawaiian language and culture products and services, educational consulting and research and evaluation for Hawaiian-focused and other Indigenous programs. I am also the founder and former director of Kanu o ka 'Āina New Century Public Charter School, Hālau Wānana Indigenous Center for Higher Learning, Mālamapōki'i Early Childhood Program, the Kanu o ka 'Āina Learning 'Ohana and Kauhale 'Ōiwi o Pu'ukapu, all located in Waimea on Hawai'i Island. This family of programs is grounded in a Pedagogy of Aloha, which I developed as part of my doctoral research in Indigenous Education. This Pedagogy is also known as Education with Aloha, or EA and has been documented to bring about significant, positive changes for Hawaiian K-12 students. Specifically, providing not just Hawaiians, but all who are interested, a solid grounding in native Hawaiian language, culture and traditions has shown increased socio-emotional well-being (e.g., identity, self-efficacy, social relationships), increased math and reading test scores, particularly for those with low socio-emotional development, significant increases in graduation and college going rates, impressive student and parent satisfaction, significant decreases in absenteeism, and an exceptional commitment to being responsible 21st century global citizens, evidenced by helping others, protecting the environment and making the world a better place.

Over the years, I have received many awards including the Order of Princess Pauahi from the Kamehameha Schools. This is the highest and most distinguished award given to those whose extraordinary lifetime contributions have positively impacted the Hawaiian community and who exemplify the values and vision of the Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop." WDT of Kū Kahakalau at pages 1-2; Ex. B.06a. at pages 1-2.

349. Dr. Kahakalau is opposed to the construction of the TMT on Mauna Kea. WDT of Kū Kahakalau at page 2; Ex. B.06a. at page 2. She is critical of the Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program because she believes that an annual training is inadequate for any employee to gain an understanding and respect for any cultural and religious practices, and/or sensitivity to the negative impacts on cultural resources. Ex. B.06a (WDT Dr. Kahakalau) at 5. Dr. Kahakalau testified that: "Well, again, my personal belief is that there is no place for the TMT or any other observatories on top of Mauna Kea, and that they need to not be built and be decommissioned ASAP. So that is – that's my belief, that this is not the place to build anything. If you want to get buried up there and your Ohana wants to put you up there, you know, that is a personal decision. But for me, it's that there is no place for TMT up in the wao akua, any wao akua, in this case its Mauna Kea." Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 195:8-195:17. Dr. Kahakalau's opinion is that the building of the TMT on Mauna Kea is non-negotiable, no matter what evidence is presented. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 116:22-117:6.
350. Dr. Kū Kahakalau criticized the TMT Project's proposed educational contributions, stating that for native Hawaiians, something is only educational if it follows their value

system. Tr. 1/9/17 at 33:25-34:5.

351. In addition to those mitigation measures at the project-level, the University has also proposed area-wide mitigation measures, including formally and legally binding itself to the commitment that this is the last new area on the mountain where a telescope project will be contemplated or sought, and has committed to decommission the Caltech Submillimeter Observatory, Hoku Ke‘a, and the United Kingdom Infra-red Telescope by the time TMT is operational. Exhibit A-39; WDT Dr. McLaren at 3-4; *see also* Ex. A-13. These actions go beyond simply addressing the impact of the TMT Project in a vacuum. They will substantially mitigate existing area adverse impacts of the astronomy sites on Mauna Kea as a whole and therefore on claimed impacts to native Hawaiian traditional and customary rights. Ex. C-6 (WDT Callies) at 8.

L. TMT PROJECT DECOMMISSIONING

352. At the end of the TMT Observatory’s useful life, the TMT Observatory and the portion of the Access Way exclusively used to access the TMT Observatory will be dismantled and the site restored in compliance with the Decommissioning Plan. TMT will take approximately 3-4 years to decommission. Vol. 7, Tr. 11/2/16 at 201:16-20. Deconstruction and site restoration efforts will be managed by TMT Project staff with oversight by OMKM. TIO is committed to adequately fund decommissioning. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 11- 12; Vol. 7, (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 233:8-17. Even if the General Lease, which expires in 2033, is not extended, TIO members have committed to providing the funds needed for decommissioning of the TMT Observatory and portion of the Access Way exclusively used to access the TMT Observatory. Vol. 18, (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 120:7-121:2, 178:7-179:6; Vol. 7, (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 201:16-20.
353. Excess landscape materials removed from the site during construction will be stored at the Batch Plant so that they can be used to restore the TMT Project site as best as possible upon decommissioning. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 58:16-24.
354. In compliance with the Decommissioning Plan, TMT Project staff will develop a Site Restoration Plan ("**SRP**") that will present specific targets for site restoration and describe the methodology for restoring disturbed areas after the demolition/construction activities described in the Site Deconstruction and Removal Plan ("**SDRP**") for the TMT Project are completed. Under the Decommissioning Plan, the two primary objectives of site restoration are: (1) restoring the look and feel of the summit prior to construction of the observatories; and (2) providing habitat for the aeolian arthropod fauna. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 12; Ex. A-13 at 22-26.
355. The level of restoration to be performed and the potential impact of the restoration activities on natural and cultural resources will be carefully evaluated in the SRP and in consultation with OMKM and DLNR. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 60:2-14. Specific factors that are required to be considered during the development of the SRP include cultural sensitivity. WDT Dr. Sanders at 12. TMT employees took approximately 960 photographs of the site, over 600 photographs of the Batch Plant area, and aerial

photographs to a resolution of 2- 3 inches to document the original conditions so that the site may be restored as close to its original condition as possible upon decommissioning. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 39:1-14; Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 58:16-19, 60:2-24.

356. Site restoration activities may involve using cinder or materials similar to the surroundings either to fill holes or to reconstruct topography. Consideration will be given to where fill material will come from, how excavation and removal of materials will impact the collection area and any wēkiu bug habitat surrounding the restoration area, and the cultural considerations related to bringing materials from a different area on Hawai‘i Island to Mauna Kea. Upon the completion of site restoration, monitoring of the restoration activities will begin and continue for at least three years. Results of monitoring activities will be submitted to OMKM. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 12.
357. Some underground facilities may be left in place because removing them could cause more of a disturbance than leaving them. This decision will be during the planning and review of the decommissioning process, however, the starting point for determining the level to restore the site begins with full restoration. Vol. 21, Tr. 01/04/17 at 61:3-21; Ex. A-13 at 26.
358. During decommissioning of the TMT Observatory, there may be temporary adverse impacts due to noise, traffic, dust, visual intrusion, and the increase in human presence on the mountain. Possible adverse impacts during construction and decommissioning also include potential disturbance beyond project limits. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-7; Vol. 8, Tr. 11/15/16 at 147:18-24.

M. FUNDING

359. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors argue that the CDUA should be denied because TIO does not yet have all the funds necessary to build the TMT Project. *See, e.g.*, B.19a at 5, 6-7.
360. Dr. Sanders, the Project Manager for the TMT Project, provided testimony that TIO has already received substantial funds and will undertake additional fundraising efforts once a decision has been made as to the project approval. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 35:15-20. The members of TIO have committed to providing their respective shares of the operating budget. Vol. 20, (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 55:1-6. If the TMT Project is permitted, sufficient funds would be committed to decommission it by the current termination of the General Lease in 2033. Vol. 7, (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/02/16 at 233:8-17.
361. Petitioner Ching posited that the TMT Project has not taken proper steps to ensure funding of the project. Ching cites Section II(C) of the Mauna Kea Plan (1977), which provides that "[n]o application or any proposed facility shall have final approval without the applicant having first filed with the Board, adequate security equal to the amount of the contract to construct the telescope facilities, support facilities and to cover any other direct or indirect costs attributed to the project[.]" Ching argues that, to comply with the foregoing, a bond in the amount of the contract to construct the project (and ancillary

facilities) must be posted before the CDUA can be approved. Ex. B.19a at 6-7; Ex. B.17g; Vol. 29, Tr. 1/24/17 at 215:9-21.

362. The Mauna Kea Plan (1977) is a "policy guide" and "a policy framework for the management of Mauna Kea." Ex. B.17g at 6, 16. The plan indicates that it is "conceptual" and must be reviewed and updated as time goes on, and circumstances change. *Id.* at 16. It was the first "master plan" for Mauna Kea and consists of 17 pages. It has obviously been superseded by the much more detailed and extensive planning efforts that are described elsewhere in these findings of fact.

N. THE OCCL REPORT RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF CDUA

363. On February 25, 2011, OCCL submitted its staff report recommending that DLNR approve the University's CDUA. Ex. A-7/R-7; Ex. A-8/R-8; Ex. A-24; Ex. A-25. Lemmo, the administrator of OCCL and signatory to the OCCL report, testified that in drafting its recommendation, OCCL consulted the CDUA, the FEIS, the CMP and subplans, and comments from members of the community and various state agencies. Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 34:8-34:17, 40:3-41:1; 83:5-83:14, 84:23-85:1; Vol. 41, Tr. 2/27/17 at 218:14-17, 219- 220, 222-223; Ex. A-7/R-7.
364. OCCL's conclusion that astronomy is an economically and environmentally sustainable use was the result of very difficult, deep analysis, reflection, and concern. It looked at all actions in the context of the setting in which the action might take place, the framework that is currently in place, and the outcomes that it believes will occur if it should recommend approval. Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 65:10-66:6.
365. OCCL's recommendation was based upon its finding that:
- a. The TMT Project had done everything possible to absolutely mitigate or ameliorate cultural, ecological, recreational effects of placing the largest telescope in the world on the summit of Mauna Kea. Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 65:10-66:6; Ex. A-7/R-7 at 19-21, 59-61.
 - b. The TMT Observatory will not be built in critical habitat for the wēkiu bug or any species of concern. Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 66:22-67:3; Ex. A-7/R-7 at 6, 45, 50-51.
 - c. The TMT Project is proposed to be located on the north slope, away from traditional cultural properties ("TCPs"). A portion of the Access Way will traverse the lower portion of Kūkahau'ula. There are no known burial sites, ahu, or other historic features near the project area. Historic maps do not show any paths crossing the Northern Plateau where the TMT is being proposed. The proposed location is removed from the Kūkahau'ula Summit and other identified culturally significant features. Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 66:22-67:3; 67:25-68:9; Ex. A-7/R7 at 49-50, 59; Ex. A-59 at 39.
 - d. The TMT Project will bring significant funds to Hawai'i that will be used to reinvest in Mauna Kea. It also will provide needed blue-collar and professional

jobs. The financial and other resources that TMT will bring will improve the University's ability to implement many of the management plan actions. Ex. A-7/R-7 at 45, 60; Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 68:10- 68:18.

- e. A strong management regime, approved by the BLNR, is now in place for caring for the mountain's resources. The management framework consists of a comprehensive management plan with the subplans, resource plans, cultural plans, public access plans, and decommissioning plans. Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 68:19-69:1; Ex. A-7/R-7 at 46- 47, 60.
366. Lemmo further testified that the TMT Project met all eight of the criteria applicable to conservation district use applications, as set forth in HAR § 13-5-30, and thus, he recommended approval of the CDUA to the BLNR. OCCL considered the cultural and religious issues and concluded that the site location below the summit ridge in Area E mitigated the impacts of the new telescope in the area. While the TMT Project represents an incremental impact, the TMT Project in and of itself is not a significant impact in the context of the proposed mitigation measures and the already existing significant impacts within the Astronomy Precinct. Vol. 42, Tr. 2/28/17 at 66:7-70:22.

III. MAUNA KEA CONSIDERED SACRED

367. Ku'ulei Kanahele, a witness called by KAHEA, is a researcher with the Edith Kanaka'ole Foundation. Here is her story:

"My name is Ku'ulei Kanahele and I am the lead Papahūhūhonua (earth science) researcher with the Edith Kanaka'ole Foundation, a Hawaiian cultural-based organization whose mission is to heighten indigenous Hawaiian cultural awareness, knowledge, and participation through educational programs. My primary duty is to interpret traditional Hawaiian chants to understand how our ancestors lived and thrived in our island environment. Understanding traditional chants is important because chants document centuries of environmental observations and is the method our ancestors used to record that information. I have presented my findings locally, nationally and internationally, most recently to Google X and the Hōkūle'a Mālama Honua Worldwide Voyage as well as at the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress.

Aside from my work at the Edith Kanaka'ole Foundation, I am an instructor at the Hawai'i Community College, where I have taught Hawaiian language since 1998. I have my Masters in Education from Central Michigan University and I am currently a graduate student at the University of Hawai'i at Hilo, where I am earning my Ph.D. in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization.

I am writing to provide my testimony on the hydrology of Maunakea from a Hawaiian worldview." WDT of Kuulei Kanahele; Ex. B.11a.

368. Mauna Kea is born of the gods Wakea and Papa, these same gods are also the progenitors of the Hawaiian race. Kanahele, Vol. 29, Tr. 1/24/17, at 143:1-9; Ex. B.11a at 2.

369. The summit of Mauna Kea is wao akua, the place where the gods reside, where water, snow and mists are found, far removed from the wao kanaka where humans can reside. Vol. 29, Kanahele, Tr. 1/24/17, at 143-44:25-3.
370. Citing to E O E Mauna Kea, in her testimony Kanahele described the specific water akua residing in Mauna Kea wao akua, being Poliahu, Lilinoe, Waiau and Kalauakolea, the snow, the mists, the lake and the fog drip. Vol. 29, Tr. 1/24/17, at 148; Ex. 8.11a, p.3.
371. It is the belief of Hawaiian people that the summit of Mauna Kea touches the sky in a unique and important way, as a piko by which connections to the ancestors are made known to the them, as, too, is their collective knowledge. Vol. 29, Tr. 1/24/17, at 147-49: 21-25, 1-25.
372. Mauna Kea can be considered the piko ho'okahi, the single navel, which ensures spiritual connections, genealogical connections, and the rights to the regenerative powers of all that is Hawai'i. It is from this "world navel" that the Hawai'i axis emerges. Ex. A009 at ii.
373. Mauna Kea is an ancestor. It was a purpose of the birth chant, E O E Mauna Kea, to establish the relationship of the Hawaiian people to their primordial parents, Papa and Wakea, and to their ancestor, Mauna Kea. Kanahele, Vol. 29, Tr. 1/24/17, at 162: 3-11.
374. Mauna Kea is considered sacred by people all over the world. Neves, Vol. 33, Tr. 1/31/17, at 193:21-25. However, it is specifically the calling of Native Hawaiians to maintain their relationship with Mauna Kea. Vol. 33, Tr. 1/24/17, at 206-207. "We were given this kuleana...we [have] to do all the things we do to keep that mountain in unblemished form." Vol. 33, Tr. 1/31/17, at 207:19-22.
375. In fact, Mauna Kea, as the first born of Papa and Wakea and piko of the island, has all the hallmarks of what Mircea Eliade referred to as a "sacred center". McCoy Ex. A-122 at 7-11.
376. The TMT FEIS states that the upper mountain region, is a sacred landscape. The TMT FEIS states: "Due to the spiritual and sacred attributes of Maunakea [sic] in Native Hawaiian traditions, traditional and customary cultural practices are performed in the summit region, including. . . Practices associated with the belief in that the upper mountain region of Mauna Kea, from the Saddle area up to the summit is a sacred landscape, personifying the spiritual and physical connection between one's ancestors, history, and the heavens." Ex A003 (TMT FEIS) at S-4.
377. Adopting the same interpretation as that of witness Kuulei Kanahele of Mauna Kea as hiapo to all native Hawaiians and the origin point or piko of the island, McCoy describes the ascent of Mauna Kea as "a walk upward and backward in time to cosmological origins" and opines that "[b]ased on the large number of shrines in the summit area it is clear that Hawaiians went to the top of the mountain with a sacred purpose in mind....[t]he ritual landscape that exists today is almost certainly the result of journeys by a number of families and adze makers over many generations." Ex. A-122 at 7-12.

378. McCoy opines that archaeological evidence of ascent and descent routes littered with lithic artifacts, ritual stations, burials, and propitiation ahu, supports a pan-island production system having political and land use implications on the Island of Hawai‘i. Ex. A-122 at 7-43 to 7-49, 7-60 to 7-61; Fig 7.6 at 7-46.
379. The Applicant called one archaeologist to testify in the course of these proceedings, Richard Nees ("**Nees**"), on December 5, 2017. Nees is a Senior Archaeologist with Pacific Consulting Services, Inc. ("**PCSI**"); he has worked at PCSI for 28 years. He received a B.A. degree from Arizona State University in 1988. In his words: "I have actively participated in archaeological field work contracted by the Office of Mauna Kea Management ("**OMKM**") to PCSI since 2005, and have co-authored numerous archeological inventory survey reports for Mauna Kea. I was the Field Director or Field supervisor for archaeological inventory surveys by PCSI n the Mauna Kea Science Reserve ("**MKSR**"), the Mauna Kea Access Road Corridor, and Hale Pōhaku, as well as the archaeological survey of the Mauna Kea Ice Age Natural Area Reserve to the south of the MKSR. Since 2011, I have led annual monitoring inspections of the historic properties identified within the lease lands held by the University of Hawai‘i on Mauna Kea." WDT of Richard Nees; UHH Witness; filed 10/11/2016.
380. Nees worked with Dr. Patrick McCoy from 2005 through 2013 in his work on Mauna Kea. Vol. 12, Tr. 12/5/17, at 121:21-25.
381. Nees is listed as the coauthor of Ex. A 122. *Id.* Vol. 12 at 121:9-19.
382. Nees agrees with the conclusions of A 122 as they relate to the sacredness of Mauna Kea and the activities that took place there. *Id.* Vol. 12 at 123:8-25, at 124: 1-13.
383. Nees agreed that the activities which took place in the adze quarry took place throughout the upper mountain region. *Id.* Vol 12 at 125: 2-25.
384. Nees stated that he drew Figure 7.6 on page 7-46 of Exhibit A122. *Id.* Vol 12 at 126: 1-25, at 127: 1-25, at 128: 1-5. He also confirmed his agreement with the conclusions in the report as to what is depicted in Fig. 7.6.
385. Manulani Aluli Meyer, a witness called by Flores-Case ‘Ohana, is a Professor of Education in the field of Indigenous Epistemology. Here is her story:
- "I am Manulani Aluli Meyer, the fifth daughter of Emma Aluli and Harry Meyer. The Aluli ohana hail from Mokapu, Kailua, Kamamalu, Kohala, Hilo One and Wailuku – Oahu, Hawai‘i, Maui. I am a 30+ year practitioner of hooponopono [healing process through ritualized communication], and a scholar-practitioner of Hawaiian knowledge working as a Wilderness Instructor and Outdoor Educator for 20+ years, and as a Professor of Education for 15+. My work is in the field of Indigenous Epistemology or Philosophy of Knowledge as it applies to world-wide awakening within systems [ie: education, economics, evaluation, prison reform, health]. I earned my Doctorate from Harvard University in 1998 on this topic and have taught at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo – Education Department; at Te Wananga o Aotearoa – largest Maori University in NZ; and currently as the Director of Indigenous Education at the University of Hawai‘i

West Oahu. I now evaluate Indigenous PhD's from around the globe, and discuss/write about native knowledge systems throughout multiple countries and universities. My job now is to assist the University of Hawai'i to become a clearly definitive and inspiring Indigenous serving higher education system." WDT of Dr. Manulani Aluli Meyer, Ex. B.05a.

Dr. Aluli Meyer believes that we cultivate transpatial relationships with Mauna Kea, or relationships that transcend space and distance. WDT of Dr. Manulani Aluli Meyer, Ex. B.05a. at 1.

According to Dr. Aluli Meyer, indigenous epistemologies, or ways of knowing, are integral for understanding those things that are ineffable, or too grand to be measured for value using "mainstream" or "empirical" methods. Mauna Kea, she argues, is one such entity that must be understood with indigenous wisdom if we are to truly understand why it is "beloved" to people. WDT of Dr. Manulani Aluli Meyer, Ex. B.05a. at 2.

386. Dr. Aluli Meyer explained "Kū Kia'i Mauna": "You know, there are manifestations of Ku, but for me it's a synonym for what the animation principle of your life is. So stand within your own life force and – and be something erect, pono, powerful, nurturing, inspiring. Be the first the sun wants to touch, Kū Kia'i Mauna, care for our beloved inspiration." Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 32:15-21.
387. Dr. Aluli Meyer affirmed that Mauna Kea was identified by Hawaiian ancestors as a place of great healing. She explained that it was wao akua, a presence. "Every sunrise you're renewed, every sunset you're rejuvenated. So the relationship one has is the point not the gawking but the relationship. And Mauna Kea has always been inspiring for me, living in Hilo Pali Ku." Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 84:6-12.
388. Spirituality, as Dr. Aluli Meyer explained, is often confused with religion. Indigenous epistemologies, or ways of knowing, similarly, are often dismissed as "soft science" by the so-called "hard sciences." But this leads to dysfunction. Spirituality is real and should not be confused with religion. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 117:21-119:5.
389. Dr. Aluli Meyer explained that wailua, or spirit, is a reality. Although it is unseen, and therefore has no form, we see the expression of wailua in life: in places, in natural elements, etc. If these things are then polluted, then the spirit will find its end. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 120:5-19.
390. Dr. Aluli Meyer affirmed that the proposed mitigation that the "TMT project facilities will be furnished with items to provide a sense of place and acknowledge the cultural sensitivity and spiritual attributes of Mauna Kea" is not a sufficient mitigation to allow for the building of the TMT on Mauna a Wakea. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 139:1-11.
391. Dr. Aluli Meyer affirms that continuing to change or drastically alter the environment will force native Hawaiians to also compromise cultural values and relationships with the environment, relationships that are found within indigenous epistemologies. WDT of Dr. Manulani Aluli Meyer, Ex. B.05a. at 1.

392. Dr. Aluli Meyer articulated that "mainstream" interpretations of "ownership" in a capitalist system allow for exclusion and not for the "necessity of care," which has ultimately led to the "destruction of our planet." Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 28:13-21.
393. Dr. Aluli Meyer made the distinction that "spirituality" has nothing to do with "religion" and that being asked for physical evidence of "religion," like a church, collapses spirituality. It implies that there is only one way, one truth, one agreed upon way of being. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 39:16-40:3.
394. Spirituality, as Dr. Aluli Meyer explained, is a "synonym for indigeneity and for continuity and therefore aloha." Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 41:6-7.
395. As an employee of the University of Hawai'i system, hired under the Papa o ke Ao directive, Dr. Aluli Meyer affirmed that the University's application for another facility on Mauna Kea is not in alignment with the University's strategic directive to become an indigenous serving institution. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 109:14-110:11.
396. Dr. Aluli Meyer discussed why the TMT is not appropriate for our time. She stated that there are other ways to learn about the stars. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 110:12-14.
397. Dr. Aluli Meyer defined culture as the "best practices of a group of people specific to a place over time." Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 48:6-7. She contends that Hawaiian "love of land" is what allowed Hawaiians to survive in Hawai'i. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 48:7-8.
398. Dr. Aluli Meyer testified that the TMT project will adversely impact traditional cultural practices as well as cultural and spiritual views of the mauna. Vol. 31, Tr. 1/26/17 at 69:23-70:13
399. Hawane Rios, a witness called by Opposing Intervenor Mehana Kihoi, is a Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) cultural practitioner. Here is Ms. Rios' story:

"O wau 'o Hāwane. 'O Mauna a Wākea ku'u mauna, 'o Kohākohau ku'u kahawai, a 'o Pu'ukapu, Waimea ku'u 'āina kūlāiwi.

My name is Hāwane Rios, my mountain is Mauna Kea, my river is Kohākohau, and the land that raised me is Pu'ukapu, Waimea on the island of Hawai'i. I am a descendant of Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior 1778 as established through my genealogical lines of 'Umihulumakaokalanikia'imauna'o'Āwini and Ka'ā'īkaulakaleikauilahāmakanoē Naweluokekikipa'a. My ancestors come from the 'Āiwni Valley of the Kohala Mountains connecting me and my bloodline to a lineage of indigenous peoples rooted in honoring the land, waterways, and all living beings. The practice of aloha 'āina – to love and care for the land, was passed down by these same ancestors through the generations all the way to my mother and then to me. It is a practice of our people to know where we come from, to remember our creation story and how our family genealogies connect to it. I offer this part of our genealogical creation story here to create a space of better understanding as to why I stand to protect Mauna a Wākea from the further destruction and desecration of the Thirty Meter Telescope." WDT of Hawane Rios, page 1; Ex. F-5 at page 1.

400. Ms. Rios testified that she descends from a line of "seers, of medicine people" and that healing is in her lineage; this is where her practices come from. She is also a dancer and chanter. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 130:21-131:9.
401. Ms. Rios testified that Mauna Kea is a temple, one of highest significance, a place of prayer and worship where ceremonies are conducted. These ceremonies are about the supreme law of the universe. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 131:20-132:7.
402. Ms. Rios testified that she is a haka, a seer, a medium that has received these gifts genealogically. This is a traditional gift that allows her to receive ancestral insight. Her mediumship has taken place on Mauna Kea in areas at the Northern Plateau, Lake Waiau and different pu'u. Mediumship allows her to receive information that others like archaeologists might not receive. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 142:5-144:18.
403. Ms. Rios testified that she has received ancestral knowledge through mediumship in areas on the Northern Plateau. Ms. Rios explained the significance of shrines along the Northern Plateau, their connection to one another, their alignment with the constellations and tides at certain times of the year, and that they are portals which connect to celestial bodies of the universe. In particular, the Northern Plateau is a place of learning, a celestial realm in the cosmos that is also connected to voyaging. She describes the Northern Plateau as "a very sacred space of higher learning, spiritual learning, higher consciousness." These shrines were built and cared for by certain families and that there is knowledge that is embedded into the site. She explained that: "The knowledge from these ancient beings of a celestial realm and of the kupuna realm are in the fabric of the mountain. They are a part of the portal that exists there. They're not separate. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 149:21-152:11.
404. Ms. Rios testified that by destroying one particular site or ahu you cause destruction to others. If built, the TMT project would cause destruction to some of these sites severing, permanently closing, access to knowledge of the celestial realm. Vol. 36, Tr. 2/15/17 at 153:1-21.
405. Petitioner B. Pualani Case ("Pua Case" or "Ms. Case"), is a native Hawaiian cultural practitioner and more. Here is her story:

"I am, B. Pualani Case, member of the Flores-Case 'Ohana, residing in Pu'ukapu, Waimea, Kohala Waho, Mokupuni o Hawai'i. I am a Kanaka Maoli (also identified as a Native Hawaiian, he hoa'aina o Moku o Keawe, he 'oiwi o ka pae 'aina Hawai'i, an indigenous person of the archipelago of Hawai'i) and a cultural practitioner with connections to Mauna a Wākea, Kumu Hula, chanter, and most importantly a parent of two daughters who are passionately connected to their culture and traditions. We are descendents of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778 as established through my family lineage connected to the clan of 'Awini dating back before the time of Kamehameha's birth. My grandfather seven generations ago was 'Umihulumakaokalanikia'imaunao'awini who guarded the pass of 'Awini. Through the writings of my kūpuna, namely Kupuna Pheobe Hussey, Kupuna Sally Berg and Kupuna Marie Solomon, we have established through family stories written by the hands of our

kūpuna direct connections to family ‘aumākua which we still reverently acknowledge, the pueo, the manō and the mo‘o.

I received a B.A. degree in Hawaiian Studies in 1983 from the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo along with a D.O.E Teaching Certification. I have been an educator for nearly 30 years in the Hawai‘i State public school system. I am presently a cultural consultant, teacher, lecturer and community leader and resource. Therefore, based upon the legal standards covered in Hawai‘i Rules of Evidence – Rule 702, I would also be qualified as an expert witness through my knowledge, skills, experience, training, and education in the subject matter pertaining to Hawaiian cultural traditions." WDT of B. Pualani Case; Ex. B.21a.

406. Ms. Case testified that the chanting, dancing and practices are the foundation that has carried Ms. Case all through her life, from Pu‘u Huluhulu to the Wekiu, the top of Mauna a Wakea. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 128:10-13.
407. She testified that customary and traditional practices relating to the Northern Plateau of Mauna Kea include going there at sunrise to welcome the sun in the only way that you can on that spot, reciting particular chants in which the vantage points that we look at dictate that we are there, honoring the ancestors whose bones are there. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 129:10-130:19.
408. Case and her daughters go to the Northern Plateau to pray and chant and "make correct" for those who would disturb that area, to make pono in the best way, to pray the forgiveness chants, to shed tears, and to pray that chants assure our ancestors that we will do whatever can be done that they may never know that disturbance. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 130:4-14.
409. Case testified that the prayers and the chants done on the Northern Plateau and the ceremonies are different than what would be done elsewhere. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 227:23- 228:20.
410. In this contested case hearing members of Case's ohana identified as cultural practitioners with connections to Mauna a Wakea. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 131:13-16.
411. Case indicated she had not ever been consulted regarding "traditional customary practices" related to Mauna Kea by DLNR, the OMKM, and Kahu Kū Mauna. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 130:23-131:1.
412. No archeologists who conducted surveys on MKSR consulted with Case. Vol 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 132:1-4.
413. No archeologists consulted with Case with regard to the significance of cultural sites on the Northern Plateau. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 132:5-8.
414. Ms. Case testified that between the last contested case hearing and now, she has not been consulted in any way including under 106, by the TMT, BLNR, the UHH, the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, or the IfA. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 156:8-157:4.

415. No one from the University of California or Caltech asked Case to consult. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 157:9-14.
416. No one has asked Case in all of these years to consult as to the impact of the TMT project Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 157:23-158:3.
417. Ms. Case testified that the TMT Project, if built, would obstruct the open space characteristics of the Northern Plateau. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 239:11-14.
418. Ms. Case states: "...in our chants the way we regarded water was sacred, Hawai'i wai'ola, Hawai'i wai kapu, water is life, and so the place that the water fell upon, if we could just keep that clean, sacred. So if we don't have a business going to where the first water falls, perhaps we didn't need to go there. When the water falls on the mauna, it's going to end up being somebody's water, because it is our water aquifer, it is our watershed, it is the spirit of our water." Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 176:21-177:5.
419. Pua Case testified she is one of the 14 percent, who would see it every day, every moment of the day. Her window faces the mauna. She would see it from the moment her eyes open until the moment that she goes to bed. Her life would change. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 136:14-19.
420. Case affirmed that if the TMT Project was built without doing their part to prevent it, it would cause her such guilt and despair that she would also be embarrassed to go there and try to pretend as though nothing happened. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 178:25-179:7.
421. Case testified that the TMT would block the mo'o's views and block the portal's piko to Ke Akua. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 222:23-223:3.
422. Case testified that the TMT would impact the mo'o and other religious and gods that dwell on the summit or deities Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 223:4-225:1, and if the TMT Project was built on the Northern Plateau, it would curtail Ms. Case's traditional and customary cultural practices. Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 239:5-10.
423. If the TMT Project was built somewhere else other than Mauna Kea, Ms. Case believes "it's still going to be at least 12-and-a-half acres of construction, destruction and desecration" and "it should impact me, because she loves this Hawai'i more than anything. It's my home land." Vol. 25, Tr. 1/11/17 at 240:2-12.
424. Ms. Case feels, "In the same way that I have experienced this loss of hula traditions tied to place over the years, I see that it would happen again if the Thirty Meter Telescope is built in the upper region of our Mauna." Ex. B21.a at 4 (Case WDT).
425. According to Ms. Case, the traditional practice of ceremonies including chanting, dancing, honoring at these places would be impacted by the building of the eighteen stories. The place with its pristine form would be no more, it would be under concrete along with an enormous visual eyesore, the place would have been desecrated, destroyed. Ex. B.21a at 4 (Case WDT).

426. Ms. Case asserts that the kanaka maoli and those who share these practices physically and spiritually would not be able to recite and perform the hula traditions there because of the overwhelming sense of despair and guilt that we would be consumed with. Ex. B.21a at 5 (Case WDT).
427. Ms. Case contends that the people cannot stand by and witness the desecration, destruction and construction and then conduct the same ceremonies we have done for years on the mountain. Ex. B.21a at 5 (Case WDT).
428. For Ms. Case, it would be akin to forfeiting her right to be there if she was unsuccessful in protecting the mountain. She could not return there to chant, dance and sing in the same manner. She would not be able to pray in the way that she has been led to do. A connection would be lost between the ancestral realm and the human realm. Information shared and knowledge passed down ancestrally would be lost. Interaction between the mountain and humans would be diminished like a loss of a family member, and the death of a way of life. Ex. B.21a at 5 (Case WDT).

IV. HAWAI'I ADMINISTRATIVE RULE § 13-5-30(c): THE EIGHT CRITERIA

429. Section 13-5-30(c) of the HAR is the overarching framework that guides this contested case. Section 13-5-30(c) sets forth the eight criteria by which the Board is to evaluate the merits of a proposed land use in a Conservation District.
430. The University has the burden to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the TMT Project meets the eight criteria to support a recommendation of approval of the CDUA and issuance of a CDUP. HAR § 13-1-35(k) ("The party initiating the proceeding and, in the case of proceeding on alleged violations of law, the department, shall have the burden of proof, including the burden of producing evidence as well as the burden of persuasion. The quantum of proof shall be a preponderance of the evidence.").
431. In preparing the CDUA, the University's consultants relied on a wide variety of materials as well as consultation with, *inter alia*, specialists and archaeologists. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 12:14-13:10 (White).
432. The CDUA was prepared in 2010. Whether a CDUA requires revisions or updates does not depend upon the mere passage of time; rather, it depends on the particular facts of the situation. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 186:10-13 (White). White, the primary author of the CDUA, testified that he knows of no new fact that would change his assessment of the CDUA. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 187:9-18.
- A. CRITERION ONE, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(1): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE OF THE CONSERVATION DISTRICT[.]"
433. The Conservation District statute is designed "to conserve, protect and preserve the important natural resources of the State through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety and welfare." HRS § 183C-1.

434. The Conservation District administrative rules are designed "to regulate land-use in the conservation district for the purpose of conserving, protecting, and preserving the important natural and cultural resources of the State through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety, and welfare." HAR § 13-5-1.
435. Astronomy development is an expressly permitted use within the Conservation District with a valid CDUP; the Conservation District rules are designed to appropriately regulate and manage land uses. HAR § 13-5-24(c); HRS § 183C-1.
436. To meet Criterion One, the TMT Project must be reviewed to determine if the proposed land use will be appropriately managed and used to protect, preserve and promote the long-term sustainability of important natural resources, public health, safety and welfare.
437. The 11,288-acre MKSR is within the Conservation District. Ex. A-9 at 3-1. The proposed TMT Project is within the MKSR's 525-acre Astronomy Precinct. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-6. Currently, there are eight optical and/or infrared observatories, and three submillimeter observatories in the Astronomy Precinct. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-1.
438. The CDUA outlines how the proposed use within the already-developed Astronomy Precinct is consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District to conserve, protect, preserve and promote the long-term sustainability of the surrounding areas within the MKSR, which are at present used principally for scientific astronomical activities. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-1 to 2-2.
439. The CDUA also contains descriptions of practices and protocols that provide for "appropriate management and use" to promote the long-term sustainability of resources and the public health, safety, and welfare within the Conservation District. Ex. A-1/R-1.
440. The TMT Project will promote the health, safety and welfare of the public through the advancement of scientific study, providing educational benefits in the form of telescope viewing time for the University's students and researchers, advancing STEM educational opportunities for Hawai'i residents through the community benefits package, and other measures. Ex. A-1/R-1; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 2-6.
441. The TMT Project will be subject to management through the BLNR-approved CMP and sub-plans, the TMT Management Plan, which complies with Ex. 3 of HAR § 13-5 et seq., and the BLNR-imposed conditions to the CDUP, as well as the University's internal Master Plan. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-1. The TMT Project is consistent with the foregoing plans. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-2. The comprehensive management framework appropriately addresses cultural and natural resources, public access, and the ultimate decommissioning of the Project and restoration of its site.
442. The relevant plans, sub-plans, and permit conditions require the University and TIO to conserve, protect, and preserve the important natural and cultural resources of the State, and promote their long-term sustainability, as well as promoting the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Ex. A-9 at 7-40.

443. The relevant plans, sub-plans, and permit conditions require the TMT Project to comply with the Conservation District rules and applicable laws and regulations. Ex. A-9 at 7-40.
444. The natural resource characteristics that make Mauna Kea uniquely suitable for astronomy (including its elevation, stable atmospheric clarity, low humidity and absence of light pollution), making it arguably the single best location in the northern hemisphere to conduct astronomical research, are also "important natural resources of the State" that must be appropriately managed and used to "promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety, and welfare." HRS § 183C-1; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 1; Ex. A-9 at A4-13 to A4-15.
445. Based on a review of the TMT Project's design, mitigation efforts, planned financial contributions to the management of MKSR, and its consistency with the objectives and provisions of the applicable plans, the TMT Project will conserve, protect and promote these unique and important astronomical natural resources of the State. WDT White at 2-5; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-2.
446. As the BLNR has acknowledged in the past, astronomy is an environmentally responsible and economically sustainable use that does not extract a large amount of resources, and does not consume significant natural resources once constructed. WDT White at 5; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 60:5-7, 92:17-94:7.
447. The design of the TMT Project complies with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan, the purpose of which is to protect and preserve the resources of the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea, and with the CMP and sub-plans for Mauna Kea. Ex. A-48 at II-1 to II-4; WDT White at 3; WDT Nagata at 7-10; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 60:7-10, 61:2-62:9; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 15:17-17:11.
448. The CMP and sub-plans provide management strategies designed to preserve and protect the resources located in the UH Management Area. These plans are the BLNR-approved management documents for the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea, and they provide the management framework and strategies that protect, preserve, and enhance the resources within the UH Management Area. The TMT Project is consistent with the CMP and sub-plans. WDT Nagata at 3-4; WDT White at 3-5; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 59:15- 60:10; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 15:17-17:15, 129:11-15; *see generally* Exs. A-9 to A-13.
449. In compliance with Ex. 3 of HAR Chapter 13-5 *et seq.* (entitled "Management Plan Requirements"), TIO has developed a TMT Management Plan (attached as Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B) that adopts the approach, goals, objectives, findings, recommendations, and management strategies and actions of the CMP and sub-plans in their entirety. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-3 to 2-4. The TMT Management Plan is intended to guide various activities within the TMT Project area. WDT White at 4; *see generally* Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 63:8-13. As previously stated, the CMP and its sub-plans have been approved by the BLNR. *See* FOF No. 135; Ex. A-26 at 36-37.

450. The TMT Management Plan is the management plan required under HAR § 13-5-24. The TMT Management Plan provides a general description of the proposed TMT Project, the existing conditions on the parcel, proposed land uses on the parcel, and reporting schedule. It also provides for implementation of all relevant action items in the CMP and sub-plans on a site-specific basis. This ensures that the management actions called for in the CMP and sub-plans are effectively and responsibly implemented in the TMT project areas. WDT White at 4; Ex. B of Ex. A-1/R-1; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 59:19-60:10.
451. The TMT Management Plan sets forth mitigation measures in the form of best management practices and conservation methods intended to mitigate the impacts of the TMT Project on Mauna Kea's varied resources (see, for example, Table 4-1 in Ex. B of the TMT CDUA). The TMT Management Plan provides site-specific information and complements the CMP and sub-plans. Both mitigation and avoidance are consistent with the goals of the Conservation District. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 227:23-228:4. By following the applicable provisions of all of the plans (the Master Plan, CMP, sub-plans, and TMT Management Plan), the University and TIO will fulfill the purpose of the Conservation District concerning the TMT Project. WDT White at 4; WDT Nagata at 7-10; Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B, Table 4-1.
452. Other mitigation measures include the THINK Fund and the WPP, which were developed and shaped in large part to respond to community input and suggestions. In the extensive scoping process for the TMT Project, one of the most frequently raised issues was the local community's desire to have the Project positively affect the socioeconomic landscape of Hawai'i Island and increase the potential for residents to work for the TMT Project during its construction and operation. Ex. A-3/R-3, § 1.6.3, at 1-4 to 1-5.
453. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors contend that the economic benefits of the TMT Project described above should not be considered mitigation measures.
454. The University and TIO have committed themselves to developing and operating the TMT Project in compliance with Conservation District Rules, the CMP and its sub-plans, the TMT Management Plan, and all conditions included in a CDUP. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 61:17-22. Adherence to the Conservation District rules, the CMP and its sub-plans, the TMT Management Plan and a CDUP will ensure proper management. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 61:23-62:9.
455. The TMT Project is the first proposed astronomical observatory since the inception of the Master Plan to commit to contributing funds to assist in the management of Mauna Kea. WDT White at 3.
456. The TMT Project will not have a significant or adverse impact on area water resources, including the waters of Lake Waiau and Mauna Kea's underlying groundwater. The TMT Observatory will use a zero-discharge wastewater system. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-120. The TMT Project will not threaten the health, safety and welfare of the public, with regard to water resources. WDT White at 5; WDT Hayes at 23-28; *see generally* WDT Nance.

457. The TMT Project will make optimum use of the natural resources that make Mauna Kea one of the best places on Earth to conduct astronomical research. These resources include Mauna Kea's altitude, location at a favorable latitude, atmospheric clarity and stability, general lack of cloud cover, low humidity, low mean temperature and temperature variability, and distance from light pollution. The TMT Project will make use of these natural resources in a sustainable manner. Tr. 10/27/16 at 337:22-338:12; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 92:17-94:13; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 50:8-11; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 1.
458. The TMT Project will allow the people of Hawai'i to continue to use and benefit from the astronomical resources of Mauna Kea and to maintain the University at the forefront of astronomy. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 62:3-9.
459. TIO has committed to developing, in compliance with the CMP and the Decommissioning Plan and as approved by the BLNR, a project-specific decommissioning plan through which it intends to restore the Project site at the end of the useful life of the TMT Observatory, or at the end of the General Lease if extended, or if a new General Lease is not executed. WDT White at 5; Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B, 4-39 to 4-44. The specific details of the decommissioning of the TMT Observatory will be determined once decommissioning is determined to be required, or approximately five years in advance of planned decommissioning. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 131:16-132:6.
460. As detailed in the TMT FEIS, CDUA, and Management Plan, TIO has committed to implementing a number of measures and management actions intended to address and effectively mitigate the impacts of the Project. *See generally* Ex. A-1/R-1, A-3/R-3, A-4/R-4 and A-5/R-5. Harm to resources on Mauna Kea that has already occurred will be mitigated by providing resources for the management of Mauna Kea and through public education about Mauna Kea's resources. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 89:17-24.
461. The management of the TMT Project addresses cultural and natural resources, public access, and the ultimate decommissioning of the Project and restoration of its site.
462. Implemented in accordance with its plans, the TMT Project will not consume significant natural resources; will not pollute; will not harm species of concern, or the environment generally; will not prevent contemporary, customary, historical and traditional cultural practices; will not impede recreational uses; and will not threaten the public health, safety, or welfare.
463. Implemented in accordance with its plans, the TMT Project will make optimum and sustainable use of the natural resources that make Mauna Kea an ideal location for astronomy; will facilitate the management of Mauna Kea; will be an enormous benefit to the public welfare by contributing significant funds to Hawai'i Island; will provide jobs; will inject significant money spending and revenues into the local economy; will contribute new programs and funds to Hawai'i Island schools; will enable the University to remain at the forefront of astronomy in research and education; and contribute to the overall knowledge base of mankind. Those discoveries made using TMT will provide inspiration to generations of students for which many of Hawai'i's citizens can be proud.

(Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 108:19-22.

464. Tajon, who appeared on behalf of Kakalia, testified that in his opinion the TMT Project is not consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District because he felt there was no community input. Tr. 2/27/17 at 15:5-15:10. The extent of community input is not the proper standard by which to determine whether or not a project is consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District. Moreover, as discussed herein, the credible evidence demonstrates that significant community input was sought and generated for this project at various public approval stages. In any event, as discussed above, the TMT Project complies with the purpose of the Conservation District, as set forth in the applicable authorities. *See supra* at FOF Section IV.A.
465. Prof. Fujikane, a witness for KAHEA, testified that the TMT Project is not consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District because the TMT Project will be built in a pristine area of Mauna Kea that is viewed as the firstborn child of Papahānaumoku, Earth Mother, and Wākea, Sky Father. Ex. B.13a (WDT Prof. Fujikane) at 4.
466. Paradoxically, Prof. Fujikane also opined that Mauna Kea is overbuilt and that there are no mitigation measures that can remedy the area. Tr. 1/9/17 at 226:9-226:13.
467. White testified that because of the proposed mitigation measures the construction and operation of the TMT Project will not have a substantial adverse impact on natural resources in the area. WDT White at 7-8.
468. Dr. Kahakalau, a witness for the Flores-Case 'Ohana, argued that the TMT Project is not consistent with the Conservation District because any construction will have some impact on the existing environment. Dr. Kahakalau explained: "Conserving, conservation, means to take care of the things that are currently there. Any construction will have an impact on the things that are currently there, and therefore not conserving. Not just the individual things like rocks or whether there are plants or whether there are animals or insects and all of that, but also the entire atmosphere of this district that is designed to conserve the cultural, spiritual and natural landscape of that place." Vol. 23, 1/9/17 at 122:18-123:8.
469. Based upon reliable, credible evidence, the TMT Project is consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District.
- B. CRITERION TWO, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(2): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE SUBZONE OF THE LAND ON WHICH THE USE WILL OCCUR[.]"
470. The Conservation District is divided into various subzones, some more restrictive than others. Uses that are not appropriate in the most restrictive subzone may be appropriate in the Resource subzone. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 60:15-61:1.
471. The TMT Project will be located in the Resource subzone. Ex. A-2/R-2 at SS-1.
472. Amendments to the Conservation District Rules were adopted by the BLNR on August

12, 2011. These amendments were signed into law by the Governor of the State of Hawai‘i on November 23, 2011, and became effective ten days thereafter. *See* HAR §13-5 et seq. (2011).

473. Under the version of HAR § 13-5-13(a) that was in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, "[t]he objective of this [Resource] subzone is to develop, with proper management, areas to ensure sustained use of the natural resources of those areas."
474. Within the Resource subzone, astronomy facilities – such as the TMT Project – (along with other specifically enumerated uses such as commercial forestry, mining and extraction, and aquaculture) can be allowed with proper management. HAR § 13-5-24(c); WDT White at 5; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 61:8-61:11; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 17:16-18:15; Tr. 1/11/17 at 51:4-22; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-142, 3-155.
475. Evidence presented addressed whether the TMT Project will be properly managed to ensure the sustained use of the natural resources within the MKSR.
476. For purposes of the criteria in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(1) and (c)(2), the rules do not specify limits as to the size, appearance or other characteristics of an astronomy facility within the Resource subzone.
477. As an astronomy facility that will be subject to appropriate management aimed at ensuring the protection and sustained use of natural resources in the area, the TMT Project is consistent with the purposes of the Resource subzone.
478. One of the objectives of the Resource subzone is to develop and promote science through astronomical facilities constructed in the approved geographic areas, including the specific Area E location for the TMT Project within the Mauna Kea Astronomy Precinct.
479. The version of HAR § 13-5-24(c) in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, clearly provided that "Astronomy facilities under an approved management plan" are permitted activities in the Resource subzone.
480. The version of HAR § 13-5-2 in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, provided that a "'Management plan' means a comprehensive plan for carrying out multiple land uses."
481. The evidence presented at the hearing, and addressed further below, shows that the CMP, with its sub-plans, is a comprehensive plan for carrying out multiple land uses in the designated subzone. The CMP that was previously approved by the BLNR is still fully applicable and was in place and approved by the BLNR when the CDUA for the TMT Project was presented to the BLNR for approval.
482. The current amended version of HAR § 13-5-13(a), provides: "[t]he objective of this [Resource] subzone is to ensure, with proper management, the sustainable use of the natural resources of those areas."
483. The evidence presented demonstrates that the TMT Project, with proper management,

provides a mechanism for the sustainable use of the natural resources in areas affected by the TMT Project.

484. The current amended version of HAR § 13-5-24(c), provides that "Astronomy facilities under a management plan approved simultaneously with the permit" are permitted in the Resource subzone.
485. The current amended version of HAR § 13-5-2, provides that "'Management plan' means a project or site based plan to protect and conserve natural and cultural resources."
486. The TMT Management Plan is a project or site-based plan to protect and conserve natural and cultural resources, and was appended to and incorporated into the CDUA.
487. HAR § 13-5-13(a) seeks to "ensure, with proper management, the sustainable use" of the resources that are proposed to be used. Here, the TMT Project will not consume or significantly adversely affect Mauna Kea's "natural resources" – *i.e.*, Mauna Kea's high altitude, large fraction of clear nights, atmospheric stability, low mean temperature, low perceptible water vapor, distance from light pollution, and optimal latitude. The TMT Project is sustainable in that it does not actually consume the natural resources; it principally uses the existing natural environment as an optimal resource to observe the night sky and star light. The 5-acre area of land upon which the TMT Observatory will be built, will ultimately be restored and returned to its original state following its use after decommissioning. (Dr. Hasinger) Tr. 10/27/16 at 337:22-338:14.
488. The University and TIO have committed to managing the natural resources in the UH Management Area in a manner that fulfills the objectives of the Resource subzone and the purpose of the Conservation District. WDT White at 6; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 60:15-62:25 (White); *see* Exs. A-9 to A-13.
489. The proposed TMT Project meets the objectives of the Resource subzone by using the excellent natural astronomical resources that Mauna Kea possesses in a sustainable way in order to uphold Hawaii's position at the forefront of astronomical research, while also implementing and supporting overall Mauna Kea management activities in a way that promotes the sustainable use of the resources in the subzone area. WDT White at 6; *see* (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 62:14-62:20 (White).
490. The University and TIO have committed themselves to develop and operate the TMT Project in compliance with the Conservation District rules, CMP, sub-plans, TMT Management Plan, and with all conditions attached to any resulting CDUP. Compliance with the Conservation District Rules, CMP, CRMP, NRMP, Decommissioning Plan, PAP, and the TMT Management Plan will ensure the appropriate and sustained use of the natural and cultural resources found on Mauna Kea. WDT White at 6; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 61:17-62:9.
491. The CMP and sub-plans comprise the BLNR-approved management documents for the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea. (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 28:23-29:17 (Nagata). The University has taken significant steps to implement the CMP and sub-plans and to manage the resources found in the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea to ensure the

sustainable use of those resources. Exs. A-9 to A-14; Ex. A-16 - A-22.

492. The TMT Management Plan adopts the approach, goals, objectives, findings, recommendations, and management strategies and actions of the CMP and sub-plans in their entirety. Exhibits A-1, Ex. B at S-2, 1-1 to 1-2; Ex. A-26 at 7. The TMT Management Plan commits to guide various activities and uses within the TMT Project area. The TMT Management Plan is consistent with HAR § 13-5-24(c). Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B at 1-1 to 1-2; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 59:15-60:18.
493. The TMT Management Plan contains a draft historic preservation mitigation plan, a construction plan, a historical and archaeological site plan, a maintenance plan, and an arthropod monitoring plan. These plans are consistent with and link to the broader CMP and sub-plans. Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B at App. A to App. E; Ex. A-7/R-7 at 46-47.
494. The TMT Management Plan will govern the TMT Project construction, operation and decommissioning. The TMT Management Plan will be updated every five years based on: (1) updates to the Mauna Kea CMP and sub-plans; (2) relevant new or modified laws, regulations, and policies; (3) results from the regular monitoring and reporting done by the TMT Project and OMKM; and (4) modifications to the operation of the TMT Observatory. Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B at 5-2.
495. Kehaunani Abad, PhD ("**Dr. Abad**"), a witness for KAHEA, testified that in her opinion, the CDUA does not meet the criterion stated in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(2) because an astronomy facility must "also meet the full spectrum of permitting requirements under § 13-5-30(c)." Ex. B.08a (WDT Dr. Abad) at 4-5. Among the many reasons Dr. Abad feels she is qualified to offer such an opinion are:
 1. I received a masters and a doctoral degree in Anthropology from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa in 2000, specializing in Hawaiian archaeology in 1992 and 2000, respectively and including training in 'ōlelo Hawai'i (Hawaiian language).
 2. I meet the standards established in HAR §13-281-3, §13-281-6, and §13-281-7 to serve as a principal investigator or researcher in archaeology, ethnography, or history.
 3. I previously served as a Hawaiian cultural advisor, researcher and program developer for the Ho'okahua Division of Kamehameha Schools in Honolulu, Hawai'i (2005-2007) and later as the Kamehameha Schools' director of Kamehameha Publishing overseeing such matters as the cultural integrity of its publications (2007-2012).
 4. I have also served as the director of the Community Engagement Division of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (2012-2015), overseeing the cultural integrity and historical accuracy of film and print publications produced by this communications unit.
 5. I currently serve as the director of Kealaiwikuamo'o at Kamehameha Schools, a division charged with supporting a collaborative network of preschool through

graduate school entities dedicated to forwarding Hawaiian language, culture, and ‘āina (land) based education (though this testimony is provided solely in my personal capacity, separate from my formal employment).

6. From 1994 to 2000, I served as the ‘Ewa regional representative on the O‘ahu Island Burial Council and was involved in the determining the cultural appropriate treatment of previously identified Hawaiian burials and advising the State of Hawai‘i Historic Preservation Division regarding inadvertently discovered Hawaiian burials.
7. From 2006 to 2012, I served as Kamehameha Schools’ representative on the O‘ahu Island Burial Council.
8. I have prepared burial treatment plans and served as a cultural and archaeological monitor on behalf of the Queen Emma Foundation (John Young burial restoration) and Kamehameha Schools (Keanakamanō restoration). Kēhaunani Abad, PhD 10.10.16 Exhibit B.08a 3
9. I have served as an expert witness in cases involving Hawaiian burials as well as other sites of Hawaiian religious and cultural significance including the case of the City and County of Honolulu vs. Paulette Kaleikini (related to the Honolulu Rail project, 2011), Joseph A. Brescia vs. Ka‘iulani Edens-Huff, et al. (related to the Nāue, Kaua‘i Brescia property burial treatment plan, 2008), State of Hawai‘i vs. Paulette Kaleikini (related to the Ward Villages project, 2008), the ‘Īlio‘ulaokalani Coalition, et al. vs. the United States Army (related to the Stryker Brigade, 2006).
10. I was qualified as an expert witness in archeology and Hawaiian cultural burial practices by Judge Ronald Ibarra during the trial of Kelly, et al., v. 1250 Oceanside Partners, et al. concerning burial protection issues involving the Hōkūli‘a subdivision development in South Kona (2001).

WDT of Kehaunani Abad, PhD, Ex. B.08a.

496. Dr. Abad contends that the TMT CDUA failed to: (1) identify existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community or region for inclusion in its analysis; and (2) adequately address the highly significant nature of sites in the region. She also argues that the TMT CDUA is significantly flawed in its discussion of project impacts.

497. The TMT Project is consistent with the objectives of the Resource subzone.

C. CRITERION THREE, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(3): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE COMPLIES WITH PROVISIONS AND GUIDELINES CONTAINED IN CHAPTER 205A, HRS, ENTITLED ‘COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT’, WHERE APPLICABLE[.]"

498. HRS § 205A-1 defines Hawaii’s Coastal Zone Management Area ("CZMA") as consisting of "all lands of the State and the area extending seaward from the

shoreline to the limit of the State's police power and management authority, including the United States territorial sea." It establishes guidelines for the use of these lands. Many of the objectives of the Coastal Zone Management program parallel the purpose and objectives of the Conservation District under HAR § 13-5 *et seq.* HRS § 205A; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 18:16-19:13.

499. HRS § 205A-22 provides: "'Special management area' means the land extending inland from the shoreline as delineated on the maps filed with the authority as of June 8, 1977, or as amended pursuant to section 205A-23."
500. The TMT Project is not in the special management area.
501. Part II of Chapter 205A, HRS §§ 205A-21 through 205A-33, which applies only to special management areas, is not applicable to the TMT Project.
502. The evidence presented demonstrates that the TMT Project complies with the purpose and objectives of the Conservation District and also complies with the objectives of Chapter 205A of the Hawai'i Revised Statutes, specifically including those objectives that do not overlap with the objectives of the Conservation District, but are unique to Chapter 205A. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-4 to 2-6; Ex. A-7/R-7 at 48-49; WDT White at 6; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 18:16-19:13. The objectives of Chapter 205A that do not overlap with the Conservation District's objectives relate specifically to the protection of water quality.
503. As set forth in more detail below, the TMT Project will have no significant or adverse impacts on water resources, including no significant impacts upon Lake Waiau and ground water, and no significant effects upon the area surrounding the project through surface water runoff or through wastewater (which will be collected and transported off the summit for treatment and disposal).
504. The TMT Project proposal is to conservatively treat all chemical waste as if it were hazardous waste for purposes of handling and disposal. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 97:11-18, 196:12- 197:8. The TMT Observatory will use a zero-discharge wastewater system. Ex. A-1/R1, App. D at D-2; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-120. The TMT Project will not release wastewater into the surrounding environment. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-120. All wastewater, including mirror washing wastewater (which is not a hazardous waste), will be collected and transported off of Mauna Kea for proper disposal. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-120 to 3-121.
505. While construction of the TMT Project will create some new impermeable surfaces at the five-acre TMT Project site, due to the high permeability of the surrounding area, surface rainwater will percolate into the ground whether or not the TMT Project is built. The TMT Project will not create any additional adverse impact on existing water resources. WDT Hayes at 24; *see generally* WDT Nance; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-127 to 3-130; Ex. A-9 at 6-6 to 6-8; Tr. 10/25/16 at 36:11-14, 202:15-205:11; Tr. 11/15/16 at 25:23-27:20.
506. It is impossible to completely eliminate the possibility of an accidental spill. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 205:5-8. However, the TMT Project will implement measures to mitigate the

risk of an accident spill to the extent logically and reasonably practicable based on best means and methods available to mitigate against such events.

507. To minimize the potential for an accidental spill while waste materials are in transit down the mountain to a proper disposal site, no tanks or containers being transported will be filled to the top. To further ensure the safe transport and disposal of hazardous waste, the TMT Observatory will utilize only Environmental Protection Agency – permitted and licensed contractors to transport hazardous wastes. WDT Hayes at 23-25; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-127 to 3-131.
508. No mercury will be used at the TMT Observatory. WDT Hayes at 23; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-30 and 4-32; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-234. Further, the TMT Observatory will utilize a secondary containment area to store all hazardous materials or wastes. That containment area will be inspected daily for leaks. Fuel storage and piping will also be double-walled and will be equipped with leak monitors. Based on these measures, the chance of a spill entering the surrounding environment is negligible. WDT Hayes at 23-25; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 3-127 to 3-131 and App. D at D-2.
509. No fracking or liquid dynamite use has been planned as part of the TMT Project. Tr. 10/25/16 at 38:11-14; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 206:4-7.
510. Storage and waste management include a Spill Prevention and Response Plan ("**SPRP**") and a Materials Storage/Waste Management Plan. The SPRP provides for inspections to ensure that systems are working properly, no leaks are occurring, and any necessary maintenance measures are taken. The SPRP also requires protocols for proper handling, storage, use, and disposal of liquid and solid materials and wastes. WDT Hayes at 25; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-128 to 3-130.
511. The TMT Project site is 12 miles from the nearest wells that extract groundwater. The groundwater beneath the summit of Mauna Kea is impounded and compartmentalized by subsurface geologic structures. Because the TMT Observatory will use a zero-discharge wastewater system, wastewater will not be released from the TMT Project so no percolation of wastewater will reach the aquifer. Moreover, Mauna Kea is comprised of very porous lavas that naturally treat and filter water percolating downward. A discharge on the summit area would be naturally treated and filtered through thousands of feet of the porous lavas, which would remove any contamination from that discharge before reaching any groundwater. See Ex. A-44. Contamination of groundwater is extremely remote and very unlikely from the TMT Project. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-116; WDT Nance at 4.
512. There is no reasonable prospect of an adverse impact on either drinking or coastal waters from the TMT Project. Accordingly, the TMT Project complies with the applicable objectives, provisions and guidelines in Haw. Rev. Stat. Chapter 205A. WDT Hayes at 26.

D. CRITERION FOUR, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(4): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE WILL NOT CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT TO EXISTING NATURAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE SURROUNDING AREA, COMMUNITY, OR REGION[.]"

513. Under the version of HAR § 13-5-2 that was in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, "Natural resource" is defined as meaning "resources such as plants, aquatic life and wildlife, cultural, historic and archeological sites, and minerals." The amendment added to this definition "recreational" and "geologic" sites, "scenic areas, ecologically significant areas," and "watersheds."
514. The TMT Observatory will not significantly add to or burden the balance of any existing impact from a level that is currently less than significant to a significant level within the Astronomy Precinct. Tr. 10/25/16 at p. 181:6-10 (Hayes). This means that the TMT Project itself will not cause substantial adverse impacts. When taken in conjunction with its proposed mitigation and applicable management and decommissioning plans, the overall effect of the TMT Project will be either neutral or provide for lesser overall impacts than current existing uses in the Astronomy Precinct.
515. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors' argue that Mauna Kea has suffered previous "unlawful" significant and adverse impacts.
516. The CDUA and supporting documents provide sufficient information for the BLNR to consider whether the "proposed land use" itself will cause "substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region[.]" HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4).
517. Under HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4), UH Hilo has provided sufficient information to show the level of impacts on natural resources within the MKSR would be substantially the same even in the absence of the TMT Project within the MKSR.
518. The definition of "Natural resource" in HAR § 13-5-2, includes cultural, historical, and archaeological "sites"; but not necessarily cultural practices.
519. Prof. Fujikane, a witness for KAHEA, argues that the TMT FEIS's conclusion that the TMT Project will add a limited increment to the level of cumulative impact is not persuasive and does not consider the TMT Project as a whole with its proposed mitigation efforts. Her opinion focuses on a view of the cumulative impact of the TMT Project, with all existing observatories, as an added impact on the cultural concerns of certain native Hawaiian practitioners. B.13a (WDT Prof. Fujikane) at 2.
520. Under HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4), mitigation measures for the TMT Project have been considered even though "mitigation" is not expressly stated as a requirement. *Morimoto v. Bd. of Land & Natural Resources*, 107 Hawai'i 296, 303-304, 113 P.3d 172, 179-180 (2005).
521. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors claim proposed mitigation measures do not specifically address the environmental and cultural impacts of the project. *See*

Petitioners' Collective Prehearing Statement at 4.

522. Numerous proposed mitigation measures for the TMT Project are specifically designed to address the environmental and cultural impacts of the project, including, but not limited to:
- a. The site selection and physical design of the project itself and related infrastructure to mitigate its visual, cultural and environmental impact;
 - b. The TMT Access Way design;
 - c. Implementing a cultural and natural resources training program;
 - d. Developing educational exhibits;
 - e. Restoring of Pu'u Poli'ahu;
 - f. Providing a sense of place within the TMT facilities;
 - g. Providing financial contributions to support cultural programs;
 - h. Implementing specific cultural and community outreach efforts;
 - i. Implementing cultural observance days;
 - j. Continuing consultation with the State Historic Preservation Division and Kahu Kū Mauna Council regarding the protocols for the relocation of the modern shrine at the 13N site;
 - k. Implementing arthropod and other biological monitoring;
 - l. Working with OMKM to develop and implement a wēkiu bug habitat restoration study;
 - m. Developing and implementing an invasive species prevention and control program; and
 - n. Continuing consultations with cultural practitioners.
523. Mitigation measures accepted in the approved TMT FEIS may be considered as part of the CDUA approval process. On the basis of the evidence presented, those measures are reasonable and accurate efforts to mitigate and lessen any cultural impacts in the Mauna Kea summit area as a whole which benefit would not otherwise exist without the TMT Project.
524. The approved and unchallenged FEIS for the TMT Project identifies several mitigation measures, both direct and indirect, that are aimed at ameliorating potential impacts on the environment and cultural practices. These measures mitigate the Project's potential impacts on the environment and cultural practices so that the TMT Project will not create a substantial adverse impact to these areas.
525. The TMT Project also provides significant scientific, economic and educational benefits, which are material, substantial, and highly unique.
526. Dr. Stone's testimony and other evidence demonstrated that the TMT Project is designed

to be a world-class telescope that will provide a much more advanced and powerful ground-based observatory than currently exists anywhere on Earth. The TMT Project is designed to investigate and answer some of the most fundamental questions regarding our universe, including studies relating to the formation of stars and galaxies shortly after the Big Bang and how the universe evolved to its present form. Ex. C-1 (WDT Dr. Stone) at 3; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 2.

- 527. TIO has committed to a substantial community benefits package, addressed in more detail below, which has provided over \$2.5 million to date for grants and scholarships for STEM education to benefit Hawai'i students. TIO has committed to providing \$1 million annually for this program.
- 528. TIO will pay sublease rent to the University (the first telescope developer on Mauna Kea to do so). Those funds will be used for the management of Mauna Kea through the Mauna Kea Special Management Fund, administered by OMKM. See Ex. A-134.
- 529. The TMT FEIS addresses the existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region, as well as the potential impacts of the TMT Project. The incremental nature of a project's impacts, standing alone, cannot endlessly justify development within an existing developed area. However, in this case, the TMT Project's compliance with all applicable rules, regulations, and requirements, the Master Plan, CMP, sub-plans, and the TMT Management Plan, along with the mitigation measures committed to in the TMT FEIS, CDUA, and TMT Management Plan, demonstrate that the TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impact to the existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region under HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4). WDT White at 7; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 73:1-21.
- 530. Further specific areas of concern presented in evidence are set forth and summarized below:

i. Biologic Resources

- 531. Dr. Clifford W. Smith, a witness for UHH, has extensive education and experience in the field of botany. Ex. A-37. In his words:

"I have a Bachelor of Science in Botany from the University of Wales, Bangor, U.K., a Master of Science in Botany from the University of Manchester, U.K., and a Ph.D in Botany from the University of Manchester, U.K. I taught botany and biology for 32 years.

I have been studying lichens on the summit Maunakea [sic] since 1982. A list of my publications is provided in my curriculum vitae, submitted as Exhibit A-37. I prepared the following technical report on the flora found at the proposed Thirty Meter Telescope Observatory site on the summit of Maunakea [sic] in May 2009 with a few nomenclatural amendments in 2016."

WDT of Clifford W. Smith, Ph.D; UHH Witness Statement 3 filed 10/11/2016.

532. Dr. Smith testified that the highest densities and diversity of the 21 known species of lichens tend to grow on north and west facing rocks in protected locations away from direct early morning sun exposure. WDT Dr. Smith at 10; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-60 to 3-62.
533. According to Dr. Smith, there are two general ecosystems or habitats in the Mauna Kea summit region. They are: (1) alpine shrub lands and grasslands, which generally occur from the 9,500-foot elevation to the 12,800-foot elevation; and (2) alpine stone desert located above the 12,800-foot elevation. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-59 to 3-60.
534. Vegetation generally decreases in diversity, density, and size towards the summit of the mountain, moving from alpine shrub lands and grasslands above the tree line, at roughly 9,500 feet, to a stone desert above 12,800 feet. The TMT Observatory site, the Access Way, and the Batch Plant Staging Area are located in the alpine stone desert. The plant community in the alpine stone desert consists of several species of mosses and lichens, and a limited number of vascular plants. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-58 to 3-62.
535. A general botanical survey of the summit area above 12,992 feet was conducted in 1982 and recorded one species of algae, no hornworts or liverworts, 12 species of moss, 25 species of lichen, one fern, and five flowering plants. All species occurred in very low abundance though there were very small, highly protected pockets where the lichens and mosses were common. WDT Dr. Smith at 1-2, 10; Tr. 12/1/16 at 189:3-190:7.
536. A 2009 comprehensive survey of Area E detected 10 lichen species, 2 species of moss, and 7 vascular plants. This survey and subsequent report determined that there is a very low diversity and cover of plants in Area E and that all of the species are found at lower elevations at least on the southern side of Mauna Kea. None of the lichen or moss species are unique to Hawai‘i. WDT Dr. Smith at 5-10; Tr. 12/1/16 at 154:5-156:10, 161:8- 162:11; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-59 to 3-62; Ex. A-5, App. K at 12-13, 21-25.
537. There are no unique plants within the proposed project site. (Dr. Smith) Tr. 12/1/16 at 154:5-156:10, 171:11-172:4.
538. Although there is vegetation in the summit region, because of the incredibly harsh environment, there is an extremely low cover of lichens, and bryophytes (less than 1%) in the summit region. Most, if not all, types of the vegetation found in the summit region can be found at lower elevations on Mauna Kea. There are no endangered or threatened species of flora in the TMT Project area. WDT Dr. Smith at 1-2, 8, 10; Tr. 12/1/16 at 174:5- 176:13, 207-208:4.
539. There are no species of flora unique to the TMT Project site. Based on this, the TMT Project will not have a significant impact on botanical resources because species and habitat of these areas are not unique to the Project site and are found elsewhere on Mauna Kea and/or on other islands of Hawai‘i. In addition, any potential impacts will be appropriately mitigated by the measures described herein. Thus, the displacement of roughly 6 acres of alpine stone desert lava habitat – which is the ecosystem located above 12,800 feet and includes the summit cinder cones – is less than significant because this represents less than 0.5% of this type of habitat available. Overall, the TMT Project will

not have a substantial adverse impact on the biological resources of Mauna Kea. WDT Hayes at 31-33; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-69 to 3-77, 3-214; WDT Dr. Smith at 10; Tr. 10/25/16 at 126:14-20; Tr. 12/1/16 at 156:5-156:10, 203:6-23, 209:1-212:20.

540. The only resident faunal species in the alpine stone desert ecosystem above 12,800 feet on Mauna Kea are arthropods. At least 10 confirmed resident species of native Hawaiian arthropod species have been collected near the summit, including: (1) wēkiu bugs (*Nysius wēkiuicola*); (2) lycosid wolf spiders (*Lycosa* sp.); (3) two sheetweb spiders (genus *Erigone*); (4) two mites (Family Aystidae and Family Eupodidae: both species unknown); (5) two springtails (Family Entomobryidae: two species unknown); (6) a centipede (*Lithobius* sp.); and (7) a noctuid moth (*Agrotis* sp.). Several other native Hawaiian species have also been collected near the summit but their resident status is unconfirmed. Additional arthropod species, non-native to Hawai‘i, are thought to be resident to the summit area cinder cones. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-62 to 3-63.
541. There are no currently listed threatened or endangered species known to occur in the Astronomy Precinct. The arthropod and botanical surveys conducted in 2008 and 2009 of the TMT Project areas in the Mauna Kea summit region did not encounter any species listed as endangered or threatened under either Federal or State of Hawai‘i endangered species statutes. The Mauna Kea Silversword, an endangered species, is known to occur at lower elevations and not at the TMT Project site. One species currently considered a species of concern by the United States Fish & Wildlife Service ("FWS"), the Douglas’ bladderfern, is known to occur in the Mauna Kea summit region. The Douglas’ bladderfern was found in Area E. However, it is known to be widespread, occurring on all main Hawaiian Islands, and on Mauna Kea it is more common to the east, in the vicinity of Area F. Area E is not considered critical habitat for the Douglas’ bladderfern. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-64 to 3-65.
542. Hansen was called as a witness for KAHEA. He has a Master’s of Science degree in Tropical Conservation Biology & Environmental Science and a Bachelor’s of Science degree in Environmental Science from UH Hilo. Ex. B.10b. His background is in tropical conservation, biology, and environmental science, with an emphasis on botany, conservation biology, and landscape ecology. Ex. B.10b. In May 2011, Hansen began working as a field crew leader for the Mauna Kea Baseline Botanical Survey for OMKM. Ex. B.10a (WDT Hansen) at 1.
543. Hansen is not a trained entomologist and not an expert in lichen but his testimony focused on the lichens present on Mauna Kea. He identified two endemic lichen species present on Mauna Kea. He was unsure if they were endemic to Mauna Kea only, or could be found throughout the Hawaiian Islands. Tr. 1/19/17 at 160:4-10, 167:8-10. Hansen testified to the presence of unique assemblages of lichens found at the TMT Project site. Hansen acknowledged that those species of lichen can be found elsewhere on the mountain and that the particular assemblages of lichens found at the TMT Project site could be found elsewhere. Tr. 1/19/17 at 147:7-25, 192:6-22.
544. When asked about the report prepared by his superior, Dr. Gerrish, which did not focus significantly on the assemblages of lichens that he (Hansen) testified about, Hansen

admitted that there were differences between his opinion and that of Dr. Gerrish. Specifically, Hansen noted that the report prepared by Dr. Gerrish did not consider the lichen assemblage to be "significant." Tr. 1/19/17 at 194:7-195:14.

545. Hansen testified that, in his opinion, the CDUA does not meet criterion 4 because the development of the TMT Project will "dig into the mountain, move rocks and alter substrate." Ex. B.10a (WDT Hansen) at 2.
546. The wēkiu bug was previously proposed as a candidate species for Federal listing under the Endangered Species Act. On October 26, 2011, the FWS formally removed the wēkiu bug as a candidate from the Federal Endangered Species Act stating threats to the wēkiu bug did not put the species in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. FWS cited OMKM's continued monitoring of the bug and its habitat, scientific studies to assist in managing and protecting the wēkiu bug's populations and habitat, the CMP, subplans, and procedure for formal review of new projects all contribute to the protection and conservation of the wēkiu bug. FWS concluded that the wēkiu bug no longer met the definition of a threatened or endangered species and no longer warranted listing. WDT Hayes at 31-32. The FWS's action is documented in the official Federal Register at 76 Fed. Reg. 66,377 (Oct. 26, 2011).
547. Wēkiu bugs are found in habitat composed of loose cinder found on cinder cones above 11,715 feet on Mauna Kea. WDT Hayes at 32. The wēkiu bug is a small "true bug" that has made a remarkable adaptation in feeding behavior. Many true bugs, including most of those found elsewhere in Hawai'i, are herbivores and feed on seeds and plant juices. The wēkiu bug is a scavenger that uses its straw-like mouth to feed on insects blown up to the summit area from the surrounding lowlands. These aeolian insects accumulate in protected pockets on the cinder cones; they quickly become moribund in the cold and thus easy prey for foraging wēkiu bugs who have adapted to the harsh conditions of the summit area. Wēkiu bugs are generally concentrated on the cinder cones in the summit area, but also utilize other habitats. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 3-6.
548. OMKM has a plan to restore wēkiu bug habitat that was prepared in coordination with the wēkiu bug working group, the FWS, and University entomologists, and is currently being implemented. Tr. 12/6/16 at 20:6-20:16 (Klasen).
549. There are six arthropod habitat types in the alpine stone desert, including:
- Type 1** Snow patches. Seasonal patches of snow accumulate insects that are blown up the mountain from lower elevations. Wēkiu bugs are thought to exploit the edges of these patches, feeding on aeolian insects as they emerge from the melting snow.
- Type 2** Tephra ridges and slopes. On cinder cones, where tephra cinders are large enough (≥ 1 cm), wēkiu bugs, spiders, caterpillars (*Agrotis* sp.) and smaller arthropods are able to move within the interstitial spaces and utilize humid, protected microhabitats among the tephra. This is the habitat where wēkiu bugs are observed in greatest abundance. Smaller arthropods, like springtails (*Collembola*), and mites inhabit smaller (≤ 1 cm) tephra cinders.

Type 3 Loose, steep tephra slopes. The unstable steep outside slopes of cinder cones where tephra cinders are smaller and subject to downward creep. Wēkiu bugs are present in low abundance in this habitat.

Type 4 Lava flows. A‘ā and pāhoehoe flows with large outcrops of andesitic (iron-poor gray lava) rock are the primary habitat for lichens and mosses, lycosid wolf spiders, and centipedes. Wēkiu bugs are uncommon in this habitat, presumably because of the lack of suitable microhabitat.

Type 5 Talus slopes and fractured rock outcrops. Usually found as islands within Type 4 habitat, these are areas of talus slopes, highly fractured rock outcrops, and depressions between lava flows with glacially deposited, rounded cobbles and rocks lie on fine loess. Small voids provide suitable microhabitat for the wēkiu bug, which can occur in moderate abundance during times of high population outbreaks.

Type 6 Compacted ash, silt, and mud. Found on roadways, disturbed areas, and where fine aeolian loess accumulates. The interstitial spaces are mostly filled with fine-grained material and therefore not suitable for wēkiu bugs and lycosid spiders. Springtails and mites are the most abundant arthropods in this habitat type.

Ex. A-1/R-1 at 3-6 to 3-7; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-62 to 3-64.

550. The great majority (greater than 95 percent) of the area that would be disturbed by construction of the proposed TMT Observatory and Access Way consists of Type 4, 5, and 6 habitats. Surveys conducted in 2008 and 2009 show these to be free of wēkiu bugs. Only one percent of the area that would be disturbed consists of Type 3 habitat, which the spring 2009 survey showed had a few members of this species. No wēkiu bugs were identified in the affected Type 3 habitat in the summer of 2008. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 3-7.
551. The lava substrate in Area E is not considered an ideal wēkiu bug habitat. Area E is largely comprised of Type 4 habitat, with smaller areas comprised of Type 5 habitat. The loose cinder adjacent to the existing TMT Access Way is highly suitable as wēkiu bug habitat, consisting of different sized cinders larger than 1/2 inch in a depth of 2 – 10 inches above the ash layer. The bulk of the Access Way alignment is habitat similar to the lava flow terrain in Area E (Types 4 and 5), while the rest is Type 6 habitat. No wēkiu bugs were located in Area E or the Access Way during the 2008 and 2009 sampling efforts. During the 2009 sampling effort, wēkiu bugs were only found in the cinder along the southern portion of the Access Way. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 3-7; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-62 to 3-66, 3- 229; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. K at 20.
552. The stockpiled cinder at the Batch Plant Staging Area has already been altered and is disturbed regularly for road maintenance activity and, thus, is not suitable wēkiu bug habitat. Activity at the Batch Plant Staging Area, does not appear to impact wēkiu bug populations elsewhere. It is unlikely that construction activities at the Batch Plant Staging Area would have any significant impact on the wēkiu bug population. Ex. A-5, App. K at 20.
553. The disturbance of prime wēkiu bug habitat (Type 3) for the TMT Project would be

limited to 0.2 acres. The amount of Type 4 and 5 wēkiu bug habitat that will be affected by the TMT Project is approximately 10 acres, which is less than 0.25% of the total more than 4,000 acres of Type 4 and 5 wēkiu bug habitat that exists at elevations above 11,700 feet. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-70 to 3-71, 3-229.

554. The impact to wēkiu bugs resulting from construction of the TMT Access Way will be less than significant. The total population of the species will not be significantly impacted by the disturbance of a small area of habitat along the TMT Access Way. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-70 to 3-77.
555. Any potential adverse impacts on the wēkiu bug and its habitat, such as dust generated from excavation and site preparation, wind-blown debris, and potential introduction of invasive species, will be mitigated by the TMT Project's planned implementation of various mitigation measures listed in the TMT FEIS and CDUA. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-68 to 3-77. Currently, a program for inspections for invasive species prevention and control is in place with the Big Island Invasive Species Committee. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 80:7-19. The TMT Project also imposes requirements on materials shipped to the site from any country and any supplier to control invasive species. In other words, despite varying standards for invasive species control in other countries, the TMT Project will impose the most stringent requirements for *all* shipments to the site. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 81:21-82:21.
556. Equipment and materials will be inspected for invasive species at lower elevations, below Hale Pōhaku. TIO follows the Mauna Kea Invasive Species Management Plan and has additional invasive species controls that augment OMKM's requirements. TIO is working with the Big Island Invasive Species Committee to implement those actions. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 01/04/17 at 43:1-44:10.
557. The TMT Project will implement the following mitigation measures with regard to potential impacts on biologic resources, including wēkiu bugs: (1) implementation of a Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program that will give TMT personnel and construction workers an annual orientation regarding Mauna Kea's natural resources; (2) implementation of an Invasive Species Prevention and Control Program that will outline steps to be taken to avoid the potential impacts associated with invasive species; (3) pursuant to CMP Management Action FLU-6, the TMT Access Way has been designed to limit disturbance and displacement of sensitive wēkiu bug habitat, including reducing the Access Way configuration to a single lane in certain areas and paving the roadway where adjacent to such habitat to reduce dust-related impacts; (4) pursuant to CMP Management Action FLU-6, construction-phase measures will be implemented to reduce impacts to sensitive habitat and arthropods will be monitored in the area of the TMT Access Way prior to, during, and for two years after the occurrence of construction on the alpine-cinder cone habitat; (5) implementation of a Ride-Sharing Program that will reduce the number of vehicle trips per day to the summit; and (6) the planting of two new māmane trees for each māmane tree directly impacted by possible TMT Project activities. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-75 to 3-77.
558. TIO plans to relocate as little material from the mountain as possible. The Project will

use excavated material from the grading and excavations for the building foundations and will stockpile excess material at the Batch Plant for future use in restoration. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 01/04/17 at 58:16-24. The only materials that TIO plans to bring in from outside of Mauna Kea are those necessary for paving and will be removed from the mountain upon deconstruction of the TMT Observatory. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 113:13-15:23.

559. Dust generated from an unpaved road can degrade wēkiu bug habitat by filling the voids between cinder making it more difficult for the bugs to move about. There is a potential that dust generated vehicle traffic during operation of the TMT Observatory will impact wēkiu bugs. However, the bugs only occupy habitats nearby and downwind of the Project areas during periods of high population, an uncommon event, and generally are more abundant elsewhere in the Mauna Kea summit region that will not frequently receive dust from the Project areas. Nevertheless, the Access Way will be paved where it is adjacent to, but upwind of, sensitive wēkiu bug habitat. This will reduce the generation of dust. Accordingly, the potential impact to the wēkiu bug is less than significant. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-74. The existing roadway is required to be paved where adjacent to sensitive habitats to reduce dust-related impacts. Construction-phase mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce potential impacts to sensitive habitat. WDT Hayes at 33.
560. The paving of the TMT Access Way will not have a significant adverse impact on wēkiu bug populations. Wēkiu bugs have been seen crossing dirt roads, but none have been observed crossing paved roads. Only wēkiu bugs that occasionally cross dirt roads while dispersing during periods of high population could be impacted by the pavement. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-74.
561. There is no scientific evidence that the wēkiu bug population on Mauna Kea has declined since 1982. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. K at 18.
562. TMT Project impacts on biological resources is proposed to be less than significant through implementation of the Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program and Invasive Species Prevention and Control Program. Implementation of the additional mitigation measures is planned to further reduce the potential impact of the TMT Project. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-76 to 3-78.
563. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors generally dispute the University's positions regarding the fauna and flora in the vicinity of the TMT Project, primarily through the testimony of Ward, Hansen, and C. Freitas.
564. Ward offered opinion testimony concerning certain entomological, biological, and botanical issues to support her claim that the CDUA is inadequate. Ward did not offer any scientific studies or data to support her opinions. Ward conceded during cross-examination that she is not an entomologist, biologist, or botanist. Tr. 1/31/17 at 132:8-11; 117:2-4; 132:2-7 (Ward). Although Ward sits on the advisory OMKM Environment Committee, her background is in horticulture, which is a distinct field from botany, entomology, and biology. *Id.*

565. Petitioners raised general concerns regarding the introduction of invasive species caused by the TMT Project. C. Freitas testified as to her concerns regarding the protocols for invasive species management. Tr. 2/21/17 at 2/21/17 at 102:25-104:13. C. Freitas failed to produce any evidence that the TMT Project will result in the introduction of invasive species, or that such introduction would result in a significant and adverse impact on the biological resources on Mauna Kea.
566. The only recent evidence of invasive species introduction to the UH Management Area is near the Hale constructed by persons opposing the TMT Project across from Hale Pōhaku. See Ex. A-135 at 1. The invasive fire ant *Ochetellus glaber* was identified in the area on or about April 16, 2015. OMKM continues to monitor the situation and has not observed *O. glaber* on the summit of Mauna Kea. Camara testified that he has never seen red fire ants on the summit and acknowledged that the summit is a harsh environment not only for the fire ant, but for arthropods and other insects as well. Tr. 3/1/17 at 198:3-9.
567. Based on the totality of the evidence, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have not refuted the University's extensive scientific studies, reports and testimony that the TMT Project will not have a significant adverse impact on biological resources.

ii. Archaeological and Historic Resources

568. The archaeological process generally consists of surveying the project area, a walk through, contacting people with knowledge about the area, generating maps, photographs, recordings, historical background research, and writing a report with all historical information combined. Tr. 01/04/17 at 152:23-153:18 (Rechtman). The walkthrough consists of fieldworkers walking transects, lines, and spacing intervals. The spacing intervals are spaced sufficiently to ensure the entire site can be carefully surveyed and reviewed. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 47:23-48:7. Archaeologists also rely on previous surveys by other archaeologists and historical maps by map makers and surveyors. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 135:24- 136:2.
569. Subsurface work is done on occasion. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 131:17-132:20. Excavations are allowed only based on a permit to conduct archaeological studies in the State of Hawai'i. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 136:10-18.
570. Nees was called as a witness for UH Hilo and testified in the area of archaeology, particularly archaeological investigations on Mauna Kea. Nees has expertise in archaeology and is particularly familiar with the archaeological investigations on Mauna Kea. He has extensive experience in archaeology in Hawai'i, with over 26 years in physical anthropology, historic preservation, and archaeological monitoring. He also has experience and is familiar with the historic preservation process under Haw. Rev. Stat. Chapter 6E. Reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence supports Nees's opinions and recommendations. Nees has actively participated in archaeological field work on Mauna Kea since 2005 and co-authored numerous inventory survey reports for Mauna Kea. Ex. A-119 (Nees CV); WDT Nees at 1; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 188:4-8. Nees was responsible for ensuring that cultural resources on Mauna Kea were properly

recorded. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 68:4-8. Nees testified that all AIS reports prepared in relation to the TMT Project comply with Haw. Rev. Stat. Chapter 6E, and its implementing regulations found in HAR §§ 13-275 through 282. Nees also testified as to the extent of cultural and historic resources present in the Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District, and opined that the TMT Project would not result in a substantial adverse impact to such resources within the surrounding area, community or region. WDT Nees at 1-8.

571. Rechtman was called as a witness for TIO and testified about archaeological investigations for the TMT Project on Mauna Kea. Rechtman has extensive expertise in archaeology and is particularly familiar with the archaeological investigations on Mauna Kea for the TMT Project. Rechtman has been the principal archaeologist at ASM Affiliates, Inc. ("**ASM**") since 2013. He has spent 38 years in the field of archaeology, with extensive experience in archaeology in Hawai'i, completing more than 800 cultural resources management projects throughout the state for private parties, as well as state, county, and federal agencies. Ex. C-11 (WDT Rechtman) at 1. Those projects included compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act ("**NHPA Section 106**"), cultural impact assessments, archaeological assessments, reconnaissance surveys, inventory surveys, site testing, data recovery, preservation planning, burial treatment planning, and archaeological monitoring. *Id.*; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 37:1-38:11. He is also familiar with the historic preservation process under Haw. Rev. Stat. Chapter 6E. Rechtman conducted five archaeological studies of the TMT Project site from 2013 to 2015. These studies included archaeological monitoring reports and archaeological field reconnaissance reports of the TMT Project site. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 38:12-40:9; Exs. C-12, C-14; C-15; C-16; C-39. Rechtman concluded that all of the constructed features encountered were modern in nature. Ex. C-11; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 37:2-40:12.
572. The National Environmental Policy Act ("**NEPA**") and NHPA Section 106 apply to federal agencies and private projects that use federal funding. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 136:22- 137:3. If a project involves a federal undertaking, then the federal agency must conduct its own environmental review process under NEPA and NHPA Section 106. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 83:16-23, 229:3-8. There was no federal nexus for the TMT project requiring or allowing NEPA or NHPA Section 106 compliance. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 211:1-11. Therefore, NHPA Section 106 does not apply, and no federal EIS is required nor allowed. Tr. 10/25/16 at 139:12-40:14, 157:2-162:4, 182:6-183:25.
573. While the National Science Foundation ("**NSF**") previously awarded a planning grant of \$250,000 to TMT Corporation, the grant specifically stated that no funds were to be used for construction. TIO has not applied for any construction funding from the NSF. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 33:17-19, 88:7-90:25, 228:2-15; A-126. The NSF was not involved in the design of the TMT Observatory. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 177:9-20. The NSF has stated that it has made no commitment to the construction of the TMT Observatory, and that it has not triggered the federal review processes under NEPA or NHPA Section 106. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 88:10-25, 227:18-25; A-125.

574. Consultation under NHPA Section 106 was not required nor allowed for the TMT Project because: 1) the proposed TMT Project does not have the potential to cause effects on federally protected historic properties; and 2) the NSF funding does not convert the TMT Project into a federal undertaking for the purposes of NHPA Section 106 because such funds were provided for the limited purpose of governance planning focused on development of a partnership model for the TMT Observatory, which would serve as a model for other similar projects at other locations in the future. The TMT project is not a federal project and will not use federal funding. Exs. A-124, A-125 and A-126; (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 30:2-31:7, 227:13-228:15; (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 33:14-19, 88:8-90:6.
575. Under Haw. Rev. Stat. § 6E-2, an "**Historic Property**" means any building, structure, object, district, area, or site, including heiau and underwater sites, which is over fifty years old. "**Historic Districts**" are geographically definable areas possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of contributing properties – sites, buildings, structures, or objects united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A contributing property adds to the historic architectural qualities, historic associations, or archaeological values for which a district is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time or is capable of yielding important information about the period. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-40.
576. Historic properties contribute to the Historic District's significance. The natural landscape may be considered a contributing characteristic in relation to the significance of a historic site, but find spots are not given any sort of significance in terms of impacts when archaeological surveys are done and reviewed. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 71:19-74:6, 105:9-14, 218:3-12; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-12, Figure 3-1; Ex. C-12 at 3, Figure 2.
577. In 1997, SHPD instituted a process of recording "find spots." "Find spots" are cultural resources that are obviously modern features or features that cannot be classified with any confidence because of their uncertain age or function. Ex. A-11 at 2-50. Find spots are sites that could resemble historic properties (50 years older) but are likely of more recent vintage, typically shrines of recent origin that are not contributing properties to the Historic District. (Nees) Tr. 12/5/16 at 31:17-32:13, 79:13-80:1, 86:16-88:5; 218:3-12. Find spots may or may not be historic properties, contemporary, and/or made by practitioners. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 31:21-33:1; 238:15-239:7. Find spots are generally manmade features on the landscape that appear to be a more recent construction such as pile of stones on a boulder, camp sites with tin cans, pieces of glass or other modern material cultural items. They are less than 50 years old. Generally, they are structures that are of indeterminate age, but assumed to be modern. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 86:16-88:5, 179:25-180:8, 252:23-253:2. They are likely to be recent because they were not recorded during the first or previous archaeological visits. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 79:9-80:11; Ex. A-55 at 5-20.
578. Find spots encountered on Mauna Kea often incorporate ti leaves. Ti leaves are considered contemporary given their organic nature. Ex. A-122 at 7-49; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 187:23-188:4.

Several AISs have been conducted on and adjacent to the MKSR documenting the historic properties and cultural resources of the MKSR. Reports have been completed and approved by SHPD for the following areas: (1) Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR¹; (2) Mauna Kea Access Road Management Corridor; (3) the MKSR²; (4) Hale Pōhaku Rest House; and (5) the NAR. WDT Nees at 1-2; Ex. A-55; Ex. A-56; Ex. A-122; Ex. A-123; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. G, App. H, App. I.

579. In addition to these reports, archaeological surveys were conducted for the TMT Project areas. The University prepared the CRMP to identify and manage the cultural resources in the entire the University Management Areas. The University also prepared a Mauna Kea Historic Preservation Plan that was prepared in conjunction with the Master Plan. WDT Nees at 1-2; Ex. A-11; Ex. A-48, App. F; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-39 to 3-41, Appendices G and H; Ex A-5/R-5, App. J.
580. Rechtman and ASM prepared the following archaeological documents for the TMT Project (1) Archaeological Monitoring Report: Geotechnical Boring (2013); (2) Archaeological Monitoring Report for the Construction of a Graded Site Pad (2014); (3) Field Reconnaissance of TMT Development Site (July 2015); (4) Updated Field Reconnaissance of the TMT Development Site (Dec. 2015); and (5) Assessment of Find Spots. Ex. C-11 (WDT Rechtman) at 1-2; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 38:12-40:7; Exs. C-12; C-14; C-15; C-16; C-39. In preparing these studies, ASM reviewed and considered the previous archaeological studies done on Mauna Kea and the identification of find spots on the TMT Project site as a starting point. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 67:19-68:21.
581. In 2012, Nees's employer, Pacific Consulting Services, Inc. ("PCSI") began archaeological monitoring of sites in the UH Management Area. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 9:9-12. Annual monitoring inspections of historic properties are conducted on Mauna Kea. WDT Nees at 1; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 188: 17-20. PCSI surveyed all of the MKSR, Astronomy Precinct and the NAR, including Area E, not knowing it was the proposed TMT Project site. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 240:9-242:15.
582. There were no challenges to the acceptance of the Astronomy Precinct AIS. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 215:24-216:2. There were also no legal challenges to the TMT FEIS, including the AISs that were attached. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 216:3-8.
583. Surveys indicate that people's activities on Mauna Kea occurred on the top of the mountain area that is now the MKSR. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 55:7-18. While there is

¹ Applicant submitted into evidence copies of: (1) SHPD's December 28, 2009 letter to Dr. McCoy accepting the draft AIS of the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR as final (Ex. A-53), and (2) SHPD's May 26, 2010 letter accepting the draft AIS for the MKSR as final (Ex. A-63). Notwithstanding that Exhibits A-53 and A-63 were not received into evidence in this contested case hearing, see Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553], as amended [Doc. 649], SHPD did in fact accept the AIS for the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR by letter dated December 28, 2009 (LOG NO: 2009.4076; DOC NO: 0912TD22) and the AIS for the MKSR by letter dated May 26, 2010 (LOG NO: 2010.0066; DOC NO: 1005TD05).

² See *supra* n.1.

also a foot trail on the summit, the trail does not connect all sites identified on the map. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 54:19-55:4; see Ex. A-12 at 2-27, Figure 2-5 (Historic Properties, Traditional Cultural Properties, and Find Spots).

584. There are historic (but not ancient) campsites on Mauna Kea. Historic campsites are generally identified by features such as writing or carvings on rocks and rock enclosures. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 55:20-56:20, 101:4-23.
585. The TMT Observatory site, the TMT Access Way, and the Batch Plant Staging Area are all within the proposed Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District – Statewide Inventory of Historic Places ("**SIHP**") No. 50-10-23-26869 – as previously defined in SHPD's Mauna Kea Historic Preservation Plan Management Components. WDT Nees at 2-3; Ex. A-48, App. F at Figure 1.
586. The Mauna Kea Summit Historic District is not currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-3.
587. The proposed boundary for the Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District starts at the summit and goes down to approximately the 10,000-foot level above sea level. The Mauna Kea Summit Historic District does not include Hale Pōhaku. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 26:9-21.
588. Mauna Kea has one of the largest concentrations of shrines anywhere in Polynesia. Ex. A-122 at 7-67; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 17:3-5. There are roughly over 200 sites identified as historic properties on Mauna Kea. These sites are mostly concentrated on the eastern and northeastern sides of the mountain. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 68:17-21, 115:7-19. On the southern side, within the NAR, many sites relate to the adze quarry. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 115:21-116:4. There is not a large concentration of sites outside of the NAR and adze quarry areas on the south side. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 116:6-15.
589. Mauna Kea's archaeological landscape consists of clusters of terraces, shrines and burial sites. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 184:20-17.
590. Sites consisting of rock shelters and shrines and coral located in the NAR have been carbon dated to between 1280 to 1660, which predate western contact and the arrival of Captain Cook as well as the statutory historic period of 1892. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 78:2-79:7.
591. The Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District contains significant historic properties that are linked through their setting, historic use, traditional associations, and ongoing cultural practices. These include shrines, adze quarry complexes and workshops, burials, stone markers/memorials, temporary shelters, historic campsites, traditional cultural properties, a historic trail, and sites of unknown function. WDT Nees at 2-3; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 100:21-101:3. All of these types of historic properties are contributing properties to the Historic District.
592. SHPD is not notified when modern cultural sites are located because they do not fall under historic preservation; OMKM and KKM handle those more recent sites.

(Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 85:9-86:3. New (find spots) as well as old sites that are identified are reported to SHPD via reports completed after the survey is done.
(Rechtman) Tr. 01/04/17 at 155:8-10. Find spots are documented and photographed, but not evaluated. (Rechtman) Tr. 01/04/17 at 155:11-21.

593. The Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District has been determined by SHPD to be significant under all five criteria (A, B, C, D, and E), as defined in HAR § 13-275-6. Ex. A-122 at iii; WDT Nees at 2-3; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. I at 7-3; Ex. A- 1/R-1, at 4-1; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 11:14-14:1, 29:13-22, 100:21-101:3.
594. The Historic District is significant under Criterion A because of the presence of Mauna Kea adze quarry complex which is a national historic landmark which was used for a period of 500 to 700 years or more and hundreds of shrines are inside and outside of the quarry. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 12:3-11.
595. The Historic District is significant under Criterion B because of the association with several gods who may have been deified ancestors. These include Kūkahau‘ula (SIHP No. 50-10-23-21438), Līlīnoe (SIHP No. 50-10-23-21439) and Waiau (SIHP No. 50-10-23-21440). These pu‘u were deemed TCPs by SHPD. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 12:12-23.
596. The National Register of Historic Places also identifies a category of properties called "TCPs" based on its association with the cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, life ways, arts, crafts or social institutions of a living community. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 31:8-15.
597. Some of the current activities observed in the Astronomy Precinct are by religious persons (not necessarily native Hawaiians) making offerings to the gods as they travel through the area. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 114:8-115:1.
598. Shrines embody distinctive characteristics of traditional Hawaiian stone tools manufactured by craft specialists and a distinctive type of shrines construction found only in a few other places in the Hawaiian Islands, making the district significant under Criterion C. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 12:25-13:8.
599. Studies of the Mauna Kea adze quarry complex have made a significant contribution to our understanding of Hawaiian prehistory and history, making the district significant under Criterion D. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 13:10-16.
600. The district is significant under criterion E because of the presence of numerous burials and hundreds of shrines. Many of the shrines have been interpreted as evidence of land use practices in the form of pilgrimages to the summit of Mauna Kea and Lake Waiau to worship gods and goddesses. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 13:18-14:1.
601. Criteria to determine historic properties for uprights includes the shape of the stones, placement of stones (by man), and associated artifacts. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 77:10-18.
602. The State-recognized TCPs that are contributing properties to the Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District include Pu‘u Kūkahau‘ula, Pu‘u Waiau (which encloses Lake Waiau), and Pu‘u Līlīnoe. WDT Nees at 3. SHPD declined to designate all lands on

Mauna Kea above the 6,000-foot level as a TCP. *See* Ex. A-122 at 3-26 to 3-27. WDT Nees at 3. SHPD did not designate Pu‘u Poli‘ahu as a TCP. *See* Ex. A-122 at 3-27.

603. Pu‘u Kūkahau‘ula (SIHP No. -21438) encompasses the three pu‘u that form the highest portion of Mauna Kea’s summit, Pu‘u Hau‘oki, Pu‘u Kea, and Pu‘u Wēkiu. All three pu‘u were given recent geographic names for these landmarks. Established by SHPD in 1999 as a TCP, Pu‘u Kūkahau‘ula bears the name of a legendary figure that appears in Hawaiian traditions and is particularly associated, by name, with legends about Mauna Kea. Kūkahau‘ula variously appears as the husband of Līlīnoe, a suitor or husband of Poli‘ahu, and as an ‘aumakua of fishermen. The initial area of the Access Way that begins the road leading to the TMT Project site would intersect the northwestern edge of Pu‘u Kūkahau‘ula for approximately 800 feet. Ex. A-55 at 5-15 to 5-20; WDT Nees at 3.
604. SHPD designated Pu‘u Līlīnoe as SIHP No. 50-10-23-21439. At the same time, SHPD designated Lake Waiau and the encompassing Pu‘u Waiau as the Waiau Site (SIHP No. -21440). The Waiau Site is located outside the MKSR, within the Mauna Kea Ice Age NAR. Pu‘u Līlīnoe is within the MKSR, southeast of Pu‘u Kūkahau‘ula. No portion of the TMT Project area is in or near Pu‘u Līlīnoe or the Waiau Site. WDT Nees at 3.
605. Pu‘u Poli‘ahu is a summit cone to the immediate southwest of the Astronomy Precinct. Poli‘ahu is identified as a goddess who plays a prominent role in many Hawaiian traditions pertaining to Mauna Kea. In the 1890s, W.D. Alexander proposed giving her name to a pu‘u in the summit region. No portion of the current project is located on Pu‘u Poli‘ahu. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at 17, 26-30; Ex. A-55 at 5-18; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-12 to 3-13; WDT Nees at 3.
606. Notwithstanding extensive surveying, no archaeological or historic sites, or burials have been found on the TMT Observatory site, on the TMT Access Way, or in the Batch Plant Staging Area. WDT Nees at 4; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 217:18-23. As identified in the CDUA for the TMT Project, Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-1 to 4-5, recent surveys have recorded a few archaeological sites designated as historic properties that are in the general vicinity of the TMT project areas. Tr. 12/05/16 at 57:24-58:6.
607. The following sites are known to be in the vicinity of the TMT Access Way and TMT Observatory site:
 - a. SIHP No. -16172 was recorded as a shrine and consisted of a single upright with several support stones. SIHP No. -16172 is located about 225 feet north of the proposed TMT Observatory site.
 - b. SIHP No. -16167 was recorded as a shrine in 1982 and subsequently documented during surveys conducted in 1995, 1999, and 2007. The site consisted of two uprights placed in a bedrock crack. SIHP No. -16167 is located approximately 500 feet east of the proposed TMT Access Way, and about 1,300 feet southeast of the proposed TMT Observatory site.
 - c. SIHP No. -16166 was recorded as a multi-feature shrine with eight, possibly nine, uprights arranged in two groups. SIHP No. -16166 is approximately 350 feet east

of the TMT Access Way and 1,600 feet southeast of the proposed TMT Observatory site.

- d. SIHP No. -21449 consists of a single terrace constructed of stacked cobbles and small boulders with a surface composed of cobbles, small boulders, and thin flat slabs which were probably brought to the area by human agency. SIHP No. -21449 is located approximately 200 feet east of the TMT Access Way and 700 feet south of the proposed TMT Observatory site.

Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-1 to 4-3; Ex. A-55; WDT Nees at 3-4; Ex. C-44.

- 608. Archaeological landscape is defined as built (man-made) structures having an age greater than 50 years old. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 176:3-12.
- 609. The TMT FEIS describes Site 21449 as first being recorded in 2005 and located about 200 feet east of the access road and 700 feet south of the TMT project site. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-44 to 3-46. The site was given a State Inventory of Historic Places number even though testing found no evidence of historic origin. An archaeological excavation was conducted to determine the presence or absence of cultural materials and to determine the site's function. No cultural materials or features were encountered and no human burials, or isolated human skeletal remains were present. This site is likely to be a natural feature. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-44 to 3-46; Ex. A-55 at 5-20 to 5-22; Ex. A-5/R-5 Appendix G at A-4. SHPD determined that it was not a historic site. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 151:5-152:10. SIHP 21449 is one of thousands of natural features that occur on that landscape. It remains labeled as a historic property because it has not lost its designation. It is not man made and not a historic site. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 152:13-21. For these reasons, this site is not on Figure 2 of Ex. C-12. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 80:5-81:10.
- 610. No subsurface archaeological work was done at the proposed TMT Project site except for the geotechnical testing. During the geotechnical testing done in 2013, no archaeological findings were identified and no water was located during the geotechnical work on the TMT Project site. Tr. 01/04/17 at 156:6-12. Archaeological monitors were present during all ground disturbing activity and observed all the materials excavated or removed during ground searching. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 78:22-79:6. A grading permit was acquired for the geotechnical work. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 01/04/17 at 16:19-23.
- 611. ASM selected sites 16166, 16167 and 16172 for monitoring because they were the three closest sites to the area proposed for development of the TMT Observatory. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 79:16-25.
- 612. The TMT Project site and rocks were identified and evaluated before groundbreaking and grading for the road took place and before any rocks were broken up and placed in the crusher. (Rechtman) Tr. 01/04/17 at 156:13-23.
- 613. Opposing Intervenor W. Freitas asserted that there were two stones near the groundbreaking site that were dislodged. Mr. Rechtman testified that the stones were not in the area that was bulldozed. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 152:22-156:24. The stones

are not near SIHP 21448, SIHP 16172 or find spots 2005.08 or 2005.06. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 157:8-21. The stones were in the vicinity of the boundary of the TMT Project site; the TMT Project site is indicated by the large block in the middle of the pink area on the map identified as Figure 2 in Ex. C-12. Ex. C-12 at 3.

614. The lā'ī lei in the photo was placed next to the drill overnight. Ex. C-12 at 12, Figure 14. So it was placed after the drill was already there and when construction crews and the archaeological monitor were not present. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 157:18-158:20. Rechtman testified that in his opinion, the ti leaf lei placed under the drill on the TMT Project site is a cultural symbol of protest. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 190:21-191:14.
615. The determination of what sites were historic versus modern "find spots" was made using the criteria established by Dr. McCoy in 1995, based on reasonable scientific certainty. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 252:21-253:3. The definition of find spots was developed during earlier archaeological studies for rock constructions on Mauna Kea that are less than 50 years old. Those are not considered historic properties. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 40:24-41:3.
616. When certain find spots (like a building for example) turns 50 years old, it becomes eligible to be considered historic property. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 58:13-22.
617. There are a variety of ways to determine that find spots are less than 50 years old, one of which is if there has been work done at the site previously and evidence shows it was not previously in place, but exists in the place later in time. Determinations are also made by looking at the form, structure and style of the find spot. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 41:6-10.
618. Ex. A-11, Figure 2-9 identifies find spots and TCPs, as well as historic properties in the MKSR.
619. Two "find spots" (2005.06 and 2005.08) were identified within Area E. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 210:19-25; Ex. A-55 at 5-20. One was initially interpreted to be a possible pre-contact shrine, consisting of two upright stones, located in the northwestern portion of Area E. The second was initially interpreted to be a possible pre-contact temporary habitation complex, consisting of a C-shaped enclosure and two small terraces, located within a lava channel in the northern portion of Area E. Upon completion of a site visit and survey by SHPD staff of the two find spots, neither was determined to warrant historic property designation. The shrine was determined to be a modern structure constructed within the last 10 years. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. G at A-1 to A-3. The possible temporary habitation complex was determined to most likely be a natural geological feature that only gave the appearance of being possibly not naturally formed. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. G at A-4 to A-6. Therefore, neither of the find spots located within the TMT Project area is considered a Historic Property. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-44 to 3-46; Tr. 12/05/16 at 218:13-24.
620. Rope and cautionary signs were put up around find spot 2005.08 at the request of SHPD. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 97:21-98:15; Ex. C-38.

621. Find spot 2005.08 is not an historic property. It was constructed sometime in 2004 or 2005. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 98:8-101:2; Ex. C-38. This was determined based on prior archaeological studies and field work, as well as through discussions with esteemed archeologist Pat McCoy. The letter to DLNR notifying it of the site was submitted on August 22, 2014. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 99:2-24; Ex. C-38. No determination was made as to the origin or religious nature of find spots 2005.06 and 2005.08. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 147:11- 22.
622. The Updated Field Reconnaissance (Dec. 2015) survey found one additional offering, a rock stack location. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 112:21-25; Ex. C-16.
623. Professor Peter Mills, a witness for MKAH, is a professor of anthropology at UH Hilo. Ex. B.12a (WDT Prof. Mills). He testified that, in his opinion, the CDUA inadequately acknowledges the adverse impacts of the TMT Project to cultural practices because: 1) the CDUA underestimates the visual impact of the TMT Project on cultural practitioners; 2) while the CDUA emphasizes the physical impacts to tangible cultural resources, the CDUA does not adequately recognize the impacts to "intangible" cultural resources; and 3) the CDUA omits a number of "find spots" and SHPD sites 16169 and 21447. *See* (Prof. Mills) Tr. 1/25/17 at 39:19-40:10, 43:1-24, 78:14-25.
624. Prof. Mills admitted that he had not read the CDUA and the FEIS in their entirety. (Prof. Mills) Tr. 1/25/17 at 130:9-132:3. On cross-examination, Prof. Mills acknowledged that – contrary to his understanding – SHPD sites 16169 and 21447 are in fact referenced in the CDUA. *See* (Prof. Mills) Tr. 1/25/17 at 152:1-153:7; Ex. A-1/R-1 at Fig. 4.1. He further testified that the comment letter he submitted during the public comment period for the EIS makes no reference to "intangible interest" or the "area of effects" alleged in his present testimony. (Prof. Mills) Tr. 1/25/17 at 135:19-138:16; Ex. A-4/R-4 at 343. Prof. Mills also acknowledged that the time period to challenge the EIS or the AIS had expired. (Prof. Mills) Tr. 1/25/17 at 139:23-140:2.
625. Petitioner Flores asserts that the CDUA is deficient because it does not (1) make assessments based on criteria that are not part of the CDUA criteria, or (2) evaluate impacts that have in fact been analyzed. *See* Ex. B.02a at 11-12; (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 223:5-232:17, 236:3-13 (asserting that the scope of the CDUA is wrong under State Historic Preservation Law), 236:14-239:6. Flores' WDT asserts that the CDUA does not assess the impacts of the TMT Project on historic properties or find spots.
626. The FEIS for the TMT Project, and the related AISs, which are part of the CDUA, do in fact analyze such impacts. *See* Ex. A-5, App. G at 52-57 (Archaeological Inventory Survey, Mauna Kea Summit Area); Ex. A-5, App. I. Flores also acknowledged that both the CDUA and EIS reference find spots. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 237:8-240:4. Flores testified that the AIS for the MKSR did not include the proposed TMT Project site, when in fact, it does. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 208:12-15. All relevant surveys and documents, specifically including the CDUA, were provided to SHPD for its review and comments. SHPD found no incompleteness in those submissions. WDT Nees at 2-3; *see, e.g.*, Ex. A-4/R-4 at 22-27; Ex. A-66.

627. There are pockets on the TMT Project site filled with eroded materials such as sand, cinders and silt. Rechtman testified that those pockets are identified as a sort of geologic phenomenon that takes place with the movement of a form of mini glacier that can happen overnight during the cooling process. So those are considered features that are naturally formed and derived – not archaeological features. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 134:2-19.
628. There was no physical evidence that the TMT Project site was used for piko, iwi, placenta or otherwise storing artifacts. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 145:9-12; Tr. 2/21/17 at 122:12- 123:2, 147:2-12.
629. There are natural formed terraces on Mauna Kea. Dr. McCoy excavated one terrace (SIHP 21449), but did not find any iwi, ashes, piko, or other artifacts. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 158:21-167:5; Ex. A-55 at 5-20 to 5-22.
630. The TMT Project site has been extensively and intensively surveyed. There are no known pre-existing burials or human remains located in the TMT Project area. Ex. C-11 (WDT Rechtman) at 1-2; Tr. 2/21/17 at 147:2-12; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 217:18-23; 211:13-16; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. G at Table 1, pages 39 and A-1 to A-6; Ex. A-55. There is no reasonable likelihood that there are burials in the surface or any opening to the subsurface on the TMT Project site. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 218:25-219:5.
631. Laulani Teale, called as a witness by Deborah Ward, is a Kanaka Maoli practitioner of many traditional and customary practices. Here is Teale's story:

"I am a Kanaka Maoli traditional practitioner and advanced student of many customary practices, such as laau lapaau and hooponopono. I also hold a Master's degree in Public Health, and have worked in peacemaking and community health development professionally for 16 years. Much of my work focuses on health issues affecting Kanaka Maoli. My mentor in this area was Dr. Richard Kekuni Blaisdell, M.D., with whom I was very close from 1992 until his death this past year.

Earth/Sky/Human Alignments

I have studied with many other kupuna as well. My first strong connection to Mauna Kea came through mentorship by Kamakahukilani Von Oelhoffen, a traditional Kanaka Maoli astronomer from a long navigational lineage who died in 1999, strongly connected to Mauna Kea, and a close student/assistant to Kupuna Pilahi Paki.

It was through Kamakahukilani, an early member of Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, that I originally learned of that organization, of which I am a longtime member. Mauna Kea was her favorite site for observation and worship, and she taught about it a lot. Her focus was on the importance of alignments – between stars, between Earth landmarks and stars, between landmarks and other landmarks, and between people and all of the above. She also had a specific teaching about sound in relation to air/breath, water, foundations, and the individual person.

She taught that alignments in the heavens are reflected in alignments on earth, and that

these directly relate to alignments within and between human beings. Our relationships to one another, to the Earth, to pono within ourselves are all affected by natural alignments that are the product of Wakea and Papa relating to one another in the context of creation. She used strings, hands, and her wooden staff to measure these alignments. Human interference with this great act of continual alignment is very harmful. We can only relate to it as part of this great creation."

WDT of Laulani Teale, MPH; Ex. B.15a.

Teale testified that she believed the archaeology studies are incomplete. She acknowledged not having read all of the studies and provided no countervailing evidence to the contrary. (Teale) Tr. 1/11/17 at 95-96.

632. Diana LaRose was called as a witness for the Petitioner Flores-Case 'Ohana. LaRose is not a native Hawaiian practitioner, is not from Hawai'i, and admitted that she has no knowledge of Hawaiian history. Her testimony included assertions that she is able to pinpoint the locations of burials with a high degree of accuracy based on her subjective feelings, and that her feelings indicate there are burials in the summit area. Other than her feelings, LaRose was unable to point to any credible, probative or admissible evidence of actual burials she felt existed. She otherwise admitted that her testimony was speculative. (LaRose) Tr. 1/19/17 at 204-205, 214-215, 238-240. LaRose's speculation is not scientifically verifiable or logically credible.
633. Michael Lee, called as a witness by Opposing Intervenor Harry Fergerstrom, testified that his family has burial sites somewhere on the planned access road leading to the TMT Project site. He could not provide any specific location or demonstrate a specific location on or near the roadway. Lee testified as to his beliefs regarding the water god Kane on the northern side of Mauna Kea, and the significance of various find spots. Ex. D-1 (WDT Lee) at 2-11. Lee claimed to have knowledge of underground caves and burials near the access road that will be impacted by the TMT Project, but was unable to provide any concrete evidence of such underground caves and burials. Additionally, Lee claimed that the underground caves and burials are located in an area identified in Ex. D-4, which is not within the TMT Project site and is not within the MKSR area. Ex. D-4 shows a portion of the access road far removed from the TMT Project site, below the MKSR. (Lee) Tr. 1/23/17 at 39-40, 83, 146.
634. Opposing Intervenor Camara, a native Hawaiian practitioner and NAR Resource Manager, was unable to identify the location of any burials and admitted to having a "limited understanding" of any burials that might be located on Mauna Kea. (Camara) Tr. 3/1/17 at 167, 189-190.
635. Some known burials were identified well away from the TMT Project site on the way to the adze quarry and outside of the adze quarry. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 128:17-129:4. Pu'u Mekanaka is within the MKSR and the Historic District, but it is not within the Astronomy Precinct. There are 2 identified burials and roughly 8 possible more burials on Pu'u Mekanaka. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 169:17-172:22; 243:4-13; 216:9-21.

636. A burial treatment plan was prepared by PCSI for the entire MKSR and Mauna Kea Access Road Corridor, including the TMT Project site. Ex. A-138; Ex. A-139; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 216:22-24; 243:20-244:2; (Klasen) Tr. 12/6/16 at 141; Ex. A-138. The burial treatment plan was approved by the HIBC and SHPD. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 217:1-14; Ex. A-128. Burials on Mauna Kea are not excavated or disturbed. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 138:3-5. Though no burials have been identified within the TMT Project area, the burial treatment plan for the area that includes the TMT Project site provides that any burials found are to be left alone. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 199:9-14; Ex. C-11 (WDT Rechtman) at 2; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 40:10-12; Ex. A-5/R-5 at 39; Ex. A-138. Archaeological recommendations to redesign projects, which may include realigning a road so it does not go through a heiau, will be made if burials or other significant features such as a large complex of structures, are found even though that is highly unlikely given the prior studies that show none exist. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 139:5-13.
637. The TMT Project site has been extensively and intensively surveyed. There are no known historic properties located in the TMT Project area or on the TMT Project site. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 40:10-12; Ex. A-55; *see generally* Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-15, 3-25, App. G. This was deduced based on modern properties being around the site, coupled with the fact that several earlier archaeological surveys of the TMT Project site did not identify those new properties. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 55:8-18; Ex. A-55 at 5-20 to 22; Ex. A-5, App. G at 39, A-1 to A-6.
638. The Batch Plant Staging Area is adjacent to the southwestern boundary of Pu‘u Kūkahau‘ula, across the Mauna Kea Access Road. No historic properties are known to be within this area. Two shrines are located in the general region of the Batch Plant Staging Area, both of which are more than 500 feet to the west: (1) SIHP No. -16164 is a shrine composed of two upright features: a) Feature 1 consists of three (possibly five) upright stones that are positioned along the edges of a low rectangular platform, and b) Feature 2 which consists of a single upright placed in a bedrock crack, supported by several cobbles. (2) SIHP No. -16165 consists of two single uprights about 1.4 meters apart along a ridge. Each upright is supported by cobbles. WDT Nees at 4-5; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. I at 3-9 and App. G at 18, 44.
639. Several features of the Pu‘u Kalepeamoia Site Complex (SIHP No. 50-10-23-16244) are in the general vicinity of HELCO’s Hale Pōhaku Substation. Two lithic scatters were designated as SIHP Nos. 50-10-23-10310 and -10311. These sites eventually underwent archaeological data recovery after increased erosion made preservation difficult. The data recovery fieldwork demonstrated the presence of both lithic workshops and manufacturing areas for octopus lure sinkers. WDT Nees at 5; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. I at 3-13.
640. In addition to the lithic scatters, two shrines are located across the four-wheel drive access road and to the south about 190 feet away from Hale Pōhaku. SIHP No. -10313 is a shrine with three to five upright stones, and SIHP No. -10315 is a single upright shrine. The shrines and lithic scatters are over 1,200 feet from the HELCO substation and from the nearest electrical pull box that will be accessed when the conductors in the existing conduits are replaced. None of the actions required to construct the TMT Project will

affect those historic properties. WDT Nees at 5.

- 641. Only one known archaeological site is present near HELCO's Hale Pōhaku Substation, where transformer swaps will occur. SIHP No. -10320 (also part of the Pu'u Kalepeamoia Site Complex) is a lithic scatter that lies about 200 feet west of the existing substation. None of the potential TMT Project activities in this area will be carried out near this site. WDT Nees at 5.
- 642. Sites on the summit and near Hale Pōhaku were used to produce fishing (octopus) lures. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 37:13-25. A pre-1778 fishing tool was identified on Mauna Kea and is detailed in the archaeological monitoring reports. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 207:13-24.
- 643. The AIS fieldwork was carried out in accordance with the prevailing professional standards. WDT Nees at 8; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 47:19-22. Generally, cultural practitioners are not present as consultants when archaeologists are performing field surveys. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 109:18-110:8.
- 644. The historic preservation work that Nees and his employer prepared with respect to the TMT Project to identify historic sites within the MKSR was done in compliance with Chapter 6E, the Historic Preservation Law. The work was reviewed by SHPD. The results of the reports were fully approved and accepted by SHPD. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 215:8- 23; WDT Nees at 8. All of the AISs done for the summit area of Mauna Kea have been reviewed by SHPD. SHPD has determined that the TMT Project would have no significant adverse impact on historic properties. *See, e.g.,* Exs. A-66, A-137.
- 645. SHPD recognized that the proposed mitigation measures to address impacts to cultural practices and visual impacts in the TMT Project's application documents (including the CDUA and EIS) address the project-specific and cumulative impacts to the Mauna Kea Summit Historic District and the TCPs from existing observatories on the summit. Ex. A-137 at 1.
- 646. TIO developed an Archaeological Monitoring Plan and submitted the draft to SHPD for review and approval on September 20, 2012. SHPD approved the TMT Archaeological Monitoring Plan on April 24, 2013. *See* (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 197:20-198:18; WDT Nees at 6; Ex. A-142; Ex. C-13.*

**Applicant submitted into evidence Exhibits A-141 (Historic Preservation Mitigation Plan In Support of Construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope in the Astronomy Precinct, dated Sept. 2012) and A-143 (Letter from SHPD to PCSI approving Ex. A-143). Notwithstanding that Exhibits A-141 and A-143 were not received into evidence in this contested case hearing, see Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553], as amended [Doc. 649], the Historic Preservation Mitigation Plan (Ex. A-141) does in fact exist, a draft of which is attached as Appendix A to the TMT Management Plan in Ex. A-1/R-1 and referred to in SHPD's letter dated December 1, 2010 (Ex. A-137).*

- 647. A portion of the Batch Plant Staging Area will be restored to a more natural condition upon completion of TMT Project construction. The TIO will also fund restoration of the

- closed access road on Pu‘u Poli‘ahu to its natural state to address visual impacts of astronomy-related development on the summit region of Mauna Kea. WDT Nees at 7; Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B, App. A, at A-9.
648. The TMT Project will develop and implement construction best management practices to avoid potential disturbance of land beyond the planned limits of disturbance. WDT Nees at 7; Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B, App. A at A-9.
649. The TMT Project will camouflage the existing HELCO pull-boxes and other utility boxes that are visually distracting or intrusive at the summit as well as other key locations on Kūkahau‘ula by treating them so that they blend and integrate visually with the natural environment. WDT Nees at 7; Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B, App. A at A-9.
650. The TMT Project will develop and implement a Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program, as required by the CMP and to help mitigate any potential effects on historic properties generally. Cultural event training as a part of mitigation would benefit the public and cultural practitioners. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 64:9-20. As discussed in the CMP, the Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program will include educational instruction and materials designed to: (1) impart an understanding of Mauna Kea’s cultural landscape, including cultural practices, historic properties and their sensitivity to damage, and the rules and regulations regarding the protection of historic properties; (2) make it clear that any disturbance of a historic property is a violation of Haw. Rev. Stat. § 6E-11, and punishable by fine; and (3) provide guidance and information about what constitutes respectful and sensitive behavior within the summit area. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-51 to 3-52; WDT Nees at 7.
651. To mitigate the TMT Observatory’s visual effect within the Historic District, the TMT Observatory specifically chose site 13N within Area E. Additional design efforts to reduce the Observatory’s size, finish, and coloring have been taken to address the TMT Observatory’s potential visual impact. The TMT Observatory will not be visible from Pu‘u Wēkiu (which is the actual summit of Mauna Kea), Lake Waiau, and Pu‘u Līlīnoe, three traditional cultural properties in the summit region of Mauna Kea. Ex. A-3/R-3 at S-12, Table ES-1, 3-31 to 3-32, Ex. A-5/R-5, App. G at 57-58 & Figure 26; WDT Nees at 6; Ex. C-18. This is due to the presence of the northern ridge of Kūkahau‘ula (Pu‘u Wēkiu) blocking the view from the summit peak. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-31.
652. Rechtman testified that he and members of the ASM team have participated in OMKM’s cultural orientation. Rechtman has participated in 3 orientations to date. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 82:2-83:11. The orientation included discussions regarding cultural resources and find spots related to native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 83:23-: 84:2.
653. Two of the ASM staff members who worked on the TMT Project reports are native Hawaiian, including the cultural monitor. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 214:17-215:22.
654. To mitigate the TMT Access Way’s effect on Pu‘u Kūkahau‘ula and the Historic District, the Access Way has been devised to reduce disturbance by designing it as a single lane

configuration in certain areas, and coloring the pavement of the roadway to blend with the surroundings, and paving the roadway for a length of approximately 1,600 feet. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-14; WDT Nees at 6.

655. To mitigate the general effects of the development of the TMT Observatory, the Project will work with OMKM and 'Imiloa to develop exhibits for the VIS and 'Imiloa regarding cultural and archaeological resources as well as to develop a TMT outreach office that will work with 'Imiloa and native Hawaiian groups to support and fund programs specific to Hawaiian culture and archaeological resources. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-52 to 3-54; WDT Nees at 8.
656. The TMT Project will not result in the loss or significant destruction of any historic properties within the MKSR. Physical impacts on the only two historic properties physically affected, Pu'u Kūkahau'ula and places in the Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District, will be minimal and will not be significant. The TMT Project will not have a substantial adverse impact on any historic properties within the MKSR. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-48 to 3-55.
657. Appropriate mitigation for archaeological and historic properties may consist of keeping the status quo or omitting some proposed actions. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 60:8-61:12.
658. The mitigation measures for addressing any effects on cultural practices that have been developed for the TMT are consistent with those stipulated in the CMP and CRMP. WDT Nees at 8; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 47:11-17. The mitigation measures contained in the CMP and CRMP are sufficient to protect historic sites. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 50:12-16.
659. PCSI conducts ongoing monitoring of the archaeological and historic sites on UH Hilo-managed lands. Monitoring entails going back to the sites previously recorded and then documenting, photographing and re-mapping those sites in order to assess any changes, alterations or damage. WDT Nees at 1; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 98:1-4; 188:18-25. Monitoring is done by returning to the sites once a year. The entire MKSR is surveyed once every five-year period. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 96:6-97:13.
660. ASM's archaeological monitoring for the TMT Project site consisted of monitoring the little road extension, the grading of the loop road, and all of the bore locations as shown on Ex. C-12, Figure 6 (Map of Bore Locations). (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 92:15-23.
661. The ASM archaeological monitor did not notice any oil spots or residue on the ground associated with drilling activities on the TMT Project site. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 96:14-17.
662. New ahu, shrines, and other features were located and documented in annual monitoring done during the period 2012-2016. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 189:9-14. These ahu or properties documented during this period were not reported to SHPD because they are considered recently constructed find spots. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 189:16-20.
663. A few practitioners construct ahu on Mauna Kea today, although in some instances, their construction and location are based more on political disagreements over land uses rather

than cultural practices. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 192:7-19; (W. Freitas) Tr. 3/2/17 at 184:22-188:14; 194:20- 194:24, 199:2-199:22, 201:12-202:4, 252:12-253:12, 259:4-266:22, 268:13-269:13; Tr. 2/16/17 at 25:22-26:3, 91:7-13.

664. Petitioners called witnesses Aloua, Rios, and Dr. Abad to argue that the archaeological studies conducted in connection with the TMT Project are inadequate.
665. Ruth Aloua, a witness for Petitioner Flores-Case `Ohana, is a "Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) and cultural practitioner from Kailua-Kona." WDT of Ruth Aloua, Ex. B.24a. In her words:

"I received my Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology from the University of Hawai'i at Hilo in 2011. Three years later in 2014 I graduated from Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, Canada with a Master of Arts in Archaeology. I have worked as an archaeologist for private firms and the National Park Service. The knowledge that I gained through these experiences is implemented through community organizing and through the restoration of Kaloko Fishpond where I am a *kia'i loko* (fishpond guardian). When not in the fishpond or attending community meetings, I spend my time farming as an organic farmer growing a wide range of produce and raising pasture animals. My knowledge and skills range from familiarity with archaeological and anthropological practices, policies, management plans, at the county, state, and federal level, agriculture and aquaculture food production, to place-based knowledge grounded in the people, place, and culture of the Kona District.

My testimony provides insight into several issues regarding missing assessments, inaccurate findings, questionable conclusions and inconsistencies made by researchers regarding the archaeological resources and cultural practices associated with Mauna Kea."

WDT of Ruth Aloua, Ex. B.24a.

666. Aloua testified that the archaeological studies conducted in connection with the TMT Project fail to, *inter alia*: 1) take into account the impacts to the Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District 2) include adequate consultation of cultural practitioners; and 3) adequately consider impacts to find spots "CSH 1" and "CSH 2." Ex. B.24a (WDT Aloua) at 1-2; (Aloua) Tr. 2/14/17 at 203:2-206:22; (Aloua) Tr. 2/15/17 at 15:1-20:12; *see* Ex. A-140.
667. Aloua's *curriculum vitae*, as well as her written and oral testimony itself, demonstrated that she lacks the requisite historical practice and expertise as a credible scientific expert. Ex. B.24b (CV Aloua); Tr. 2/14/17 at 201:8-12; Tr. 2/15/17 at 44:6-60:23. Aloua did not review the CDUA, EIS, or their incorporated documents in depth, nor did she review the archaeological studies conducted for the MKSR and the Astronomy Precinct. (Aloua) Tr. 2/14/17 at 202:22-203:1, 206:11-15; (Aloua) Tr. 2/15/17 at 61:8-70:8. Aloua was not aware that issues she raised in her testimony were in fact specifically addressed in the EIS and referenced archeological documents. (Aloua) Tr. 2/15/17 at 66:3-86:4. Aloua could not provide a qualified and informed opinion regarding the archaeological studies

conducted in connection with the TMT Project. Accordingly, little weight is afforded Aloua's testimony that challenges those studies and reports.

668. Rios testified that the examination of archaeological/historic resources failed to take into account the intangible relationships between certain features on Mauna Kea. Rios's testimony was based primarily on her stated ability to connect with and receive information from a spiritual realm. Rios testified that she received 'ike kupuna (or ancestral insight) that certain ahu or shrines are energetically connected to one another, are aligned with certain tides, and connect as a portal to the celestial bodies of the universe. (Aloua) Tr. 2/15/17 at 149:1-152:23. Rios's testimony does not prove unverifiable and intangible connections between certain ahu or shrines on Mauna Kea that may be affected by the TMT Project. Even if such connections were assumed, Rios's testimony failed to provide tangible, logical, scientific, or admissible evidence of specific connections that would be affected by the TMT Project.
669. Dr. Abad is the director of Kealaiwikuamo'o at Kamehameha Schools and received her Ph.D. in anthropology with a specialization in Hawaiian archaeology from the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Ex. B.08b (CV Dr. Abad). Her opinion that the CDUA does not meet the criterion stated in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4) is based on her opinion that the CDUA does not adequately consider the appropriate "region" surrounding the TMT Project site, and the CDUA does not adequately address impacts on certain cultural sites, cultural practices and historic properties. Ex. B.08a (WDT Dr. Abad) at 5-12. A large portion of Dr. Abad's testimony focused on her assertion that the unit of analysis for the CDUA should be at a regional level based upon legal requirements, as well as archaeological and cultural considerations. Dr. Abad was unable to specify exactly what larger region should have been considered in the CDUA. Dr. Abad acknowledged that the CDUA did in fact address areas of concern in a larger region outside of the project area, outside the MKSR, and within the historic district, including Lake Waiau and Kūkahau'ula. Dr. Abad also acknowledged that section 3 through 8 of the AIS were included in the CDUA for consideration. (Dr. Abad) Tr. 1/19/17 at 22:2-25:6, 129:14-133:21.
670. In Dr. Abad's opinion, the proposed mitigation measures for the TMT Project do not "outweigh" the negative impacts of the project. Ex. B.08a (WDT Dr. Abad) at 18-19. Dr. Abad's assertion is unpersuasive given her personal biases and her opinion that the TMT Project would cause harm no matter where it is located on Mauna Kea. (Dr. Abad) Tr. 1/19/17 at 135:18-23.
671. Dr. Abad also placed great emphasis on Bulletin 38 (Ex. B.01i), claiming it should be afforded significant weight due to its status as a federal government document and that it should be considered authoritative on the subject of historic properties. Ex. B.08a (WDT Dr. Abad) at 15-16; (Dr. Abad) Tr. 1/19/17 at 36:15-37:20, 40:4-10.
672. Bulletin 38 is not applicable because the TMT Project is not a federal project. Furthermore, Bulletin 38 does not support Dr. Abad's position concerning the immovability of significant historic properties:

The fact that the community as a whole may be willing to

dispense with the property in order to achieve the goals of the project does not mean that the property is not significant, but ***the fact that it is significant does not mean that it cannot be disturbed, or that the project must be foregone.***

Ex. B.01j at 4 (emphasis added); Tr. 1/19/17 at 136:4-141:3.

- 673. While Dr. Abad claimed her views are based in part on applicable law, she is not an attorney, and has not reviewed applicable case law, including the Hawai‘i Supreme Court’s *Kilakila O Haleakalā* opinion, in preparing her testimony. Tr. 1/19/17 at 129:2-11.
- 674. Ching testified as to certain alleged inadequacies in the archaeological studies and analyses conducted in connection with the TMT Project. See, e.g., Tr. 1/24/17 at 206:5-208:7, 223:1-223:14. Ching has no education or experience in the field of archaeology.
- 675. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have not refuted the University’s prima facie showing that the TMT Project will not have a significant impact on archaeological and historic resources.

iii. Cultural Resources and Practices

- 676. Traditional and customary cultural practices have been defined as those customs and practices of a living community of people that have been passed down through generations, usually orally or through practice. Traditional and customary cultural practices are those practices that fall within the purview of Article XII, Section 7 of the Hawai‘i State Constitution. Ex. A-67 at 1-2; Ex. A-11 at 2-18 to 2-19.
- 677. Some native Hawaiians consider the large number of shrines as evidence of Mauna Kea being a sacred center. These shrines have been interpreted as remains of the historically undocumented but now known pattern of pilgrimage to worship, presumably the snow goddess Poli‘ahu and other mountain gods and goddesses such as Kūkahau‘ula, Līlīnoe, and Waiau. Ex. A-122 at 7-12; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 185:18-186:8.
- 678. There is current evidence of at minimum two functional classes of shrines in the MKSR: (1) occupational specialist shrines related to adze manufacture, and (2) all others, which appear to be non-occupational. Ex. A-122 at 6-14; *see generally* Ex. A-122 at 6-53 to 6-75.
- 679. Prior to Western contact, Mauna Kea was considered by some accounts kapu, uninhabitable and not available to the general public for areas above the habitable tree line. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 193:24-194:3; *see also* Ex. A-122 at 2-19. David Malo, who was a contemporary of pre-Western contact times, reported that such areas were considered a wasteland and off limits above the tree line for lack of utility. *See* Ex. A-122 at 2-19, 7-16 to 7-17, 7-62.
- 680. Mauna Kea has been referred to as a burial ground and a living temple. (Rechtman) Tr.

12/20/16 at 194:4-10.

681. Mauna Kea and its summit cinder cone to this day still play an important role in religious and cultural practices to many native Hawaiians and non-native Hawaiians. Ex. C-12 at 1; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 218:8-11.
682. Lithic materials found along the trail, and among shrines, burials, and dwelling structures, were markers on the routes that pre-contact adze makers used. These include nine pathways to various sections of Hawai'i Island. Ex. A-122; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 186:21-187:6.
683. Some Native Hawaiians have traditionally viewed the summit region, including Kūkahau'ula, as the realm of the ancestral akua (gods, goddesses, deities) who are believed to take earthly form as the pu'u, the waters of Lake Waiau, and other significant features of the mountain's landscape. A number of traditional and customary practices are derived from these beliefs which have led to related contemporary cultural practices. Ex. A-11, Section 4.2.1.1; Ex. A-5, App. I at 2-9 to 2-12.
684. Notwithstanding the University's position that cultural practices do not appear to be encompassed by the definition of "Natural resource" contained in HAR § 13- 5-2, both the University and the DLNR identified and assessed such practices as resources to be considered under the criterion of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4).
685. The TMT Project considers and provides efforts to mitigate negative impacts to culture. Tr. 11/15/16 at 136:16-137:7. The CDUA relies on the consultation and findings of the FEIS, including the cultural inventory assessments contained therein as well as the extensive public comment letters and responses. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 57:12-21; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 170:14-20, 226:18-24. The University and developers of the TMT Project engaged in direct and regular consultation with Kahu Kū Mauna. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 63:6-13. The HAR do not require the University to separately retain or consult cultural practitioners for purposes of preparing the CDUA.
686. Numerous research studies, plans, and impact assessments have been prepared in recent times documenting the cultural practices and resources on Mauna Kea, including native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices. These various materials include:
 - a. the CMP, which provides information and management actions to protect, preserve, and enhance the cultural resources and native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices of Mauna Kea within the UH Management Area (Ex. A-9);
 - b. the CRMP, which provides an overview of cultural resources and was formulated to ensure that the University fulfills its mandate to preserve and protect cultural resources and native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices within the UH Management Area (Ex. A-11);
 - c. "Mauna Kea-Ka Piko Kaulana o ka 'Āina" (meaning "Mauna Kea-The Famous Summit of the Land"), which provides a review of historic records and information collected through oral history interviews with

- kūpuna and kama'āina pertaining to Mauna Kea (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. F);
- d. the Mauna Kea Master Plan, which includes an Oral History and Consultation Study and Archival Literature Research (Ex. A-48, App. I) and a CIA (Ex. A-48, App. N; Ex. A-5, App. E);
- e. the FEIS for the TMT Project including all public comment letters and responses (Ex. A-3/R-3);
- f. the CIA produced for the TMT FEIS (Ex. A-5/R-5 App. D);
- g. the AIS for the Mauna Kea Summit Region produced for the TMT FEIS (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. G);
- h. the TMT CDUA (Ex. A-1/R-1);
- i. the TMT Management Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B);
- j. the TMT Draft Historic Preservation Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B, App. A);
- k. the TMT Historical and Archaeological Site Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B, App. C);
- l. the Mauna Kea Historic Preservation Plan Management Components (Ex. A-48 at App. F);
- m. the Archaeological Assessment Report for Hale Pōhaku (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. H);
- n. the Final Environmental Assessment for the CMP (Ex. A-51);
- o. the Final AIS for the Mauna Kea Access Road Corridor (Ex. A-56); and
- p. the Final AIS for the MKSR and the Final AIS for the Astronomy Precinct [Ex. A-55; *see also* (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 49:10-12 (Mr. Nees confirming the AIS for MKSR and Astronomy Precinct, respectively, included the TMT Project site but were not performed specifically for the TMT Project)].

Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-8 to 3-10.

687. The CRMP found that there are a number of different kinds of cultural practices occurring on Mauna Kea. There are two broad categories of cultural practices: (1) traditional and customary practices, and (2) contemporary cultural practices. Ex. A-11 at 2-18 to 2-19.
688. Numerous research studies, plans, and impact assessments identify the potential impacts the TMT Project and astronomy-related development may have on cultural practices and resources, including native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices. These include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. the CMP (Ex. A-9);
 - b. the CRMP (Ex. A-11);
 - c. the FEIS for the TMT Project, including all public comment letters and

- responses (Ex. A-3/R-3);
 - d. the CIA produced for the TMT FEIS (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. D);
 - e. the AIS for the Mauna Kea Summit Region produced for the TMT FEIS (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. G);
 - f. the TMT CDUA (Ex. A-1/R-1);
 - g. the TMT Management Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B);
 - h. the TMT Draft Historic Preservation Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 t Ex. B, App. A);
 - i. the TMT Historical and Archeological Site Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B, App. C);
 - j. the Mauna Kea Historic Preservation Plan Management Components (Ex. A-48 at App. F);
 - k. the Archeological Assessment Report for Hale Pōhaku (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. H);
 - l. the Final Environmental Assessment for the CMP (Ex. A-51);
 - m. the Final AIS for the Mauna Kea Access Road Corridor (Ex. A-56);
 - n. the Final AIS for the MKSR; and
 - o. the Final AIS for the Astronomy Precinct (Ex. A-55; *see also* (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 49:10-12 (Mr. Nees confirming the AIS for MKSR and Astronomy Precinct, respectively, included the TMT Project site but were not performed specifically for the TMT Project).
689. No known customary and traditional practices occur within the Area E location site of the TMT Observatory.
690. W. Freitas testified that he began conducting his practices on the summit of Mauna Kea in 2015, the same time he began actively opposing the TMT Project. (W. Freitas) Tr. 3/2/17 at 252:23-253:12. It was during this time that W. Freitas oversaw the construction of two new ahu structures in the TMT Project site area that were built, in part, as a response to the TMT Project. (W. Freitas) Tr. 3/2/17 at 194:20-194:24, 199:2-199:22, 201:12-202:4, 259:9- 259:17
691. There are no known burials or funerary relics of any significance found or located within the TMT Project site and no proof of any related ongoing cultural or historical practice of any significance. Ex. C-11 (WDT Rechtman); Tr. 2/21/17 at 147:2-12; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 217:18-23; 211:13-16.
692. The new structures (ahu) built on or near the TMT Project site are modern practices because they were built within the last two years and appear to be, at least in part, for the purpose of protesting the TMT Project by W. Freitas and others. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 253:14- 22; Tr. 3/2/17 at 259:4-262:17, 268:13-24. The two ahu were encountered by Rechtman during a field reconnaissance survey of the TMT Project site and the access road on July 7, 2015. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 169:16-21. It has not been conclusively

established that the two uprights are in fact on the TMT Project site, but they are near the boundary of the TMT Project site. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 88:6-14.

693. Archaeologists generally would not classify a new construction as a cultural placement unless they witnessed it being constructed by a cultural practitioner. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 41:21-42:4. However, upright stones and ahu are generally associated with traditional, religious or spiritual practices. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 147:24-148:4. W. Freitas testified he conducted no prior practices on Mauna Kea before he assisted in constructing the ahu. He constructed the ahu on the existing access roads to the TMT Project knowing it would interfere with and block construction workers and traffic to the proposed approximate 5- acre TMT Project site within Area E. (W. Freitas) Tr. 3/2/17 at 198:11-199:25, 232:5-11, 252:7- 254:23.
694. Archaeologists do not distinguish between religious, cultural and spiritual significance when assessing a modern cultural placement. Archeologists describe what is present at a site. If it is determined to be modern, whether it is marking a foundation for a weather station or consists of a spiritual offering, it is not analyzed or evaluated within the archaeological study. Its existence is documented. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 45:22-46:11.
695. A cultural act does not exclude a spiritual act. (Rechtman) Tr. 01/04/17 at 147:22-148:7.
696. A ho‘okupu (offering) is something that is left at a place by somebody to commemorate something (sometimes consisting of one or two rocks stacked on each other). (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 107:25-108:2, 109:14-18. Not all ho‘okupu are considered native Hawaiian cultural offerings but some are considered other than traditional. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 108:3-6.
697. Likewise, Prof. Flores testified that he believes that all spiritual and cultural practices are one and the same, but that not all religious practices are spiritual and cultural. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 234:9-19.
698. The rock ho‘okupu or ti leaf wrapped offerings and sites are not similar to the other type of historic properties found on the summit of Mauna Kea. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 109:19-24.
699. Opposing Intervenor Temple of Lono argued that non-native Hawaiians can take part in the traditional Hawaiian faith. Mr. Rechtman testified as to his belief that non-native Hawaiians can practice the traditional Hawaiian faith, but such rights are recognized as constitutionally protected only for native Hawaiians. (Rechtman) Tr. 01/04/17 at 142:25-143:9.
700. Recent uprights could be connected to native Hawaiian cultural practices that may be entitled to protection, if reasonably exercised. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 88:7-13. For example, if the practice results in a land use such as the building of a structure, or introduction of new material, or the movement of natural features on Conservation District zoned lands, such practice would be reviewed under Conservation District Rules, or Administrative Rules related to the land designation, such as Forest Reserve or Natural

Area Reserves. (Nagata) Tr. 12/12/2016 at 26: 3- 16; Ex. L-18. Modern cultural practices are identified based on the movement or rearrangement of uprights. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 97:15-19.

701. No known traditional and customary practices are associated with the proposed 5-acre TMT Project site. Since 2015, contemporary Hawaiian practices have taken place on the site, including the construction of two ahu. *See, e.g.*, Ex. T-1 at 3; (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 21:13-18, 25:22-26:3, 91:7-13.
702. The Mauna Kea summit also known as Kūkahau‘ula (cluster of cinder cones) is considered to be a wahi pana, or storied place. It serves as a site for various practices including traditional and modern shrine construction, pilgrimage, prayer, and offerings. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-6; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at 185, 191-194; Tr. 2/16/17 at 19:1-16.
703. Petitioners offered evidence that building the TMT Project on Mauna Kea offends, and is contrary to the beliefs of some members of the community, including some native Hawaiians. Petitioners also acknowledge that native Hawaiian cultural and religious practices are not codified, but rather are individual and personal in nature and vary from practitioner to practitioner. *See, e.g.*, (Pisciotta) Tr. 2/13/17 at 108:5-16; (Case) Tr. 1/11/17 at 228:1- 229:25; (Dr. Abad) Tr. 1/19/17 at 77:2-78:1; (Kihoi) Tr. 2/14/17 at 110:1-111:7, 122:12-131:9. There is no single native Hawaiian viewpoint or opinion on any subject, including the TMT Project. Some native Hawaiians, including native Hawaiian cultural practitioners with lineal or other significant ties to Mauna Kea – such as Ishibashi and Baybayan – support the TMT Project and testified that it would have no adverse impact on their cultural practices. *See* Ex. A-138a; WDT Baybayan at 1; WDT Ishibashi at 1-3; (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 15:11-15:14.
704. Dr. Coleman and Dr. Kaluna are native Hawaiians who conduct cultural practices on Mauna Kea and testified that the TMT Project would have no adverse impact on their practices. (Dr. Kaluna) Tr. 1/5/17 at 21:12-20, 25:14-26:4, 96:7-23. Although he does not consider himself a cultural practitioner, Warfield, a native Hawaiian member of PUEO, testified in support of the TMT Project, despite his personal and cultural ties to Mauna Kea. WDT Warfield at 1-2; (Warfield) Tr. 2/15/17 at 190:22-198:25. Likewise, even though he does not consider himself a cultural practitioner, N. Stevens does conduct cultural practices on the summit of Mauna Kea and testified that the TMT Project will not impact his practices. (Stevens) Tr. 12/16/16 at 194:13-23, 216:15-217:4.
705. Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, Ph.D. was called as a witness by KAHEA. Here is his story:

"I was born in Hilo, Hawai‘i and currently reside in Honolulu. My father was born in Hilo to Eliza Leialoha Kamakawio‘ole whose parents and ancestors come from Hāmākua and Kohala. My mother’s maternal great grandmother, Pi‘ikea was born in Keauhou, Kona. Ancestors on both sides of my family are pili i ka mokupuni ‘o Hawai‘i.

I am also Professor of Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa where I have taught courses in the history of the Hawaiian kingdom, history of music, history of law

and Hawaiian literature since 1992. I have been a member of the board of directors of KAHEA since 2008 and I have testified in opposition to the granting of the CDUP for the construction of the Thirty Meter telescope at the DLNR; and have testified in opposition to the extension of the management lease to the University of Hawai‘i. I have written essays in opposition to the construction of the TMT on Mauna Kea that appeared in the Honolulu Star Advertiser. 1Every scholarly article or public speech or presentation that I have given from 2011 to 2016 2has contained references this controversy, and my analysis of its importance.

I do not believe that the struggle over the future of Mauna Kea is a conflict between Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians, nor is it a clash between western science and Hawaiian cultural beliefs. This conflict is actually between people who see the history and future of Hawai‘i very differently from one another, and the issue is about how we manage resources and how we align our laws, our economy and the values of a whole, yet diverse society in Hawai‘i in order to connect a ruptured past, contentious present and very uncertain future."

WDT of Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo`ole Osorio, PhD.; Ex. B.07a.

Prof. Osorio testified that there are clear distinctions between Wao Akua and Wao Kanaka, differences in expectations and practices and what is allowed in those areas. (Prof. Osorio) Tr. 01/12/17 at 68:16-22. Wao Akua, according to Prof. J. Osorio, are "...places essentially where human activity is generally curtailed," whereas "Wao Kanaka" is a place for human habitation. (Prof. Osorio) Tr. 1/12/17 at 68:2-15. He also testified that it is not true to say that human presence is not allowed in the Wao Akua. It is not that you do not want human presence or that human presence is barred – you want them to come as a supplicant, leaving as small a footprint as possible. (Prof. Osorio) Tr. 01/12/17 at 68:23-69:7.

706. Prof. Osorio testified that the University’s action in applying for the permit to build TMT in Wao Akua is in alignment with some of the University’s goals but not with the goal of preserving Hawaiian values, traditions and culture. (Prof. Osorio) Tr. 01/12/17 at 106:3-15.
707. One of the foremost authorities and scholars of Hawaiian culture, David Malo, lived on the island of Hawai‘i in pre-Western contact and pre-abolition of the kapu system times. He made no mention of traditional or historic practices atop the summit of Mauna Kea and reported that it was considered wasteland or the realm of the gods. Ex. A-122 at 2-19, 7-16 to 7-17, 7-62; Ex. A-130 at 37-38; (Prof. Mills) Tr. 1/25/17 at 156-157.
708. Malo reported that the Wao Akua is actually not traditionally considered an area above the tree-line or near the summit area, but it was an area below the tree-line. A-130 at 37-38 ("The belt below the *kua-mauna*, in which small trees grow, is called *kua-hea*, and the belt below the *kua-hea*, where the larger sized forest-trees grow is called *wao*, or *wao-nahele*, or *wao-eiwa*"). Traditionally, the summit areas were known as *kua lono*. Ex. A-130 at 37-38; (Nagata) Tr. 12/16/16 at 210:8-211:6; (Prof. Mills) Tr. 1/25/17 at 145:1-147:4.

709. Dr. Coleman testified that many things that are claimed to be "cultural truths" have no firm basis in prior use historically. Just because someone remembers certain cultural practices a certain way, does not establish that they are traditional and cultural practices that are recognized by all. (Dr. Coleman) Tr. 1/5/17 at 128:20-129:9.
710. In 2007, Chad Kālepa Baybayan, called as a witness by UHH, was awarded the rank of Pwo; in the hierarchy of Wayfinders in the Satawalese tradition, a Master Navigator for Voyages Upon Any Ocean. This was recognized in the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 9:25-10:13; WDT Baybayan. Here is his story:
- "Aloha, my name is Chad Kālepa Baybayan and I have served as Captain and navigator for the Hawaiian deep-sea voyaging canoes Hōkule'a , Hawai'iloa, and Hokūalaka'i. I am a graduate of UH Hilo's Ka Haka `Ula O Ke`elikolani College of Hawaiian Language, and I hold a Master's degree in Education from Heritage College. I am a former employee of the `Imiloa Astronomy center of Hawai'i and am currently working on the Polynesian Voyaging Society's Malama Honua World Wide Voyage
- I have worked with students and educators sharing the powerful story of the mariner explorers and astronomer navigators who settled these islands. Along with four other Hawaiian men, I was granted the rank of Pwo and inducted into a society of non-instrument master navigators in the Satawalese tradition, and extended the privilege to teach and pass on the skills, on techniques, and values of the Oceanic Wayfinder. A copy of my curriculum vitae was submitted as Exhibit A-121."
- WDT of Chad Kālepa Baybayan, page 1; UHH filed 10/11/2016.
711. Baybayan has experience working with 'Aha Pūnana Leo to revitalize the Hawaiian language, and 'Imiloa Astronomy Center. He now works with the Polynesian Voyaging Society on the Malama Honua Worldwide Voyage. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 10:13-23.
712. Baybayan testified that his relationship to the sacred mountain, Mauna Kea, is that the summit serves as a beacon for leading him back home to his family. This relationship is spiritual but not religious. This perspective is based upon the tradition of oceanic exploration and the legacy of people who left the safety of the shoreline and sailed away to discover the stars. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 11:2-12.
713. Baybayan testified that construction of the project would be appropriate and culturally consistent. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 11:13-11:18, 12:9-12:16. He also testified that it is culturally consistent to advocate for Hawaiian participation in the field of science that continues to enable Hawaiian tradition of exploration and a legacy of discovery, and a field of work for Hawaiians to lead. WDT Baybayan at 3; (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 135:8-135:11; 12:9-16.
714. Baybayan's position does not oppose astronomy. He views it as appropriate to construct the TMT telescope, which is a facility used to advance astronomical science. His view was developed from sharing experiences with people from all walks of life, international and local, including fishermen, craftsmen, carpenters, cultural practitioners, firemen,

- policemen, students, teachers, educators, researchers, and policy makers. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 11:13-12:2.
715. Baybayan is involved with the Hōkule‘a seafaring efforts, which is an indigenous project, led by indigenous, intelligent Hawaiians, whose mission is spiritual and embraces science and technology as a principal mechanism for designing a strategy for success. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 12:3-8. In Baybayan’s opinion, the highest level of desecration rests in actions that remove the opportunity and choices from the kind of future our youth can participate in and learn from. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 12:9-16.
 716. Petitioners offered evidence that ahu built on Mauna Kea have been removed from an area of the South facing summit access roadway above Hale Pōhaku. This is not near the TMT Project site. Ex. B.01x; (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/15/16 at 80:1-83:19, 86:22-88:11.
 717. The OMKM cultural resource manager is responsible for alerting Kahu Kū Mauna regarding any new cultural features. (Nagata) Tr. 12/12/16 at 211:22-212:5. Kahu Kū Mauna’s position is that objects that are considered cultural require a permit and if not permitted, then they should be removed. This policy reflects existing DLNR rules and regulations regarding land use. (Nagata) Tr. 12/12/16 at 141:19-142:9. If a structure is going to remain in place for more than 30 days in the Conservation District, that is considered a land use requiring a permit under DLNR rules. *See generally* HAR § 13-5-2. However, if a structure poses a health or safety risk, it will be removed right away. (Nagata) Tr. 12/8/16 at 106:4-107:19; L-18.
 718. Dr. McLaren knows of no written policy that says an ahu or lele should not be allowed to remain after built. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/15/16 at 84:10-13.
 719. Dr. Kaluna testified in support of the TMT Project and her view that the pursuit of astronomy on Mauna Kea is a beautiful blend of culture and science. She testified about how her father placed her piko in a bottle and placed it in the ocean establishing a life-long bond with the water. She pursued a graduate degree in astronomy studying water on asteroids, part of her passion of studying water in our solar system. While on Mauna Kea, she gives offerings and prayers at the lele at Hale Pōhaku. Astronomy on Mauna Kea will allow us to study our origins. Dr. Kaluna believes that One’s origin and genealogy are critical aspects of Hawaiian culture. Ex. C-8 (WDT Dr. Kaluna) at 1-2.
 720. Dr. Kaluna supports the TMT project because the proponents of the project have proceeded with honorable intentions, worked with community members, promoted educational opportunities, and attempted to respect the cultural significance of the mountain. Ex. C-8 (WDT Dr. Kaluna) at 1-2; Tr. 1/5/17 at 64:2-20, 70:15-19, 78:1-24.
 721. Dr. Kaluna, who earned her Ph.D. in astronomy, developed her relationship with Mauna Kea as a result of her involvement with astronomy on the mountain. Dr. Kaluna conducts cultural practices on Mauna Kea, which includes giving offerings and prayers at the ahu lele behind the visitor center adjacent to Hale Pōhaku. Her work in the astronomy field has allowed her to continue her cultural practices and understanding the significance of Mauna Kea. Ex. C-8 (WDT Dr. Kaluna) at 1-2; (Dr. Kaluna) Tr. 1/5/17 at 21:7-20, 32:2-

14, 39:25-41:25.

722. Dr. Kaluna affirmed that her practices will not be impacted by the TMT Project. Tr. 1/5/17 at 26.
723. Dr. Coleman, a native Hawaiian astronomer, testified in support of the TMT Project, stating that the TMT Project does not conflict with Hawaiian culture, rather, it represents a return to things that were important to Hawaiians in the past. Dr. Coleman testified that it would be contrary to Hawaiian culture not to take advantage of the opportunity to construct TMT in Hawai'i, because Hawaiian culture is rooted in astronomy, which is what led Hawaiians to Hawai'i initially. Ex. C-17 (WDT Dr. Coleman) at 1-3; Tr. 1/5/17 at 92:10-17, 105:18-107:3.
724. Dr. Coleman received his bachelors in physics from the University of Notre Dame and a Ph.D. in astronomy from the University of Pittsburgh and has worked as an astronomer in Hawai'i since 1987. Ex. C-17 (WDT Dr. Coleman) at 1.
725. Dr. Coleman testified that his genealogy connects him to the Kumulipo, and therefore, the Big Bang. The TMT Project would allow him and all Hawaiians to look back in time as far as possible. In the Hawaiian sense, this would be to literally investigate their ancestors. Ex. C-17 (WDT Dr. Coleman) at 1-2.
726. For Dr. Coleman, although each Hawaiian may have a different opinion, the Mo'okini Heiau in Kohala is more important spiritually and culturally than the summit of Mauna Kea to the Hawaiian people. In fact, there are many other places he considers more important than Mauna Kea. Although Mauna Kea is sacred, it is not so sacred that the TMT Project cannot be built upon it, particularly since will advance benefits for the Hawaiian people. According to Dr. Coleman, Mauna Kea is not mentioned in the Kumulipo. He was unable to locate any literature stating that Mauna Kea is sacred in the way Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have described, despite his extensive research on the topic. Ex. C-17 at 2-3; (Dr. Coleman) Tr. 1/5/17 at 132-133; *see also* Ex. A-130, Tr. 1/25/17 at 143:6-147:4.
727. Dr. Coleman himself conducts cultural practices on Mauna Kea. This includes asking permission to enter Mauna Kea through oli. These practices will not be impacted by the TMT Project. (Dr. Coleman) Tr. 1/5/17 at 96:7-23. Dr. Coleman testified that each person must make his or her own determination regarding the sacredness of Mauna Kea. Ex. C-17 (WDT Dr. Coleman) at 2-3; (Dr. Coleman) Tr. 1/5/17 at 132:10-133:3.
728. Dr. Coleman opined that many things claimed to be "cultural truths" are in fact not so. (Dr. Coleman) Tr. 1/5/17 at 128:15-129:9.
729. Petitioners offered the testimony of Kanahale to rebut Dr. Paul Coleman's testimony concerning Mauna Kea's significance. (Kanahale) Tr. 1/24/17 at 138:11-139:2, 142:8-144:11.
730. Kanahale also testified that water from outside of the Wao Kanaka region should not be brought to the Wao Akua region on Mauna Kea. (Kanahale) Tr. 1/24/17 at 195:4-196:6.

There is evidence that in 2016, Case poured water originating from Mount Shasta (California) into Lake Waiau, which is inconsistent with the cultural norm not to do so as described by Kanahele. Exs. C-45 and C-45a; Tr. 2/14/17 at 122:12-131:9; Tr. 2/15/17 at 175:5-176:14. Those differing practices show that there is substantial flexibility when it comes to interpreting Native Hawaiian culture and traditions.

731. Water from Lake Waiau is collected by some cultural practitioners for use in healing and ritual practices. The TMT Project would not affect this practice, nor would it affect the quality of the water in Lake Waiau. There will be no adverse effect associated with the TMT Project on this cultural practice. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-26 to 3-28. Lake Waiau is located 1.42 miles from the TMT Project site. Ex. C-18.
732. Historically, depositing piko on Mauna Kea has been associated with Lake Waiau. The TMT Project would not affect cultural practices at or near Lake Waiau. There is no evidence that the vicinity of the TMT Observatory has ever been used for depositing piko. The vast majority of the MKSR, as well as the Mauna Kea Ice Age NAR, including Lake Waiau, would remain unaffected by the TMT Project and available for depositing piko. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-27.
733. The scattering of cremation remains is considered an ongoing contemporary cultural practice. There is no evidence that the vicinity of the TMT Observatory has ever been used for the scattering of cremation remains. The approximate 5-acre area occupied by the TMT Observatory would not be available for scattering of cremation remains during the life of the project. Certain individuals may decide not to scatter cremation remains in the vicinity of the TMT Observatory. Significant undeveloped natural areas are still available for scattering ashes throughout the MKSR and summit areas. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-27 to 3-29.
734. Consideration of burials is a recognized and essential part of the Hawaiian religion. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 193:15-19.
735. The TMT Project site has been extensively surveyed. No known burials exist in any of the TMT Project areas. Ex. C-11 (WDT Rechtman) at 2; (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 39:12-40:12; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 211:6-21, 217:2-24; Ex. A-138 at i; Ex. A-5/R-5 at Appendix G 39. The closest known burial sites are the two identified burials located in the cinder cones on Pu‘u Mekanaka, and roughly eight possible more burials on that pu‘u. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 169:18-172:23. A burial treatment plan was prepared for all burials in the Mauna Kea Science Reserve. Ex. A-138; (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 216:22-217:8; *see also* Ex. A-139. Pu‘u Mekanaka is not in the Astronomy Precinct, on the summit, or close to the TMT Project site; it is several miles away. (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 216:10-22. If any inadvertent or unknown burial were discovered at the TMT Project site, the burial treatment plan for the MKSR has an approved plan for handling such discoveries, including leaving burials in place. Ex. A-138 at 31. As a result, the TMT Project is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on any inadvertent burials or burial blessing practices on Mauna Kea. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-27 to 3-29.
736. Dr. Kahakalau, a witness for the Flores-Case ‘Ohana, testified that in her experience

almost every large construction project has inadvertently discovered burial sites. However, Dr. Kahakalau acknowledged that reports indicate that there are no burials located on the remote and high elevation approximate 5-acre TMT Project site. (Dr. Kahakalau) Tr. 1/9/17 at 179:7-179:13. Dr. Kahakalau's statement that every large construction project has inadvertently discovered burial sites is not evidence of actual burials at the remote and isolated TMT Project site.

- 737. Dr. Kahakalau acknowledged a plot of land is not considered a burial site just because there is the possibility that an inadvertent burial might be found in that location. (Dr. Kahakalau) Tr. 1/9/17 at 181:12-181:17.
- 738. The TMT Observatory cannot be seen from Pu'u Wēkiu. The TMT Project will not have an adverse effect on solstice and equinox observations occurring on Pu'u Wēkiu. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-21, 3-31; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at 127, 139, 142; WDT Hayes at 15-17.
- 739. OMKM can close the Mauna Kea access road for reasons specified in the CMP. Tr. 11/15/16 at 73:20-74:5. When the road is closed to the public, observatory personnel can still access the summit because they have the proper vehicles, are familiar with the snow conditions, and can navigate the landscape safely. (Dr. McLaren) Tr. 11/15/16 at 74:6-75:6.
- 740. The CMP requires that access for cultural practitioners to culturally significant sites on Mauna Kea be maintained. According to the CMP, native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices shall not be restricted except where safety, resource management, cultural appropriateness, and legal compliance considerations may require reasonable restrictions. The TMT Project will comply with this requirement and, as a matter of policy, will train TMT employees to respect, honor, and not unreasonably interfere with cultural or religious practices. Ex. A-9 at 7-7; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-23 to 3-26.
- 741. Prof. Fujikane believes the land for the proposed TMT Project site is a cultural resource because the formation of the land is referenced in the Mo'olelo. (Prof. Fujikane) Tr. 1/9/17 at 225:5- 225:19. Prof. Fujikane testified that the excavation of the TMT Project site would eliminate the ability to connect the land to the Mo'olelo because the land formations will have been changed. (Prof. Fujikane) Tr. 1/9/17 at 225:14-19; 255:16-256:15.
- 742. Other than limiting access to the actual construction site for safety reasons and to the interior of the TMT Observatory facilities once they are completed, the TMT Project will not restrict anyone from any portion of the Mauna Kea summit area. WDT White at 9; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 63:18-24, 135:2-13. During construction, cultural practitioners on the Northern Plateau would be exposed to noise, dust and the sight of construction equipment. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 135:14-23. Those impacts will be temporary.
- 743. If the TMT Observatory is built, there will be limitations on access to the buildings themselves. There is no prohibition on access to the areas outside of the TMT Observatory. Upon decommissioning of the TMT Observatory, cultural practitioners will be able to access the entire site. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 223:4-16.

744. N. Stevens credited the astronomy community for ensuring that people can easily, freely, and safely travel to Mauna Kea to practice cultural practices and share in the grandeur of the mountain. Ex. C-9 (WDT Stevens) at ¶ 5.
745. Numerous research studies, plans, and impact assessments identify the mitigation measures, as well as actions the BLNR can take, to reasonably protect cultural practices and resources on Mauna Kea, including native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices. These include but are not limited to the:
- a. CMP (Ex. A-9);
 - b. CRMP (Ex. A-11);
 - c. FEIS for the TMT Project (Ex. A-3/R-3);
 - d. CIA produced for the TMT FEIS (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. D);
 - e. AIS for the Mauna Kea Summit Region produced for the TMT FEIS (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. G);
 - f. TMT CDUA (Ex. A-1/R-1);
 - g. TMT Management Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B);
 - h. TMT Draft Historic Preservation Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B, App. A);
 - i. TMT Historical and Archeological Site Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B, App. C);
 - j. Mauna Kea Historic Preservation Plan Management Components (Ex. A-48 at App. F);
 - k. Archaeological Assessment Report for Hale Pōhaku (Ex. A-5/R-5 at App. F);
 - l. Final Environmental Assessment for the CMP (Ex. A-51);
 - m. Final AIS for the Mauna Kea Access Road Corridor (Ex. A-56);
 - n. Final AIS for the MKSR and the Final AIS for the Astronomy Precinct (Ex. A-55; *see also* (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 49:10-12 (Mr. Nees confirming the AIS for MKSR and Astronomy Precinct, respectively, included the TMT Project site but were not performed specifically for the TMT Project));
 - o. Final AIS of the Mauna Kea Ice Age Natural Area Reserve (Ex. A122); and
 - p. Final AIS of Hale Pōhaku Rest House 1 and 2 and Comfort Station (Ex. A-123)
746. The mitigation measures proposed for the TMT Project, as outlined in Appendices A (Draft Historic Preservation Mitigation Plan) and C (Historical & Archeological Site Plan) of the TMT Management Plan (Ex. A-1/R-1 at Ex. B), will prevent substantial adverse impact to existing and identified historic and cultural resources within the

surrounding area, community, or region. WDT Nees at 6-8; Ex. A-71.

747. The University and TIO have established measures to avoid and minimize direct and indirect impacts on cultural practices, including but not limited to the following:
- (1) selecting a site off of the Kūkahau‘ula summit and away from known historic and traditional cultural properties and cultural resources;
 - (2) selecting a site that minimizes the impact of the TMT Project on viewplanes;
 - (3) complying with all applicable provisions of the CMP and sub-plans;
 - (4) engaging in direct and regular consultation with Kahu Kū Mauna, with the broader Hawai‘i Island community, and with cultural practitioners on various issues;
 - (5) establishing an outreach office to engage with the larger community;
 - (6) developing and implementing a Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program for all TMT staff and construction workers; and
 - (7) minimizing TMT Observatory operations (up to 4 days per year) to accommodate cultural activities on culturally sensitive days of the year.

Ex. A-71; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-6 to 2-26; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-31 to 3-37, 3-54 to 3-55; WDT White at 8-9; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 59:5-9, 62:21-63:24; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 15:12-17:15, 19:5-22:23.

748. The TMT Observatory will reduce operations to minimize daytime activities on up to four days a year in observance of native Hawaiian cultural practices. That mitigation measure was adopted at the suggestion of the State of Hawai‘i Historic Preservation Division. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 189:8-23.
749. TIO will implement a Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program that will require all construction managers, contractors, supervisors, construction workers, and TMT staff to be trained annually regarding the potential impacts to cultural and archaeological resources and the measures to prevent such impacts. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-34 to 3-35; WDT Nees at 7.
750. In accordance with the CMP and with the commitments described in the TMT FEIS, TIO will hire a cultural resource specialist to work in conjunction with the archaeological monitor at all times and in all places or situations where on-site archaeological monitoring is required. Cultural monitors will have the appropriate background to serve as a cultural monitor and cultural resource specialist for cultural matters. Cultural monitors will provide direct oversight of construction activities and will regularly provide Kahu Kū Mauna and OMKM with a report of activities and findings. WDT Nees at 6-8; Ex. A-9; Ex. A-1/R-1, Ex. B, App. A, at A-7 to A-8.

751. TIO developed an Archaeological Monitoring Plan in accordance with HAR § 13-279 et seq. The Archaeological Monitoring Plan was accepted by SHPD on April 24, 2013. Cultural and archaeological monitors will be present at construction sites on Mauna Kea and will have authority to stop work if cultural finds are made, including historic properties. They will also inform workers of the possibility of inadvertent cultural finds, including human remains. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-35; Ex. A-142.
752. Pursuant to HAR § 13-284 et seq., TIO developed and will implement the Archaeological Mitigation Plan and in consultation with native Hawaiian organizations and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, will seek their views on proposed mitigation. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-35.
753. TIO plans to implement a Ride-Sharing Program to reduce the number of vehicle trips between Hale Pōhaku and the TMT Observatory. This step is anticipated to further reduce the Project's impact on the spiritual and sacred quality of Mauna Kea by reducing dust, transient noise, and general movements in the summit region. Ex. A-1/R-2 at 4-25 to 4-26; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-36; WDT Nees at 8.
754. TIO committed to fund a CBP of \$1 million per year, to be administered via the THINK. THINK Fund purposes could include scholarships and mini-grants; educational programs; college awards; educational programs specific to Hawaiian culture, astronomy, math, and science; and community outreach activities. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-35 to 3-36; WDT Nees at 7; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 5.
755. TIO conducts community outreach including consulting with the Kahu Kū Mauna council regularly regarding cultural impact issues. The TMT outreach office policy is to have an open door with the native Hawaiian community over issues of concern. TIO has committed to support, financially and through use of its outreach office, the following measures related to cultural resources:
- (1) hosting an annual cultural event or training;
 - (2) the translation of chants or mele and the use of their teachings;
 - (3) the translation of modern astronomy lessons into the Hawaiian language;
 - (4) development of exhibits regarding cultural, natural, and historic resources in coordination with OMKM and 'Imiloa that could be used at the VIS, 'Imiloa, TMT facilities, or other appropriate locations; and
 - (5) developing a TMT outreach office consisting of two full time staff who will work with native Hawaiian groups and 'Imiloa to support/fund programs specific to Hawaiian culture and archaeological resources.
- Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-35 to 3-37.
756. The TMT Project has committed to operate in accordance with the TMT Management Plan, the CMP and its sub-plans, as well as other relevant rules, regulations, and requirements. The mitigation measures and management actions proposed in the TMT

Management Plan, together with the broader management and mitigation actions to be implemented through the CMP and sub-plans, will prevent substantial adverse impact to the various resources of Mauna Kea and the surrounding area, community, or region. Ex. A-1/R-1 at Table 2.1; WDT White 9; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 62:14-20.

757. Evidence was presented that certain Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have been conducting cultural practices on Mauna Kea since at least 2000. These practices have occurred within the presence of the thirteen observatories at the summit and were not prevented or curtailed by these astronomical facilities. *See, e.g.*, (Camara) Tr. 3/1/17 at 188:7-191.
758. Dr. Kahakalau, a witness for the Flores-Case ‘Ohana, testified that there are many ways native Hawaiians can honor Mauna Kea without going up to the summit. Tr. 1/9/17 at 102:1-103:25. According to Dr. Kahakalau, *mana* can be acquired from honoring Mauna Kea by practitioners actively refraining from going up to the summit in honor of Mauna Kea’s sacredness. (Dr. Kahakalau) Tr. 1/9/17 at 100:22-101:7. It is Dr. Kahakalau’s belief that unless a practitioner is specifically a Poli‘ahu or mauna practitioner, then that practitioner should not go to the summit of Mauna Kea. (Dr. Kahakalau) Tr. 1/9/17 at 39:5-39:18.
759. N. Stevens noted that in ancient Hawai‘i, it was kapu for maka‘āinana to travel to the summit area of Mauna Kea. Until the kapu system broke down, only the ali‘i and kahuna were allowed to go to the summit. Ex. C-9 (WDT Stevens) at ¶ 4.
760. White testified that he observed two ahu at the TMT Project site on October 5, 2016 that were not present during his prior visits to the site. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 27:12-28:2.
761. Rechtman testified that in addition to recent ahu construction, two upright stones near the TMT boundary were placed just off to the side of the construction work area and not actually on the TMT Project site. (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 88:6-14.
762. Ahu are dated by assessing the characteristics of its construction (ahu are constructed rocks). There is no physical way to take an ordinary individual rock and date it from an archeological standpoint. Dating is a visual determination by the archaeologist, sometimes coupled with other historical information (*e.g.*, looking at older maps and seeing which sites or ahu have been marked and looking to see if it still exists today). (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 135:5-23.
763. Pisciotta has been conducting her cultural practices since the early 1990s when she was employed at the CSO Observatory. (Pisciotta) Tr. 2/13/17 at 194:13-195:5. Her practices consisted of:
- a) caring for burials;
 - b) collecting water from lake Waiau;
 - c) monitoring or observing the adze quarry; and
 - d) observing stars, constellations and the heavens.

Tr. 2/13/17 at 195:4-196:8.

Her practices included going to the summit for the equinox and solstice. These practices averaged once a month every year up to the present in addition to the solstice and equinox events. (Pisciotta) Tr. 2/13/17 at 196:19 – 198:3. These practices would not be altered by the TMT Observatory since they occur at areas away from the TMT Project site.

764. Pisciotta testified concerning alleged impacts to site plane views. Ex. B.01a (WDT Pisciotta) at 7-9. She states that her viewplanes from the summit ridge area towards Haleakalā or other areas would be materially affected or blocked. *See e.g.*, Ex. C-19. Pisciotta's cultural concerns were fully considered in the CIA and EIS process where she was interviewed extensively and placed numerous written materials in the record. Ex. A-5/R5, App. D at 31-39, 100, 131-146, 182-188, 191-193, D-1 to D-9.
765. Pisciotta further objected to any policies and signage that discourage the contemporary practice of stacking rocks. The policies and signage Ms. Pisciotta finds objectionable pre-exist the TMT Project. Ex. B.01a (WDT Pisciotta) at 13.
766. Pisciotta claims that TMT would impede her ability to track the setting sun, but admits that those observations have been performed at the summit and she and others have been doing that for years. Specifically, Pisciotta referred to a "need to track the . . . precession," described as a "26,000-year cycle ... [that] is the measure of the wobble of the earth's axis, and the time it takes for the wobble to make a complete cycle." For Pisciotta, tracking this "wobble" is important because "relative to earth the pole stars appear to change over time"; "[i]f the pole stars change it drastically impacts navigation"; and if these changes are not noted, celestial navigators will get "lost at sea." Ex. B.01a (WDT Pisciotta) at 7. Other than Pisciotta's sworn testimony, no verifiable evidence supporting native Hawaiians tracking the wobble, or a Hawaiian term for precession, a western concept. Similarly, other than Pisciotta's sworn testimony, there is no verifiable evidence reconciling the 26,000 years it takes to complete the wobble cycle with how this affected navigation by native Hawaiians to Hawai'i less than 2,000 years ago. No other independent witness confirmed or verified these statements.
767. Pisciotta also testified that the po'e kahiko (ancient Hawaiian people) conducted ceremonies meant to keep track of the motions of the celestial bodies and their relationship to the observers on earth. WDT Pisciotta at 7. Importantly, she admits that the TMT would be below the horizon if they were viewing the sunset from the Keck Observatory on the summit ridge. (Pisciotta) Tr. 2/13/17 at 198:14-200:14; Fig. 3-24 of Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-100.
768. Baybayan, who is a Master wayfinder, disagreed with Ms. Pisciotta's assertion that celestial navigators will get lost at sea if they do not track changes in the location of the pole stars over time. He testified that according to his training and practice, traditional celestial navigation is not dependent on going to the summit of Mauna Kea and making observations from there. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 14:12-14:16. For Baybayan it is most appropriate and logical to train celestial navigators along a coastline or from a

coastal location. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 22:21-23:10.

769. Baybayan testified that the only summit area used for wayfinding practices and teaching is on Kaho‘olawe, which would not be affected by the TMT Project. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 99:1- 99:8. Dr. Coleman confirmed that Hawaiian star knowledge was mostly confined to what can be seen from lower elevations because the human eye works better at lower elevations and therefore, stars are more visible from lower elevations than at the summit of Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/5/17 at 107:8-108:11, 169:3-8.
770. Baybayan also testified that if cultural sites, particularly heiau used by traditional navigators, were destroyed, navigators would nonetheless be able to continue to use the heiau. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 25:24-26:20. Baybayan further testified that the telescopes are not noticeable to navigators when they sail into Hawai‘i. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 43:23-44:6. He clarified that his understanding of desecration means something that has been there historically, such as a man-made structure from pre-history, pre-contact, that’s established and recorded, and is purposefully removed. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 75:18-76:3.
771. Baybayan does not believe that Mauna Kea is considered a public monument or structure, but recognizes that it is a cultural treasure, a place of worship and burial. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 76:5-21.
772. According to Baybayan, the current system of Hawaiian wayfinding is a hybrid system built on tradition as well as academics. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 57:8-58:20. Modern wayfinders use both traditional methods but also use modern technology such as GPS and chart plotters on a board. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 97:14-97:18. An example is Hikianalia, the second boat in the Malama Honua voyage that is equipped with modern technology and has access to modern navigational tools such as GPS. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 143:7-143:16.
773. For Baybayan, the TMT project is consistent with Hawaiian’s ancestral forbearers, and will benefit tomorrow’s generation as an important tool for modern Hawaiian society. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 59:20-59:25, 68:24-69:6. TMT will contribute to the scientific endeavor to sustain life on this planet. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 80:9-81:13.
774. Baybayan believes that cultural practices can coexist with the TMT Project and there is enough room on the island for everyone to conduct their personal practices. Collaboration between the community and TMT has been the nature of Hawaiians for generations and generations. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 73:10-73:13. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 93:18-94:14.
775. Prof. Johnson, a witness for Opposing Intervenor W. Freitas, is not a native Hawaiian practitioner. He is a religious studies professor at the University of Colorado. He focuses on comparative studies of religion, religious freedom, and living indigenous traditions, particularly American Indian and native Hawaiian religions. Ex. T-1 (Prof. Johnson WDT at 1). He is not an expert in land use planning or environmental review. See Ex. T-1 (Prof. Johnson CV at PDF page 10). In his opinion, the entire mountain is one religious

site. (Prof. Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 60:14-23. He opined that there are sacred places, churches for Hawaiians, that do not include physical structures, but are just natural land formations. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 75:5- 16.

776. Prof. Johnson was present on Mauna Kea on June 22, 2015 when the first two ahu on the TMT Project site were installed in the middle of the access roadway to the TMT Project site. Ex. T-1 at 3. That group included W. Freitas, a stone mason by trade, who was a primary person responsible for designing and installing the ahu in the specific locations in or near the TMT Project site. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 20:13-21:22. Prof. Johnson's testimony concluded that the two ahu on the TMT Project site were the first ahu to be built in that location. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 21:13-18. He acknowledged that the ahu did not exist on the site at the time that the FEIS was considered and approved and that the ahu were placed after the location of the TMT Project site was made known to the public. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 25:22-26:3, 91:7-13. That testimony confirms and corroborates the evidence that no prior ahu or religious practice occurred at that specific location prior to its designation as the TMT Project site. He also testified that members of the native Hawaiian community disagree about the status and meaning of the ahu, as some of the stones came from the Kona shoreline, and not from the surrounding summit area, thus breaking protocol. Ex. T-1 at 5.
777. Prof. Johnson argues that the presence of new ahu constructed on the TMT Project site, after the site was known and the project heavily opposed, triggers a requirement for a new EIS. Tr. 2/16/17 at 17:4-17, 28:3-21; 53:14-18. This argument, however, is unsupported under Hawai'i law and would produce an absurd result. The purposes of HRS Chapters 343 and 6E are to inventory existing conditions at the time that the studies are done. To provide protection to these new structures placed after the project site is known and in direct and obvious protest of that project would allow persons who oppose a proposed project to stop it simply by placing a stone in the area or initiating a new practice that incorporates recognized traditional practices from other areas on the island.
778. While Prof. Johnson opined that requiring a permit to build an ahu might be considered offensive to some from a religious perspective, he agreed the State has a right to regulate cultural practices. He acknowledged that in any democratic system where there are competing interests and rights, there are mechanisms, even within Hawai'i state law, that enable reasonable recognition of religious freedoms if administrative procedures are adequately followed. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 78:7-17; 94:12-15; *see also* Ex. A-145 (KKM October 13, 2010 meeting minutes, contemplating a form of regulation of lele construction). Prof. Johnson also acknowledged that while a practitioner may be unable to get a permit in the middle of the night during moments of crisis, one of the benefits of a permitting system to build an ahu is that it should provide ongoing protection of an approved ahu. (Prof. Johnson) (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 80:10-81:6.
779. Prof. Johnson acknowledged that W. Freitas had no legal title or property interest to the land upon which he had placed the ahu and W. Freitas had not practiced in the area before the recent protests in 2015. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 94:16-20. Prof. Johnson testified that placing the ahu in the middle of the narrow, bumpy four-wheel

- drive road does not cause a health or safety concern because the ahu were quite prominent and one could drive around them. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 92:2-10.
780. Prof. Johnson conceded that protestors standing in the access road for the purpose of blocking traffic do pose a safety and health risk. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 94:7-11.
781. Prof. Johnson testified that if a native Hawaiian cultural practitioner says that the TMT telescope is consistent with the ancient Hawaiian practice of studying the stars, the telescope would be a possible expression of traditional Hawaiian ideals. (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 122:16-23. This testimony was consistent with Baybayan's testimony that the proposed TMT Project is consistent with Hawaiian culture and Trask's testimony that the concept of geothermal can be traced back to King Kalākaua, who also happened to own a telescope. *See* (Trask) Tr. 03/01/17 at 111:5-112:1; Ex. C-54.
782. Prof. Johnson testified that the TMT Project will adversely impact religious practitioners. Prof. Johnson acknowledged that he was not aware of the dispute surrounding the TMT Project until the fall of 2014. There is no evidence he conducted or reviewed any peer reviewed studies concerning impacts to native Hawaiian practitioners on the mountain. Ex. T-1 at 3. When questioned about whether the protestors standing in the road block access posed a public health and safety concern, Prof. Johnson was evasive and attempted to avoid answering the question. Only after being asked repeatedly to answer, Prof. Johnson finally did admit that protestors blocking the road pose a health and safety concern. *See* (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 113:15-116:14; Ex. C-46; Ex. C-47.
783. Mililani B. Trask was a witness for Camara. She is "an indigenous Hawaiian attorney licensed to practice in the State of Hawai'i and a United Nations Expert in the field of international indigenous human rights." WDT of Mililani B. Trask at page 1. She had no previous traditional or cultural practices in the Area E location and does not conduct any practices on the summit of Mauna Kea. (Trask) Tr. 2/28/17 at 249:25-250:1. Her testimony was principally concerned with sovereignty and her political reasons for opposing the TMT Project. Trask noted, quoting portions of the CMP, that contemporary practices undertaken by native Hawaiians on Mauna Kea may or may not have a basis in traditional practice, and that the revival of an ancient practice, without established continuity to the past, can only be considered a modern interpretation and thus must be considered a contemporary practice. WDT Trask. Trask also agreed that unrestricted public access to the summit is a problem. (Trask) Tr. 03/01/17 at 85:24-86:9; Ex. A-155 at 4.
784. Trask's and N. Ho's involvement with Mauna Kea and collaboration with the State of Hawai'i can be traced back to the mid-1990s. *See* Exs. A-152, A-153, A-154. On June 2, 1995, Trask wrote a letter to Michael D. Wilson, then-Chairperson of the BLNR, and Mr. Don Hall, then Director of IfA, seeking to form a cultural review committee for Mauna Kea. Ex. A-152. Chairperson Wilson responded positively that such a committee would be a good idea for Mauna Kea and that DLNR would be interested in working with Trask's group, and directing her to contact SHPD for further consultation. Ex. A-153.
785. On February 4, 1997, N. Ho wrote a letter to Senator Malama Solomon expressing

concern as to certain issues on Mauna Kea. Ex. A-154. Mr. Ho's letter to Senator Solomon was responded to by Chairperson Wilson on May 22, 1997. Ex. A-155. Trask agreed with Chairperson Wilson's statement in response to N. Ho. that unrestricted public access to the Mauna Kea summit is a problem. (Trask) Tr. 03/01/17 at 85:24-86:9; Ex. A-155 at 4.

786. In addition to her formal correspondence with Chairperson Wilson, Ms. Trask testified that she also engaged in conversations with Chairperson Wilson in his personal capacity. (Trask) Tr. 3/1/17 at 89:6-14, 91:19-92:5.
787. Trask noted, quoting portions of the CMP, that chief among the contemporary practices was the use of Mauna Kea as a spiritual and religious site of prayer and contemplation, which included building family ahu or altars and the placement of offerings to honor families or as a form of personal spiritual worship. WDT Trask at 2.
788. Ronald Fujiyoshi, a witness for W. Freitas, is not a native Hawaiian practitioner. He was the pastor of the Ola'a First Hawaiian Church in Kurtistown, Hawai'i. (Fujiyoshi) Tr. 3/2/17 at 99:2-5, 171:16-23, 174:13-19; Ex. T-2 (WDT Fujiyoshi) at 1. In Fujiyoshi's view, the TMT Project will interfere with native Hawaiian religious practices. Ex. T-2 (WDT Fujiyoshi) at 3. Fujiyoshi testified that "public opinion" holds that Mauna Kea is sacred; however, he was unaware of the poll (Ex. I-1) showing that 46% of native Hawaiians support the project and 45% are opposed. (Fujiyoshi) Tr. 3/2/17 at 138:7-141:3; Ex. T-2 (WDT Fujiyoshi) at 6.
789. Opposing Intervenor Temple of Lono has no actual religious practices on the summit area and none in the Area E location for the TMT Project. The Temple has no congregation. WDT Nobriga at 1. Nobriga, the Kahuna of the Temple, testified that he believes his practices will be affected by the development of the TMT Project. Nobriga has never constructed an altar or shrine on Mauna Kea. Nobriga admits that he has been able to conduct his practices and faith since 1980 with the 13 existing telescopes in place on Mauna Kea. (Nobriga) Tr. 3/1/17 at 47:14-22, 64:12-23, 70:1-76:21. Nobriga offered no specific evidence as to how the TMT Project specifically would restrict or otherwise prevent his practices or any practices on Mauna Kea.
790. The Temple's position was fully reviewed and considered in a prior comment letter to the EIS process in 2010, through written submission and statements from its representative, Fergerstrom. Ex. A-4/R-4 at 153-62.
791. The two ahu built and installed by W. Freitas and others on the access road in and near Area E in 2015 were placed for political or protest reasons to halt the TMT Project, and were not placed in accordance with any recognized traditional practice performed by W. Freitas or others at the locations of the two ahu within Area E. W. Freitas, who is from Oahu originally, had not been on the area where the two ahu were placed prior to 2015. He acknowledged the two ahu were placed in the road path where vehicles that need to access the site for construction would traverse and that he personally opposed the project at that time. (Freitas) Tr. 3/2/17 at 184:22-188:14; 194:20-194:24, 199:2-199:22, 201:12-202:4, 252:12-253:12, 259:4-266:22, 268:13-269:13.

792. Opposing Intervenor Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara is a native Hawaiian practitioner and a lineal descendant of kupuna of the ali'i of Mauna Kea. WDT Camara at 1. In his words:

"I, Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara reside with my ohana in the wao maukele of Kaumana on the slopes of Mauna Kea. Our wai is Wailuku Stream. I am a lineal descendant of Kukahauula of Mauna Kea (Exhibit H-8). This ancestor lived as a Kanaka (man), and also remains with us today on Mauna Kea as a Puu, an elemental deity or akua, and a vessel for the Wai Kapu A Kane. The remains, the iwi of Kukahauula and many more of my kupuna (ancestors) rest on Mauna Kea and need vigilant care to prevent desecration. I, like many Hawaiians am a descendant of Umi a Liloa. Umi placed a kapu on Mauna Kea and part of his vast legacy was to protect the sacred Mauna Kea from desecration. This legacy and kuleana are now mine to uphold. I am a native Hawaiian and my family's history is woven into the landscape of Mauna Kea. My ancestry documents the un-severable bond that I have with this sacred mountain. This Mookuauhau and belief system passed on to me, assures that I, and other lineal descendants always think of Mauna Kea as a living family member. It assures that I care for our Mauna as I would a kupuna, always with respect and as someone I turn to for wisdom. It assures that I consider the Mauna's needs before my own. When I look at Mauna Kea I do not see an inanimate geologic mass with a good view of the heavens, I see an elder who provides every resource needed for my safety, wellbeing and survival. I see my kupuna who should always be treated with the deepest respect and gratitude. I am blessed to work on Mauna Kea as a resource manager in the Mauna Kea Ice Age Natural Area Reserve (NAR)."

Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara, Testimony against TMT Development, WDT (revised) at page 1.

Camara has never notified SHPD of his lineal descendant claims and has never been officially recognized as a lineal descendant by any state agency. (Camara) Tr. 3/1/17 at 123:21- 124:3, 126:7-17, 186:2-8. He has conducted native Hawaiian practices on Mauna Kea, though not in the Astronomy Precinct. He believes that the iwi of his ancestors are located on Mauna Kea. (Camara) Tr. 3/1/17 at 167, 189:21-190:6. Camara is a member of KAHEA, and has been involved in protests against the TMT Project. He was also part of a group opposed to the TMT Project that has petitioned the United Nations for a sacred site designation. WDT (revised) Camara at 9.

793. Wiremu Carroll, a witness for Opposing Intervenor Kanaele, is a native Hawaiian, who was born in New Zealand and is now a member of ROOK. (Carroll) Tr. 3/2/17 at 54:24-55:9, 61:11-15. Carroll has not lived in Hawai'i continuously. (Carroll) Tr. 3/2/17 at 88:16-89:6. Carroll asserts:

"Therefore, Be it known that the physical grading operations on Mauna Kea commissioned by TIO/TMT and executed by Goodfellow Construction, the prime contractor, were done under Color of Law as defined in 18 U.S. Code § 242 – Deprivation of rights under Color of Law, And

Therefore, 2 Be it known that the physical grading operations on Mauna Kea commissioned by TIO/TMT and executed by Goodfellow Construction, the prime contractor, were done in violation of H.R.S. §711- 1077 Desecration, And

Therefore, Be it known that, among other violations, the arrest and prosecution of citizens preventing the desecration of protected conservation land was done in violation of 18 U.S. Code § 241 – Conspiracy against rights of citizens and 18 U.S. Code § 242 – Deprivation of rights under Color of Law." [sic]

WDT of Ali`i Sir Wiremu Carroll, Special Witness for Kaliko Kanaele Sr.

794. Opposing Intervenor Kalikolehua Kanaele is a native Hawaiian cultural practitioner who has been connected to Mauna Kea since birth when his parents took him there. He is also a member of the ROOK, Heiau Mamalahua Helu`elua. (Kanaele) Tr. 3/1/17 at 231:2-9, 250:19-252:16; WDT Kanaele at 2. Kanaele is an Opposing Intervenor. He complains that Maunakea Observatories Support Services staff have denied practitioners access to the summit in the past. WDT Kanaele at 6.
795. Kakalia also testified about her emotional reaction to the proposed project, but had no traditional or cultural practices within the Area E site location that would be impacted by construction. Kakalia expressed her opinion that the TMT Project cannot meet the eight criteria because the project will impact her family practice, community, and well-being. PHS Kakalia; (Kakalia) Tr. 2/27/17 at 115:1-115:12. She stated that she believes that there is no area on Mauna Kea on which TMT could be built and that there is nothing that can be done or said that would cause her to reconsider or change her opposition to the TMT Project. Tr. 2/27/17 at 156:10-156:23, 208:8-210:21.
796. Tajon testified as a witness for Kakalia. Ex. O-15 (WDT Tajon). Tajon acknowledged that plurality of cultures exist in Hawai`i, but suggested that the native Hawaiian culture should dominate simply based on residency in Hawai`i. Tr. 2/27/17 at 42:13-43:5; A-144.
797. Hearing Officer Witness, Wilma Holi, is a native of Kauai and acknowledges she does not conduct practices on Mauna Kea. Holi has never been to Mauna Kea. Tr. 2/23/17 at 81; Ex. Z-1-A. Holi conducts cultural practices with respect to salt gathering on Kauai. Ex. Z-1-A. Holi stated general concerns regarding the impacts of development.
798. Noelani Kaopua-Goodyear appeared as a witness for Opposing Intervenor Sleightholm. In Prof. Kaopua-Goodyear's words: "Aloha kākou. My name is Noelani Goodyear–Ka`ōpua. He Kanaka `Ōiwi Hawai`i au. I was born and raised on O`ahu, but my Kanaka

Maoli and Chinese greatgrandparents lived on Hawai‘i island before relocating their families to Kalihi. On the Hawaiian side, my genealogy is deeply rooted in ka Moku o Keawe for dozens of generations, as far back as we can trace our lineage.

I earned my BA magna cum laude at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, as a double major in Hawaiian Studies and Political Science. I received my PhD at the University of California, Santa Cruz, having completed a dissertation titled, *Kū i ka Māna: Building Community and Nation Through Hawaiian Schooling*, in 2005.

Since 2007, I have worked at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, where I am currently an Associate Professor of Political Science, specializing in Native Hawaiian and Indigenous politics. I have also served as interim chair of the Political Science department and have helped to create the Nā Ko‘oko‘o Native Hawaiian leadership cohort and Native Hawaiian Initiative of the College of Social Sciences. My research has focused on Hawaiian and Indigenous social movements, including land struggles; on Indigenous governance; on the politics of education; and on the ways that Indigenous peoples perpetuate cultural knowledge and practice even while living under conditions of settler colonialism. As an educator, I teach and mentor undergraduate, MA and PhD students. In addition to my Political Science students, I often sit on the dissertation and MA thesis committees of students in the College of Education, as well as Hawaiian and Pacific Islands Studies, because of my extensive work in these fields." WDT Noelani Kaopua-Goodyear at 1; Ex. I-6.

799. Prof. Kaopua-Goodyear testified that she has performed mele and hula on various locations on Mauna Kea. She has no historical or familial native Hawaiian cultural practices on the summit area of Mauna Kea. She has never engaged in traditional or cultural practices on the Northern plateau Area E section of Mauna Kea. Tr. 2/22/17 at 148:12-149:21, 226:4-228:3. She had no practice before 2011 and has only been to the summit once, in 2011. Ex. J-6 (WDT Goodyear-Kaopua) at 4; Tr. 2/22/17 at 211:21-24, 227:1-25.
800. Prof. Kaopua-Goodyear confirmed that nothing would change her mind about the TMT project. She believes the development of TMT is an act of colonization in violation of United Nations consensus to end colonization, although she admits that she is not an expert in international law. Tr. 2/22/17 at 158:17-159:19, 212:3-19. She acknowledges that native Hawaiians have many different opinions about TMT and she did not speak for all native Hawaiians. She agrees that some native Hawaiians support the TMT Project. An article she authored, entitled "Protectors of the Future" (Ex. J-9), did not inform the reader of any support for the TMT Project by native Hawaiians. Prof. Kaopua-Goodyear was unaware of the poll indicating that approximately half of the native Hawaiian population supports the TMT Project. Tr. 2/22/17 at 211:3-18, 233:1-22, 243:20-244:9; Ex. C-49.
801. Nelson Ho, a witness called by Opposing Intervenor Sleightholm, opposes the proposed TMT being built on Mauna Kea. In his words: "The proposed Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) should be built. It will be a magnificent scientific instrument. But it should not be built on Mauna Kea. One key reason is because land use mismanagement—and the

unseemly politics behind it—has persisted since the beginning of the 1968 UH lease. Those practices must not be allowed to continue. It is this chronic mismanagement and unseemly politics that created the controversy, and continue to fuel widespread community opposition to TMT and the other telescope projects waiting in line behind it (such as the Canada-France-Hawai'i Telescope's so-called "upgrade" to replace it with a new \$100 million High Dynamic Range 10-meter telescope)." Amended WDT of Nelson Ho, at 1; Ex. J-8.

802. N. Ho testified that he has no traditional or cultural practices in Area E and stated he considers himself to be a long-standing opponent to development on the mountain. Tr. 2/22/17 at 120:24-121:2. N. Ho testified that he and Ward contributed substantially to the Sierra Club letter that they both signed and submitted as part of the TMT EIS process. Tr. 2/22/17 at 127:4-128:20. N. Ho also admitted that OMKM had the opportunity to review and comment on the DEIS. Tr. 2/22/17 at 132:9-16.

803. Opposing Intervenor Cindy Freitas describes herself as "a Native American, descended of the native inhabitants of Hawai'i prior to 1778 and born and raised in Hawai'i my entire life. Amended WDT of Cindy Freitas, at 1; Ex. S-2-a. In her words: "I learned my cultural traditional customary religion practices though my families Lineage. [sic]

My grandmother and grandfather is the strongest mentor for me in my growing up and raised me in a traditional cultural way. We would go to the mountain and do prayers ("Pule") for many different things. Also I have witness things beyond my understanding till I got older and mostly my grandparents also made sure that we do not desecrate any thing on land, ocean or any were else to be respectful of your surroundings. [sic]

My grandparent would speak the manaleo style (Old Hawaiian language) which tried to teach the next generation but because of the influence of time we only learn a little of the language She would take us to the mountain and learn to plant our food, raise our livestock and take care of the land so that the land would take care of the people in their culture practices.

We were thought in the Ahupua`a style (from the ocean to the mountain). While we work mostly in the middle of the Ahupua`a we would also go to the ocean and fish as well. My grandparents would always tell us to pule first before we fish and also give a ho`okupu (is a gift of abundance of mountain food that we bring) and leave it on a rock at the ocean shore line and ask for permission to fish and be safe. Then our catch would be a bounce so that we share with the people that live close to us. We also leave a fish on a rock when we get to the mountain for ho`okupu as well. [sic]

As I grew I never forgot my upbringing. Now with a family of my own I teach them also the cultural customary traditional religion practices as well and we as parents learn though our children. [sic]

I have enrolled my 2 girls as Kula Kaiapuni O Kona in the early 2000 and we grew with the school with all kinds of chants, pule and protocols. Today the school is name Ehunuikaimalino and located at Konawaena location. Though this school I have learn

also so much cultural customary religion practices as well. [sic]

As for Mauna Kea and everywhere else in the world I have deep respect for the natural resources and native plants and things that live within the earth. Today because of the fast development we as people need to keep our natural resources and help to save what is there."

Amended WDT of Cindy Freitas, at 1; Ex. S-2-a.

804. Opposing Intervenor C. Freitas testified that she conducts cultural practices on Mauna Kea, including the summit area. Tr. 2/21/17 at 145:3-147:1; Ex. S-2a at 1.
805. Opposing Intervenor William Freitas is a native Hawaiian cultural practitioner. Here is his "History of Experience": "I, William Freitas, a practitioner of many Cultural Hawaiian Religious Traditions of the practices of our Hawaiian People that I have engage in and are taught to me by my Kupuna, Uncles' Aunties and my Mother and Hawaiian family's that live these traditions and shared hands on knowledge passed to them from beyond 1778. [sic]

I am a Pohaku Kane (stone missionary). My experience started at a young age of 5 years old with my mother as we were picking kukui nuts to make Ina Mona. I found a stone under the kukui leaves in the dirt. My mother said it was a special stone use for food and medicine. Then she chanted with prayers for protection and permission to malama (care for). This special stone which is still in my possession, is the connection to my heritage as a Kanaka Maoli Ko Pa Aina and the journey that directs me to protect my birth right for the future of myself and family. [sic]

I have witness many moments as I grew up on the island of Hawai'i, of ceremonies done by my mother, Aunties and Uncles, for all different occasions, land blessing, house blessing, casting out bad spirits, call of winds, rain, sun and protection, asking for good catch when going fishing, placing of offerings, for good production by continued practice for channeling prayers and giving offerings on existing and newly established stone Ahu's (altars) to give the highest respect to the Wakea (creator) of our Akua's (life forms that represent sustaining elements). [sic]

I have been working with Pohaku from age 5 years old til present day. Pohaku is a part of me in many unexpected opportunities and moments in my life. [sic]

I was a Licensed Contractor for 16 years until 2008 as a result of Corporate Greed caused a economic down fall, left me no option but to dissolve the business. [sic]

I have had many opportunities to build, Ahus, Walls, restore heiau's, fish ponds, Kahua's (foundation) for Ku'ula stones (fishing shrines) foundation for Hale's (thatched building) stone enclosures ect., throughout the Islands. At presen time I am building traditional thatched Hale's along with ceremonies as these traditional structures are built. See Exhibits T-3.i 1 to T-3.11 , Pictures letters of acknowledgments by Malia Kipapa, Walter Wong and Reed Flickinger. [sic]

I William Freitas is the Grandson of Kahau`aulahilahikeohokaole known as Lahilahi, born 1896, my mothers mom, I was 5 years old when she passed. [sic]

This name is a genealogical name, that extends way be on 1778, before the time of Pa`ao's voyage to Hawai`i (Hawai`i). Knowledge Given to me by my mother Josephine T. Ahuna, as she was a curator of Hulihe`e Palace in the 1970's, with the late aunty Iolani Luahine of Hula, Chants and knowledge of our ancestor's. [sic]

My mother and aunty Iolani Luahine, and the late Kumu Hula of many, Uncle George Naope at one time were Haumana (students) of the late Kumu Hula Tom Hiona with knowledge of our ancestor's traditions of spiritual connection to Papahanaumoku (mother of life) Mauna O Wakea (father of creation), today known as Mauna Kea. [sic]

In the Wao Akua (realm of the deities of water) lives there Daughters, Kahau`ula, Poliahu, Waiau (where Mo`oinanea resides) and Lilinoe, there Son too, Born Haloa (deity of Kalo (taro) along with many other deities, this knowledge is a big part of our religious understanding of Kanaka maoli Ko Pae Aina, connection to the creation of our existence, the KUMULIPOLIPO (beginning of TIME instilled chants and prayers, passed down from our ancestors from generation to present time. This is a Vital Necessity of Our spirit for the future of Kanaka Ko Pae Aina to survive by. [sic]

Now today (THIS AREA IS IDENTIFIED AS THE University of Hawai`i Science Reserve for Astronomy by the university). Desecration of the Highest Level. Created by the BLNR in 1969. [sic]

With this knowledge as well as witnessing many spiritual ceremonies by these women and others as I grew, to understand my connection to our kupuna iwi (ancestors) land, ocean, and water that is always acknowledged to our creator. Akua (Gods), Makua Kane I Ka Lani, (father in heaven) Io, (highest), all and more ways we refer to Wakea. Mauna a Wakea (Mauna Kea). To give the highest respect to all our akua's. (All life sustaining elements). For our ability to exist in the middle of the pacific.

My Koko (blood), qualifies me as a descendant beyond 1778. With that, my kuliana is to give this knowledge to my children, grandchildren, and the unborn to help those may find a lineage in my genealogy, so they can do the same. I know that all kanaka mauoli Ko Pae Aina, are all related in one way or another. See PASH law presidents" [sic]

WDT William Freitas, 1-2; Ex. T-3.

806. Opposing Intervenor W. Freitas says that his first time engaging in cultural practices on Mauna Kea was on April 2, 2015. While he has no previous practice on Mauna Kea, W. Freitas testified that he believes his present or future planned spiritual, religious, and cultural practices will be impacted by the TMT Project. He acknowledged that his cultural practices are intact today despite the presence of the existing telescopes on the summit areas of Mauna Kea. Ex. T-3.0 (WDT W. Freitas) at 2; Tr. 3/2/17 at 227:6-9, 252:7-253:12, 271:20-272:12. W. Freitas has constructed ahu on Mauna Kea, though he admits the first ahu he constructed was on June 22, 2015. Tr. 3/2/17 at 259:4-262:25, 268:13-22. Prior to 2015, he had never been to the summit of Mauna Kea to perform any

practices; he had only done so from areas below the summit. Tr. 3/2/17 at 252:23-254:8.

807. Opposing Intervenor Mehana Kihoi is a native Hawaiian practitioner. Here is her story:

"I am Mehana Kihoi, I am a Native Hawaiian cultural and spiritual practitioner. I am a Native Hawaiian beneficiary as defined by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921, and a beneficiary of the Ceded Lands Trust under Section 5(f) of the Admissions Act. I am a descendant of Native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778 as established through my genealogical lines of Pa'ao and Hewa Hewa Nui. My ancestors and subsequent generations, gathered adze only found on Mauna Kea, to build their voyaging canoes. My ancestors honored Mauna Kea as a place of spiritual worship, where they would offer their deepest prayers to our creators Papa and Wakea.

I have a spiritual, cultural, psychological, physical, close and significant relationship to Mauna Kea that is tied to my identity as a Native Hawaiian. The health and well-being of Mauna Kea are tied directly to my own health and well-being because of my close and significant relationship to the land there. Mauna Kea is my spiritual place where I connect to my ancestors and my creators Papa and Wakea. Mauna Kea is where I achieve my highest level of spirituality. Mauna Kea is a sacred place.

My ancestors were stewards of Mauna Kea and ensured that these sacred lands remained untouched because of its importance to the creation of Native Hawaiians. I empower my own child by teaching her the spiritual practices at Mauna Kea so that one day she may carry these traditions to her children, and future generations. Having a direct ancestral connection to Mauna Kea, I am an active steward of this land to ensure there is no more further desecration of this land because it is tied to my spiritual and cultural identity, health and well-being as a Native Hawaiian.

I am an indigenous native Hawaiian woman, a mother, and a victim of domestic violence. Many years ago, I experienced physical and emotional trauma that left me with 5 broken parts of my face, and deep psychological & emotional pain. Pain that could never have been healed thru pharmaceutical drugs or western therapy. The Mauna is who healed me. The Mauna is where I go to, to ask my ancestors for guidance and strength. The Mauna is who gave me the courage to trust again."

Pre-Hearing Statement of Mehana Kihoi, page 1; Ex. F-1.

808. Kihoi's first visit to Mauna Kea was in 2012. She testified to this in relation to Criterion 7 and Criterion 8, generally, based on her stated emotional and psychological effects from the proposed project. Kihoi's practices have included pilgrimages to Mauna Kea since 2012 on numerous occasions. Kihoi was able to conduct her practices on Mauna Kea despite the presence of 13 existing telescopes, paved roads, and power and telecommunication lines. Tr. 2/14/17 at 109:1-25, 120:1-121:6. Prior to the October 7, 2014 groundbreaking ceremony, she had never been to the area of the proposed TMT Project site. Tr. 2/14/17 at 118:1-8. While Kihoi testified to engaging in certain practices generally over 33 years, those practices have not been directly on Mauna Kea, until recently. Kihoi believes in the sacredness of Mauna Kea. She agrees that native

Hawaiians have many different forms and types of practices that are personal to each individual. Tr. 2/14/17 at 108:7-111:7.

809. Kihoi's mother, Sarah Puaola Kihoi, is a native Hawaiian practitioner, called as a witness by Kihoi. Sarah Kihoi presents her background and support for her daughter as follows:

"I am Sarah Puaola Kihoi, I have an educational background in Sociology BA; I am a certified Ho'oponopono practitioner under the teachings of Malia Craver; a licensed lomilomi massage therapist in the State of Hawai'i; I have worked 30+ years with alienated youth dealing with social and emotional grief patterns with YMCA, Kamehameha School and Bishop Museum; I have worked with the State Correctional Office as a Youth Correctional Officer; I am currently on the Coalition Team "Families Against Domestic Violence"; I am presently developing programs for incarcerated Native Hawaiian women who have/are experiencing deep social, emotional, and psychological trauma; and for the past 20 years, my position as a Community Builder Facilitator for the Queen Lili'uokalani Children's Center I develop cultural, and educational programs specializing in intergenerational enrichment activities.

13 years ago, my daughter, "Mehana", and granddaughter, "Tali", was involved [sic] in a horrific incident, which left my daughter with broken bones in her face, jaw, eyes and neck. Tali was just 7 months old and was inches away, in her mother's arms when this happened. They both fell to the ground. After surgery, we all needed to find a place to hide for our safety. This was a week before Thanksgiving. My daughter could not eat, since her jaw was clamped shut. I was thankful that they both were alive.

Your Honor, it still brings me to tears to write this. We haven't had time to deal with these deep wounds. We have been trying to survive and deal with life. As I reflect over thirty plus years of service and as a cultural practitioner dealing with historical trauma, that has developed social, emotional, psychological struggles amongst our people. Nothing... could have prepared me to deal with what was in front of me. My most precious daughter, and grand daughter was so close to death.

What did come into LIGHT was my background as a Lomi Lomi practitioner, oli, my knowledge in medicinal Hawaiian plants, and most importantly, the power of prayer. Through these modalities, my daughter does not have a single scar on her face. Although, she healed physically, deep inside her spirit was still broken. It has been 13 years of dealing with this broken spirit, needing to be filled.

Then, Mehana found her call, her "kahea", to go to Mauna Kea. Sometimes she would leave before dawn and come home late. From Honaunau to the Mauna that is a hike. As a mother I continued to worry.

As our ohana, with genealogy of thousands of years, Mauna Kea has housed our iwi, bones of our Kupuna. It is by no mistake that, this Mauna Kea, continues to heal my daughter in her spiritual quest."

WDT of Sarah Puaola Kihoi; Ex. F-2.

S. Kihoi's practices do not include pilgrimages to Mauna Kea. Her experiences on Mauna Kea are minimal. Ex. F-2 (WDT S. Kihoi); Tr. 2/14/17 at 141:23-148:23, 170:3-6, 178:15-179:21. She had never travelled to Mauna Kea until the efforts in June 2015 to protest the access of workers to the project site. Tr. 2/14/17 at 170:3-6.

810. Opposing Intervenor, Leina`ala Sleightholm, called as a witness by Mehana Kihoi, is a native Hawaiian practitioner. Here is her story:

"My name is J. Leina`ala Sleightholm. I come from the 'ohana Keli'ipio, and Kuamo'o. I am a kanaka 'oiwi and can trace my genealogy back to the Battle of Kuamo'o in 1819. I am a 42 year old wife, and mother of 6 children of which I birthed 5. I was born in Wahiawa, O'ahu and moved to Pahoa, Moku o Keawe in 1978 with my parents, and younger sister. At the age of five, we moved to the wahi of Keahuolu where my father was the caretaker. In 1988 we moved to Ka'awaloa, Kona Hema where my parents remain today. I currently reside in Waikoloa, Kohala Hema, Moku o Keawe.

On October 7, 2014, I was moved to go to the mauna for the purpose of protecting my mountain from the desecration of the groundbreaking ceremony for the proposed Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT). I stood alongside my mother, and dozens of other people chanting, praying, and singing while armed police officers approached. As I stood there chanting at the guardrail, I saw a female police officer remove a handful of zipties from her back pocket, and I immediately was overcome with a sadness so deep and profound, and one that I had never felt before but will come to be very familiar with it in the coming months. I looked at my mother with tears rolling down my cheeks and whispered, "why does it have to come to this". Those were the only words I could form for the emotional and spiritual sadness I was feeling at that time, as I looked around to see kanaka 'oiwi from near and far standing together in love, and prayer for our mauna regardless of the threats that stood across the street. It was that day where my entire world shifted. The mauna called, and I answered. After that day, I came home and passed out on the living room floor for about 5 hours, and when I woke up, I went to take a shower and couldn't bring myself to wash the mauna dirt from my hair that night and finally did the next evening. It took me at least two weeks to recover from the feelings which I couldn't quite identify at that time, but it felt as if my physical body was at home, but my spirit was still on the mauna. Over the course of those two weeks, I had heard similar experiences and feelings from other people who were there. This would be the first "cut" I would endure over the course of the next two years.

On the evening of March 25, 2015, I again was guided by my kupuna to go to the mauna, where I and a few others would hold vigil for the next 3-5 days until hundreds began to arrive. During the duration of that time, I was in constant high alert that the mountain which had called me, which was also my church, and I regard as my kupuna was in jeopardy of being harmed by threatened construction work. Each day my fear became more and more intense. The only way to describe it in this human realm is as if my grandmother was in danger of her life. "This would be the next 3-5 cuts"

April 2, 2015 myself and many others, grounded deeply in pule, made our pilgrimage to the summit and stood arm in arm chanting, praying as police and DOCARE officers

began to bare down on us, ripping our arms apart from each other, while one forcefully grabbed each of our heads pulling it to his to exchange ha (life force/breath), against our will. I remember my arms being twisted behind my back and ziptied, all the while I continued to chant for the mauna, looking at each officer's face and recognizing that so many of them were kanaka too, some were childhood classmates, and others, family friends. I couldn't process all that happened that day, and felt spiritually numb as we were driven down the mountain in the police vehicle to the Hilo cellblock. What I did know is that I felt something in the very core of my being shift. From that day, and for the next three weeks I would remain close to home, barely able to get myself out of the house. I felt very vulnerable, tearful, and even unable to watch videos or see pictures of the arrests without breaking down in tears, literally immobilizing me. More than a year later, there are a few videos documenting that day that I haven't seen until just recently, and my reaction is the same, and I'm jolted back to that day with my arms being ripped from my mother's, and brother Elston's. Looking into the eyes of my own people carrying guns on their sides, and hands full of zipties hearing the chilling cries of our people which hauntingly replays in my mind till today, 'AUE...' AUE...and seeing the shocked and frightened faces many of which were dirt streaked from tears. "Cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut".

On the evening of September 08, 2015 I was guided to be on the mauna again in ceremony, and to pule for our brothers who were holding vigil, for the continued protection of the mauna, and to mahalo our Akua, 'aumakua, kupuna, and 'ohana. My ceremony began at Pu'uhuluhulu before going up to Hale Pōhaku, where myself, my hula sisters, and my mother continued in protocols of ceremony throughout the evening into the early morning hours. After taking some time to malama ourselves, we joined hands in a tight circle, and I felt my body begin to tremble from the very cellular level of my being to the top of my head, down to the bottoms of my feet. It was not because I was cold, and from there I entered a different state, and I only remember seeing flashes of light, and the next thing I knew, I felt myself being yanked very forcefully, then realizing I had actually been kneeling on the ground, my arms again twisted behind my back with more force than before and ziptied. As I stood next to the police vehicle, a chant loudly burst forth from my na'au, "E IHO ANA O LUNA, E PI'I ANA O LALO, E HUI ANA NA MOKU E Kū ANA KA PAIA!!" As I looked on at the chaotic scene up on the hillside next to Hale Kukia'imauna where we had just been hand in hand in prayer. All I saw was a tangled confusion of officers, dust, lights from flashlights darting around, and my sisters and mother one by one being restrained, and walked down to where I was being led into the paddy wagon. We were removed from the mountain, processed at the Hilo cellblock, fingerprinted, mugshots taken, and released on bail to our awaiting families outside. I don't know how long it was, but I again, like I had felt in April, didn't want to leave the house, when and if I could even get myself out of bed I would only go anywhere with my husband, and only to see very close friends or family. I felt like I was in a dream, walking around with my eyes open but like I was floating, extremely tearful, on edge, and it felt like I was floating in the air with a very thin string connecting me to the ground...like a leaf aimlessly blowing in the wind. Like the last time, I couldn't, and still cannot watch videos of that night without breaking down in heaving cries. I watch in those videos, my mother, the grandmother of my children roughed up, having her arm twisted so hard her shoulder hurt, ziptied and arrested like a criminal while holding hands in a circle of

wahine, while praying. Our only weapon was ceremony. The video of our arrests plastered on the morning news....again we were portrayed like criminals. (This would be the deepest cut that ultimately would take longer to heal)

I stand here today, unrecognizable from who I was just a couple of years ago. The traumas inflicted on me all too often shows in my eyes, and the fake smile I wear. So throughout my recount of events I end with "cuts" because I was urged by a close friend to read a blog that spoke of the trauma we have endured for generations and it's likened to cuts. Much like the supporters of the proposed TMT project often say, "what difference does one more telescope make? There's already so many up there it's not like the mountain hasn't already been desecrated. One more won't make a difference." What they fail to see, like with me, each cut, each time an earthmoving machine disturbs another stone, we had a hundred cuts before that are still unhealed and this one, the last one they say, WILL be the final cut which would be the finishing slice."

WDT of Leina`ala Sleightholm, pages 1-4; Ex. F-3.

Sleightholm did not conduct any practices on Mauna Kea until October 7, 2014, when she ascended the mountain to protest the TMT project. Sleightholm has followed the principles of Petitioner Case, and both oppose the TMT Project. Tr. 2/14/17 at 12:15-22, 26:21-29:1, 42; Ex. F-3 (WDT Sleightholm) at 1.

811. Petitioner Paul Neves is a Kumu Hula. In his words: "I have been a Kumu since October 23, 1999. Mu Kumu was Kumu Hula Wayne Panoke and his Kumu was Kumu Hula Nona Beamer. I have two Halau, one is a combined Hilo and San Francisco Halau, and my second one is in Washington D.C.. I have about 100 students in all. [sic]

I recently directed and produced the Princess Ka`iulani Hula Drama titled "Shattered Vase" that premiered this last April in Hilo to an audience of about 1000 people and was also presented in Washington D.C.. [sic]

I was the first Kumu to present Hula Kahiko at the Native Museum of the American Indian in Washington D.C.. I have presented at the Kennedy Center, as well. I have presented Kupuna in Hula Competitions—and have taught at least 1000 student since becoming a Kumu Hula. [sic]

I am a member of the Royal Order of Kamehameha I. My position in the Order is Ali`i Noeau Loa, which is a position given to one that has previously served as Ka Lai Moku (or one who has held the 2nd highest position). I now can consult at the highest level."

WDT of Mr. Paul K. Neves; Ex. B.18a.

While he is a practicing Catholic, he began his native Hawaiian practices related to Mauna Kea in the late 1980s. Neves has been involved in solstice and equinox ceremonies on the summit of Mauna Kea since 1999. Ex. B.18a (WDT. Neves) at 1; Tr. 1/31/17 at 239:6. His practices related to Mauna Kea continue through the present, amongst the existing telescopes on Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/31/17 at 220:5-12, 244:8-17. His practices include lele. He is unaware of any lele located on the proposed TMT Project

site. Tr. 1/31/17 at 163:12-15, 241:1-11.

Petitioner Neves testified that the TMT Project will obstruct his view of Haleakalā from the summit ridge area of Mauna Kea and will be a dominant feature. WDT Neves at 4. His practices include pilgrimages to Mauna Kea, approximately four times per year, though he admits that one need not always travel to the Mauna Kea summit to conduct these practices. He has practiced from his home, and states that offerings can be made at lower elevations. He acknowledged that there is no one particular place that you need to stand on Mauna Kea in order to view Haleakalā. Tr. 1/31/17 at 202:4-20, 207:3-10, 219:1-10, 245:5-20.

812. Petitioner Ward is not a native Hawaiian practitioner. She has no traditional or cultural native Hawaiian practices related to Mauna Kea. Ward's interest in Mauna Kea is for recreation and hiking, which she believes will be impacted by the TMT Project. Ward had no prior practice of hiking in the rough lava areas of the TMT Project. Her main concern is the view towards the northwest will be impacted by the existence of the completed project. Tr. 1/31/17 at 17:3-18:14, 22:2-25, 57:19-58:23, 64:8-65:23, 110:3-19. Ward's use of Mauna Kea for recreation purposes began when there were telescopes already existing on Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/31/17 at 17:15-18:9.
813. During the 1980s and 1990s, Ward did not witness any native Hawaiians engaging in traditional or cultural practices on Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/31/17 at 17:19-18:14, 113:3-9.
814. Ward offered various legal, hydrological, entomological, cultural, archaeological, biological, botanical and medical arguments to support her view that the CDUA does not meet the eight criteria in HAR § 13-5-30(c). Ward did not offer any credible evidence to support that she has any expertise or is otherwise qualified to provide expert or scientific opinions relating to these subjects. Ex. B.17a (WDT Ward); Ex. B.17b (CV Ward).
815. Dr. Coleman also did not observe cultural practices on Mauna Kea from the mid-to-late 1980s through the 1990s. Ex. C-17 (WDT Dr. Coleman) at 2; Tr. 1/5/17 at 155:2-156:4.
816. Petitioner E. Kalani Flores is a native Hawaiian practitioner who has been conducting his cultural and spiritual practices since the late 1970s or early 1980s at areas on Mauna Kea and the summit. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 34:10-36:5, 202:21-203:4; 232:18-233:24. The record is, however, devoid of any specific information about what those practices might be or where they have been conducted. See Ex. B-02a (Flores, WDT 2016), Ex. C-26 (Flores, WDT 2011), Tr. 1/20/17, 33-251. Here is his story:

"I am E. Kalani Flores, member of the Flores-Case 'Ohana, residing in Pu'ukapu, Waimea, Kohala Waho, Mokupuni o Hawai'i who is a Kanaka Maoli (also identified as a Native Hawaiian, *he hoa'āina o Moku o Keawe, he 'ōiwi o ka pae 'āina Hawai'i*, an indigenous person of the archipelago of Hawai'i) and a descendent of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778 as established through my genealogical lineage of Hukiku and Keulua. I am a cultural practitioner with substantial interest in Mauna a Wākea (also referred to as Mauna Kea), who continues to exercise my traditional and customary Native Hawaiian cultural, spiritual, and religious practices and

who continues to engage in cultural practices, protocols, and ceremony gatherings connected to and on Mauna a Wākea. These traditional and customary Native Hawaiian practices, including pilgrimages to the top of Mauna a Wākea, pre- date 1892 as evidenced through 'ike kupuna, oral traditions, indigenous knowledge, ancestral insight, cultural sites, and several reports.¹

I have a B.A. degree in Hawaiian Studies from the University of Hawai'i at Hilo (UHH) along with a D.O.E Teaching Certification. I have been an educator for over 30 years with the Hawai'i State Department of Education and the University of Hawai'i systems. I am presently employed as a tenured Hawai'i Life Styles - Professor at Hawai'i Community College – Pālanui instructing Hawaiian Studies courses, including, but not limited to the subjects of Hawaiian language, cultural traditions, spirituality, ethnobotany, and history. I am also fluent in the Hawaiian language. In addition, I am also owner of a consulting firm, Mana'o'i'o, specializing in the field of Hawaiian Studies who has consulted on several projects and authored several Hawaiian cultural and historical research reports for Federal and State agencies as well as for private firms. I've served for over 30 years on commissions, committees, and boards that included the review of archaeological surveys, mitigation plans, technical reports, and other similar types of documents.² I have extensive experience and knowledge in the review and assessment of reports and documents. Consequently, based upon the legal standards covered in Hawai'i Rules of Evidence – Rule 702, I would be qualified as an expert witness through my knowledge, skills, experience, training, ancestral connections, and education in the subject matter pertaining to Hawaiian cultural traditions including the review and assessment of cultural reports and surveys." (footnotes omitted)

WDT of E. Kalani Flores; Ex. B.02a.

817. Flores acknowledged that the Astronomy Precinct was "substantially developed" and that he was able to continue these practices despite the development. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 234:5-8; *see also* Ex. B.02a (WDT E.K. Flores) at 4.
818. Flores claimed throughout his testimony that the FEIS for the TMT Project was flawed in many ways, including failing to adequately address traditional and cultural practices and failing to address a sublease beyond 2033. *See generally*, Ex. B.02a (WDT E.K. Flores). Flores conceded that he and his family did not participate and file any objections to the FEIS. While Flores initially could not recall if he was consulted regarding the FEIS, he acknowledged receiving an email indicating that he was directly solicited for his input into the FEIS as part of the consultation process. Ex. A-131; (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 222:3-22. He was not certain if he provided a statement in response. When questioned about the content of the FEIS, Flores was unsure of the content, and admitted that he had no experience in preparing an FEIS, AIS, or CDUA, and was not an expert in land use, archaeology, or anthropology. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 38-39, 124-52, 163-65, 205-06, 210, 212-13, 222-23, 232. Neither he, nor his family members, filed any objections to the FEIS. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 210:19-23.
819. Flores has seen ahu on Mauna Kea that he believes are associated with traditional and customary native Hawaiian practices. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 41:2-15. He is aware of

shrines on Mauna Kea, and his kupuna took pilgrimages to the mountain for various reasons. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 45:10-46:6, 59:14-22.

820. Flores relayed that native Hawaiians conduct rituals and celebrations during solstices and equinoxes, during various times of the day and night. This depends upon the particular astronomical event, but he did not provide any evidence that he himself takes part in these activities. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 113:19-114:5.
821. Flores's asserts that the TMT Project will adversely impact his pilgrimages because many of the ahu on the Northern Plateau are interconnected and TMT would be situated amongst these sites, "causing adverse disturbance and impacts between the grid of interconnected sites." Ex. B.02a (WDT E.K. Flores) at 13. The various and extensive archaeological and cultural studies for the TMT Project provide evidence to the contrary. There are no historic properties or ahu on the proposed 5-acre TMT Project site, and the TMT Project will not result in substantial adverse impacts to cultural, archaeological and historic properties on Mauna Kea. See Ex. A-5, Apps. D, E, G, H, I, J; Ex. C-12, C-14. Flores provided no evidence that certain ahu on other parts of Mauna Kea, used to navigate ascent and descent of the summit, are used in the same way today by practitioners. See (Rechtman) Tr. 12/20/16 at 185:18-186:4; Ex. A-122 at 3-20, 5-2, 6-53 – 6-75, 7- 47. Flores currently travels to the summit area by truck using the paved roads. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17at 233:25-234:4.
822. Davin Vicente was called as a witness by MKAH. He is a Biology Lecturer at UH Hilo. Ex. B.09b (WDT Davin Vicente) at 1. Vicente testified that he is opposed to the TMT Project because it will cause irreparable damage to Mauna Kea and to native Hawaiian culture generally. Ex. B.09a (WDT Davin Vicente) at 1-2. Vicente acknowledged that telescopes already exist on Mauna Kea, which in his view, currently affect native Hawaiian cultural and religious practices. Tr. 1/25/17 at 194:14-21. Vicente testified that nothing short of placing the TMT Project on an existing telescope site would be acceptable to him. Tr. 1/25/17 at 198:21-199:9. He has no evidence regarding how the TMT Project will specifically cause "damage" to Mauna Kea. Vicente does not regularly conduct any cultural practices on Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/25/17 at 186:12-19.
823. Opposing Intervenor Dwight Vicente provided no direct testimony. His primary concern was with legal arguments over Hawai'i's statehood and sovereignty issues. Dwight Vicente did not present any evidence that he conducts any practices on Mauna Kea, including the TMT Project site.
824. Prof. Peter Mills was called as a witness by Petitioner Mauna Kea Anaina Hou to testify about historical information on native Hawaiian issues generally. In his words:
- "I am Peter Mills, full professor of anthropology at the University of Hawai'i at Hilo (UHH), where I have held a tenure track position since 1997. I received a B.A. degree (anthropology and psychology majors) from the University of Vermont in 1984, an M.A. (1987) from Washington State University in anthropology, and a Ph.D. (1996) in anthropology from the University of California at Berkeley. I have worked as an archaeologist in the Northeastern U.S., Northwest, American Southwest, Alaska, Hawai'i

and Easter Island. My professional experience has included archaeological positions held with the federal government, state government, private consulting firms, and not-for-profit research organizations. From 1988 to 1990, I was the assistant state archaeologist for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, conducting review and compliance work for the Massachusetts Historical commission (State Historic Preservation Office). In 1990, I began working in Hawai'i with the Bishop Museum's Applied Archaeology Group (ARG), and I worked on additional consulting projects in Hawai'i from 1991-1993 with Biosystems Analysis, Inc. and Scientific Consulting Service, Inc. while conducting my dissertation research on Kaua'i. For the last 19 years, my research has focused primarily on the archaeology of the Hawaiian Islands, and I served as president of the Society for Hawaiian Archaeology from 2010-2012. I have taught college courses in Cultural Resource Management almost every year since 1997, and I was a governor's appointee to the Hawai'i Historic Places Review board from 2004-2008. I am also director of the University of Hawai'i Hilo's Heritage Management M.A. program that began in 2015. One of my major research projects is the examination of stone tool exchange patterns in the Hawaiian Islands, and from 2004-2006, I conducted a geological and archaeological study of the Mauna Kea Adze Quarry as part of the overall project. I am a qualified archaeologist who meets the standards of the Secretary of the Interior (36 CFR Part 61), and Hawai'i's Administrative Rules covering professional qualifications for principal investigators on archaeological projects in Hawai'i (HR 13-281-8)."

WDT of Peter Mills, Ph.D.; Ex. B.12a.

He is not a native Hawaiian practitioner and has no prior practice experience personally on Mauna Kea. He participated in the EIS process with a comment letter that was fully considered in the approval process for the FEIS. Ex. A-4/R-4 at 343. His testimony about viewplanes does not rise to the level of a personal cultural or traditional practice.

825. Petitioner Ching testified that he participates in cultural practices related to the use of Lake Waiau and other water sources and cultural sites in and around the summit area of Mauna Kea. These practices include performance of traditional astronomy, cosmology, navigation, continuing burial practices, performing solstice and equinox ceremonies, and conducting temple worship around the Mauna Kea summit, Ice Age Natural Area Reserve, and Science Reserve. Ex. B.19a (WDT Ching) at 12-13. Since 2002, Ching has participated in a group (Huaka'i I Na 'Aina Mauna) that hikes ancient trails that traverse certain areas on Mauna Kea. *Id.* Ching testified that, although he hikes ancient trails on Mauna Kea, none of the ancient trails go to the summit of Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/26/17 at 150:11-13. Ching did not establish that any of his cultural practices at the Mauna Kea Summit area that are connected to a firmly rooted traditional or customary native Hawaiian practice dating back to 1892. Ching also did not establish that he performs any historical or traditional native Hawaiian practice at the TMT Project site. No evidence was presented that his practices would be substantially impacted or prevented by the TMT Project.
826. Prof. Fujikane also testified that the group Huaka'i I Na Aina Mauna, led by Ching, has walked the ancient trails of Kaneikawaiole from Waiau down to the springs of Houkokane, Waihuakane, and Lilinoe, Pōhakulua at Pu'u Ke'eke where the other springs

Waiki'i, Anaohiku, and Kipahe'ewai are said to have spread out from Mauna Kea to Hualalai, 'Umikoa-Ka'ula from Pu'u Lili'noe to Pu'u Makaanaka, and across the Northern Plateau. Ex. B.13a (WDT Prof. Fujikane) at 1. The CDUA makes it clear that none of these trails are near the proposed TMT Project site or the access roadway. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 3-5.

- i. Opposing Intervenor Fergerstrom is a native Hawaiian practitioner whose cultural practices include ho'oponopono and lele, as well as utilizing a "bridge" of light from Mauna Kea to Haleakalā. Tr. 1/23/17 at 200:7-204:11, 213:8-18. Fergerstrom believes that the entire MKSR is "wao akua" and that no astronomy should occur in that region. Fergerstrom further testified that, on occasion, he is the one who should decide who gets to travel up Mauna Kea, not the State or University. Tr. 1/23/17 at 215:10-218:19, 233:4-234. Fergerstrom believes that development of the TMT Project will injure him, although he did not explain how he would be injured. Tr. 1/23/17 at 196:6-197:13. Fergerstrom fully participated in the CIA and EIS process in approximately 2010. His comments and concerns were fully noted, responded to and considered as part of the EIS process. Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at 140, 184. Fergerstrom is a member of Temple of Lono. As a representative for the Temple of Lono, he was consulted during the various cultural review processes of the CIA, EIS, and AIS. Ex. A-4/R-4 at 153-162; Tr. 1/23/17 at 244:4-245:4. No challenge to that EIS process and its approval was ever made by Fergerstrom. His positions and views were fully considered and part of the record. There is no evidence demonstrating that his practices would be interfered with in any significant way by construction at the TMT Project site or otherwise.

827. Narissa P. Spies was called as a witness for Petitioner KAHEA. She is the current president of the 'Ilima SACNAS chapter at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, part of the national SACNAS (Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science), an organization made up of minorities in science. Here is her story:

"I have been directly involved in scientific research and academia for the better part of a decade, and how that system operates in Hawai'i. While dynamic, the makeup of these institutions is predominantly comprised of individuals that do not have a connection to the local culture. The responsibility of learning about cultural connection falls upon the individual, and while many embrace the unique traditions of Hawai'i, there are those that remain within the confines of their own cultures. Science itself has its own culture. As scientists are trained to be objective, and to remove cultural biases that can affect the outcome of our experiments. The longer I practice science, the more I realize that it is not possible to remove all objectivity from our studies. Our inherent culture and biases will affect how we view a system, and even how we ask the questions that we seek to answer. Years of academic training to become a scientist has lead to pride and even arrogance in many academic fields. It is quite prevalent in science, and I have had to reconcile my own scientific principles with my Native Hawaiian culture. I cannot separate the two because they are both a part of who I am as a person. I often feel that I walk a fine line between my culture and science, but there is overlap between the two. I do not think of myself as being better than another group because of their beliefs.

Unfortunately, that is not the norm in the culture of science, and in my opinion it has contributed to the disconnect between cultures surrounding the TMT.

I've written my reasons for declining the TMT THINK scholarship money in the Civil Beat article. Afterward what I dealt with was a huge amount of backlash from certain groups of the scientific community. I've lost friends over this. They don't have the same cultural connection that I have to the environment, so I was accused of being anti-science when that could not be further from the truth. There were weeks when I woke up dreading what I would find in my inbox, or who I would run in to in public that would say something negative towards me. It affected me emotionally, and I felt hurt by both sides of my community. There were scientists condemning me for standing up for what amounted to religious superstition in their eyes, as well as members of the Native Hawaiian community that just saw me as a scientist, and demonized all fields of science.

The TMT highlighted publicly that there is a divide between the different cultures in Hawai'i. I'm the former vice president, and current president of the 'Ilima SACNAS chapter at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. We are part of a national SACNAS (Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science) organization that is made up of minorities in science. Our chapter goal has been to bridge that divide between the culture and science, and that starts by being open about the type of work we do, and engaging the community in our science. I feel as though this has been something that has been lacking in the astronomy community. Their efforts, though appreciated in an educational sense, feel disingenuous and obligatory. It's as though they are fulfilling some kind of task in order to get something that they want. This certainly isn't the case for all those involved in astronomy in Hawai'i. However, the perception among Native Hawaiian groups is that it's an attempt to appease the locals so that scientists can continue to do as they please on Mauna Kea. Even those within the SACNAS community who support astronomy are bothered by the current culture in their field."

WDT of Narissa P. Spies; B.52a.

She considers herself an embodiment of the principle that culture and science can coexist. Tr. 01/12/17 at 150:21-151:14; Ex. B.52a (Spies WDT). She performs no cultural practices at the Mauna Kea summit ridge area or the TMT Project site location in Area E. She recognizes a cultural divide, but the construction of the TMT Project would not otherwise halt any traditional or cultural practice at the proposed site location. Spies testified that there are native Hawaiians who support the TMT Project, including native Hawaiian scientists. Tr. 01/12/17 at 186:21- 187:7.

828. Prof. Osorio testified that he is not a cultural practitioner, has never been to the summit of Mauna Kea, and has not observed the telescopes. Tr. 01/12/17 at 28:12-19, 41:13-42:4, 140:19-141:10. For him, the TMT Project would violate native Hawaiian cultural practices; however, he had no knowledge or evidence that anyone practiced any traditional or cultural acts in the location of the TMT Project. He had no direct evidence as to how the TMT Project would result in significant adverse impacts to any protected historical traditional practice. Tr. 01/12/17 at 25:20-26:10, 27:15-24.

829. Petitioner Case of the Flores Case ‘Ohana testified to viewplane issues from Kamuela. Case testified that Mo‘oinanea believes that the existing observatories are blocking her (and other divine beings’) views and areas that they used to occupy. Ex. B.21a (WDT Case) at 3. Case testified that her hula, chants and prayers are connected to the entire mountain of Mauna Kea, including the Northern Plateau, and that construction of the TMT Project would affect her and her cultural practices physically and spiritually. Ex. B.21a (WDT Case) at 4. Case’s practices at the top of Mauna Kea began around 2010. Tr., 1/11/17 at 228:2-20.
830. Teale has been a long-time member of Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, one of the Petitioners in this proceeding. Ex. B.15a (WDT Teale) at 1. While she is a native Hawaiian, she presented no evidence that any cultural practice of hers would be prevented by construction of the TMT Project on the Area E site.
831. Both Spies and Prof. Fujikane acknowledged that there are native Hawaiians who support the TMT Project. Tr. 1/11/17 at 61:18-61:22; Tr. 01/12/17 at 186:21-187:7.
832. Spies also testified that there are fields where science and culture coexist, such as the fields of ecology and evolution, geology, and hydrology, because none of these involve building large structures in sacred spaces. Tr. 01/12/17 at 154:20-155:4. There are other sciences that co-exist quite well on Mauna Kea. Spies participated in a project on Mauna Kea looking at ‘ōhi‘a trees. Tr. 01/12/17 at 174:12-21. Science and culture have historically co-existed and need to be incorporated together. Tr. 01/12/17 at 164:24-166:11. Hawaiians are among the first scientists; for example, Hawaiians were experts in aquaculture. Tr. 01/12/17 at 167:9-18.
833. Construction impacts of the TMT Project would only impact practitioners during construction and only if they are on the Northern Plateau. (Baybayan) Tr. 11/02/16 at 96:8-96:22.
834. Certain Petitioners, including Pisciotto, argued that the TMT Project will obstruct the viewplanes used in Polohiwa ceremonies and those connected to the path of the sun, solstice, and equinox. Tr. 2/13/17 at 106:7-106:10, 107:12-107:18, 198:18-198:24. However, this testimony contradicts Pisciotto’s previous statements that her ceremonies relating to the celestial equator are located near where the Subaru and Keck observatories are located. Tr. 2/13/17 at 104:5-105:17. Moreover, Pisciotto’s conclusion that the TMT Project will obstruct traditional viewplanes ignores her testimony that she has already adjusted her practices because existing telescopes block traditional viewplanes. Tr. 2/13/17 at 91:22-93:5.
835. Prof. Fujikane also testified that while standing on the Northern Plateau, the viewplane facing the summit already includes the existing observatories. Tr. 1/11/17 at 79:18-80:3.
836. The TMT Observatory will not be visible from Pu‘u Wēkiu. WDT Hayes at 15-17; Tr. 10/25/16 at 123:9-15; Ex. C-18. It will not obstruct any viewplanes from Pu‘u Wēkiu, and will not interfere with any practices involving viewplanes to or from Pu‘u Wēkiu.
837. Since 2000, some cultural practices involving Mauna Kea have been conducted from

locations not at Mauna Kea, such as from the pu'u of Waimea by Case (Tr. 1/11/17 at 225:1-226:24) and by W. Freitas from his aunt's farm in Waimea (Tr. 3/2/17 at 267:17-268:12). Nobriga has been able to continue to worship his god, Lono, and to conduct his spiritual practices since the observatories were built on Mauna Kea, despite his claim that the observatories are a form of persecution to him (Tr. 3/1/17 at 73-75:24).

838. Since the year 2000 and up to the present, the reliable probative evidence shows that those cultural and/or spiritual practices can continue to be conducted with the existing astronomy facilities and those activities will not be prevented by the TMT Observatory which will be located 600 ft. below the summit ridge.
839. Therefore, the reliable, substantial and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project will not result in any substantial adverse impact on the cultural practices of the community or State or native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices on Mauna Kea. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-37.

iv. Visual and Aesthetic Resources

840. The FEIS reflects extensive consultation with cultural practitioners as well as input from public meetings to determine the impact on viewplanes. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 94:21-95:9; Exs. A-3/R-3, A-4/R-4, and A-5/R-5.
841. There are currently 11 observatories on Mauna Kea within the Astronomy Precinct. Some of these existing observatories are visible from locations around the island such as Hilo, Honoka'a, and Waimea. Considering all existing observatories together, at least one observatory is visible from roughly 43 percent of the island's land area. The existing development on Mauna Kea does not block or obstruct any of the identified views in the County of Hawai'i General Plan or the South Kohala Development Plan. The existing observatories are, however, visible within the viewplanes from Hilo, Waimea, and the summit. WDT Hayes at 4-5; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3- 80 to 3-81; Ex. A-36.
842. The TMT Observatory will not substantially affect scenic vistas and viewplanes identified in the Hawai'i County General Plan or the South Kohala Development Plan. The TMT Observatory will not be visible in the view of Mauna Kea from Pāhoa-Kea'au, Volcano-Kea'au Roads, and various Puna subdivisions or from locations where Hilo Bay is visible with Mauna Kea in the background. Although the TMT Observatory may be visible in the view of Mauna Kea from portions of the South Kohala district and the area around Waimea, it will not block or substantially obstruct the views and viewplanes of the mountain. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-84 to 3-85.
843. According to a viewshed analysis conducted pursuant to Chapter 343 of the Hawai'i Revised Statutes, the TMT Observatory will be visible from roughly 14 percent of the island area. From nearly all this area, existing observatories are currently visible. According to 2000 U.S. Census data, approximately 15.4 percent of Hawai'i Island's population, or 23,000 people, live within the viewshed of the TMT Observatory. Others, including visitors and island residents who reside outside the viewshed, will be able to see the TMT Observatory when they travel through and visit locations within the

viewshed. WDT Hayes at 5-6; Tr. 10/25/16 at 119:7-121:25.

844. The determination of which viewsheds to use for that analysis took into account input from the community, including at seven public meetings around the State. Certain individuals and groups who are now Petitioners in this contested case received those documents and/or attended the meetings. No input was received suggesting other/additional methods be employed to evaluate the visual impact of the Project. WDT Hayes at 3.
845. The TMT Observatory will not be visible from the summit of Mauna Kea (Pu‘u Wēkiu) or Lake Waiau, where the majority of visitors to the summit region, including native Hawaiian cultural practitioners, spend their time. The TMT Observatory will also not be visible from Pu‘u Lilīnoe. WDT Hayes at 7, 15-17; Tr. 10/25/16 at 123:5-25; *see also* Ex. C-18 for distances from cultural practice areas to TMT Observatory site.
846. The TMT Observatory will be visible from other locations within the summit region, primarily the Northern Plateau and the northern ridge of Kūkahau‘ula where the Subaru, Keck I and II, IRTF, and CFHT observatories are located. The TMT Observatory will add a new visual element in the landscape that will be visible from viewpoints along the northern ridge of Kūkahau‘ula and by people as they travel within the northern portion of the summit region. WDT Hayes at 16-17.
847. Currently, views from the northern ridge of Kūkahau‘ula are already dominated by views of observatories, including the Subaru, Keck, IRTF, and CFHT observatories, which are located on this ridge. The majority of visitors to the summit region visit the Kūkahau‘ula summit (Pu‘u Wēkiu), not the northern ridge of Kūkahau‘ula. In addition, taking into account the TMT Observatory’s lower elevation and its size and height, it will not block the view of Maui or Haleakalā from the northern summit ridge area. WDT Hayes at 15-17; Tr. 10/25/16 at 123:5-124:23.
848. The Northern Plateau is not an open space with no telescope structures on it; SMA roads and facilities are already on the Northern Plateau. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 63:18-25. The open space characteristic of the Northern Plateau will still be preserved after the construction of the TMT Observatory since the observatory will take up five of the 2,000 acres. Tr. 12/12/16 at 163:21-164:5.
849. While the TMT Observatory will be a new visual element among the existing observatories within the views of Mauna Kea (for approximately 14 percent of the island area, and visible to approximately 15.4 percent of the population, the great majority of whom already can see one or more observatories), it will not substantially obstruct or block existing views of Mauna Kea from around the island of Hawai‘i. WDT Hayes at 21; Tr. 10/25/16 at 119:7-123:24; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-80 to 3-104.
850. The TMT Observatory will not block the views of Haleakalā, the setting sun, the shadow of Mauna Kea, or the Southern Cross constellation from the northern ridge of Kūkahau‘ula. Tr. 10/25/16 at 124:3-23; Ex. A-109; Ex. C-19; *see also* Ex. A-36.
851. The TMT FEIS considered and analyzed the viewplanes from the perspective of a

Hawai'i religious practitioner. Tr. 11/15/16 at 15:21-22:7. Consultation on viewplanes with religious practitioners was taken in part from the CIA and also contained in comment letters and responses. Tr. 11/15/16 at 28:8-11.

852. While several of the Petitioners participated in the public consultation and information processes to develop the CMP, the CIA, the CRMP for the TMT Project from 2008 through 2011, at no time prior to this contested case hearing did Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor contend that the TMT Observatory would impede views from the summit of Pu'u Poli'ahu. *See* Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D; Ex. A-9 at 4-1 to 4-7, App. A; Ex. A-11 at 6-1 to 6-23, App. F; Ex. A-74; Ex. A-75; Ex. A-79; Ex. A-81; Ex. A-86; Ex. A-87; Ex. A-91; Ex. A-94, Ex. A-95; Ex. A-99; Ex. A-100; Ex. A-101, Ex. A-103; Ex. A-104; Ex. A-105.
853. Based on the evidence presented, the TMT Observatory will be outside of the viewplane of observers viewing the setting sun from the summit of Pu'u Poli'ahu. Tr. 10/25/16 at 124:3-24; Ex. A-110. The summit area is farther south from the TMT Project site and is not directly in the line of sight at the highest sun setting point on June 21, or the summer solstice. The TMT Observatory will add a visual element below and to the right side of the view of Haleakalā from Pu'u Poli'ahu, but it will not greatly interfere with that view. Tr. 10/25/16 at 124:3-24; Ex. A-110; Ex. C-19.
854. In particular, views to the west which Petitioners and certain Opposing Intervenor now contend are unobstructed are already impacted by existing observatories including Subaru, SMA, JCMT, CSO, UKIRT, and the University 0.6-Meter Telescope. Views to the north, which Petitioners and certain Opposing Intervenor contend are unobstructed, are already obstructed by observatories including both Keck I and Keck II, IRFT, CFHT, Gemini, and the University 2.2-Meter Telescope. *See* Tr. 2/13/17 at 140:21-141:2.
855. The solstice ceremonies referenced are modern in nature and there is no evidence that solstice ceremonies at the summit of Mauna Kea are a traditional and customary practice. Dr. Coleman testified that there were no "sightline" or solstice/equinox ceremonies, and with the exception of the treatment of piko in Lake Waiau, and no cultural practices were conducted on the summit of Mauna Kea prior to the construction of the access road. This is due to the fact that it is too difficult to reach the summit by foot through the rough lava terrain and altitude, and there are sites at lower elevations that are actually preferable for such ceremonies. The construction of the access road contributed to the modern cultural practices at the summit of Mauna Kea. Ex. C-17 (WDT Dr. Coleman) at 2; Tr. 1/5/17 at 155:2-156:4, 167:19-169:9.
856. The TMT Project has already implemented, and is committed to implementing, several mitigation measures intended to address the visibility of the TMT Observatory, including: (1) locating the TMT Observatory in Area E, which is north of and below the summit of Mauna Kea, to avoid a more visible location such as the summit ridge or on a pu'u; (2) designing the telescope to be as short as possible given its focal length to allow for the smallest dome feasible; (3) covering the dome enclosure with an aluminum-like coating that will reflect the sky and reduces the visibility of the observatory during most of the day; (4) designing the support building to be small and low relative to the size of the dome and telescope; and (5) making the support building lava-colored to blend with its

surroundings. WDT Hayes at 18-21; Tr. 10/25/16 at 124:3-25:17, 126:5-127:12, 208:10-209:15; Ex. C-3.

857. In addition to residents within the TMT viewshed, the TMT Observatory will be visible to other island residents and visitors when they travel within the TMT viewshed, including travel along roads and stops at various viewpoints. The TMT Project's visual impact is perceived by some to be significant. In the context of the existing observatories, and the fact that the TMT Observatory will not block or substantially obstruct the identified views and viewplanes of Mauna Kea which is the applicable significance criterion in HAR § 11-200-12, the Project's visual impact will be less than significant. WDT Hayes at 21; Tr. 10/25/16 at 119:7-124:23; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-80 to 3-104.
858. Dr. Kahakalau testified that the TMT project will be a visible eyesore because it will add another monument to Americanism, to capitalism, and to expansion at all costs without any care and any concern about the people who live on the island and their values and traditions. Tr. 1/9/17 at 123:14-124:3.
859. C. Freitas testified that the Manitowoc 2250 crane that will be used for construction of the TMT Project will impede viewplanes during construction activities (approximately 7 years). Tr. 2/21/17 at 117:25-118:13. The crane will be a temporary impediment, and therefore does not constitute a substantial adverse impact on the visual resources of Mauna Kea.
860. The TMT Project will add a visual element to the summit of Mauna Kea, but it will be one such element among many. The incremental increase in cumulative visual impact due to the TMT Project will be less than significant. Therefore, the TMT Project will not have a substantial adverse impact on the visual resources of Mauna Kea. WDT Hayes at 21-23.

v. *Hydrology and Water Resources*

861. Tom Nance, a witness called by UHH, has substantial education and experience in the field of hydrology and water resources. Here is his story:

"I am president of Tom Nance Water Resource Engineering which is located at 560 N. Nimitz Highway, Suite 213, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96817. My company specializes in water resource development, well and water system design, and most aspects of hydrologic analyses. I received my B.S. in Mechanical Engineering from Stanford University in 1966 and a B.S. in Economics from Claremont Men's College in 1966. I received a master of science in Civil Engineering with a specialty in hydrology from Stanford University in 1970. Since receiving my masters, I have done graduate work in physical oceanography at the University of Hawai'i and also graduate work in hydrology at the University of California at Berkeley. I have been working in the field of hydrology and water resource engineering for 44 years. The first 17 years of my career in the field of hydrology and water resource engineering were spent with Belt Collins & Associates. My curriculum vitae was submitted as Exhibit A-43.

I started my own company in 1989. I have been qualified as an expert in hydrology and water resource engineering on a number of occasions. I reviewed the sections on water,

wastewater, and drainage of the Final Environmental Impact Statement ("**FEIS**") for the Thirty Meter Telescope ("**TMT**") Project. See Exhibits A-3 & A-5 (FEIS Vols. 1 & 3). Previously, I did work on the Keck Outrigger Telescopes project which involved research and water sampling of Lake Waiau and the perched springs which supply the Pohakuloa Training Area ("**PTA**"). I have also reviewed and discussed with Don Thomas the results of his geophysical work and test borehole at PTA.

...it is my opinion that the TMT Project will have no significant or adverse impact on water resources."

WDT of Tom Nance, page 1; UHH Witness Statement 10.

862. The TMT Project will cause minimal surface runoff, and the impacts of such runoff will not be significant. Paved areas and buildings are impervious surfaces that prevent rainwater from percolating directly into the subsurface. The TMT Project will create approximately 1.3 acres of new impervious surfaces at the TMT Observatory site (about 0.5 hectares) and portions of the Access Way (about 0.8 acres), including the dome and support building. The parking areas will not be paved and will remain pervious, allowing water to percolate naturally. WDT Nance at 2; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 98:5-14.
863. The impact due to new impervious surfaces will be limited by the high permeability of the surrounding ground surface and the area downslope of the TMT Observatory and Access Way. The existing landforms attest to the high permeability of the area: there are no developed water channels or evidence of overland water flow. As such, the impact associated with localized runoff from new impervious surfaces created by the Project will not be significant. Runoff will dissipate via percolation into surrounding highly permeable areas. WDT Nance at 2; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 98:5-14; Tr. 10/25/16 at 203:9-25; Ex. C-35; Ex. C-36.
864. Lake Waiau, which is located within Pu'u Waiau, is one of the highest alpine lakes in the United States. The lake is about 300 feet in diameter, reaches approximately 7.5 feet in depth at full capacity, and sits at an elevation of 13,020 feet on the southern flank of Mauna Kea. The lake's water is derived primarily from snow melt and precipitation within its watershed. Due to the topography of Pu'u Waiau, only surface runoff from within the crater rim, an area of about 30-35 acres, can enter the lake. WDT Nance at 2-3; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 98:15-23, 104:15-24; Ex. A-108.
865. The TMT Observatory will be on the opposite flank of Mauna Kea from Lake Waiau and will not be in the lake's tributary watershed. In the event that surface runoff during an extreme storm event were to flow off the TMT Project site, it would move in an opposite direction from the lake. This path of potential runoff is depicted in Ex. A-108. It is not physically possible for such surface runoff to flow to and over the Pu'u Waiau crater rim to enter the lake. WDT Nance at 2; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 98:5-99:5, 105:4-5, 107:20-110:8; Ex. C-35; Ex. C-36.
866. The TMT Project's Batch Plant Staging area, roughly 3,000 feet upslope of Lake Waiau, is also not located in the lake's watershed. Lake Waiau is approximately 3,000 feet south

of the Batch Plant and 285 feet lower in elevation. Contamination from the TMT Project site is not possible for several reasons. First, Lake Waiau sits in the central depression of Pu'u Waiau, one of a number of eruptive vents near the summit of Mauna Kea. It is surrounded by the ridges of the pu'u which define an enclosed area of approximately 32 acres. This topographic enclosure makes it physically impossible for surface runoff from other areas to reach the lake, even areas at higher elevation such as the Batch Plant. The only water that can enter the lake as surface flow is direct precipitation on the two-acre lake itself and runoff from the surrounding and enclosing 30-acre sloped area which comprises the interior of the pu'u crater area. Second, the subsurface volcanic intrusives (dikes) which created Pu'u Waiau form an impermeable base that enables Lake Waiau to be a perennial water feature. If it had a more permeable base, accumulated rainfall runoff on the 32-acre interior area of the pu'u would simply drain downward and no perennial water feature would exist. The near-vertical and impermeable intrusives complete Lake Waiau's hydrologic isolation. Perched subsurface water from upslope areas, possibly including local runoff from the Batch Plant percolating downward, would be prevented from entering the lake because of these barriers. WDT Nance at 3; Ex. A-108; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 98:15-100:5, 108:13-112:13, 123:8-24, 170:3-22.

867. In accordance with CMP Management Action FLU-7, a zero-discharge wastewater system will be installed at the TMT Observatory. A zero-discharge system means there will be no discharge of any wastewater from the TMT Observatory, including domestic wastewater and mirror washing wastewater, in the summit region. Instead, all wastewater will be collected and transported off the mountain for proper treatment and disposal. Given that no wastewater from the TMT Observatory will be released into the environment at the summit, there is no reasonable prospect of adverse impact on groundwater, and wastewater will not be an environmental issue for the TMT Project. WDT Nance at 3-4; Ex. A-9 at 6-6 to 6-7, 7-57 to 7-58; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 99:6-19.
868. The occurrence of groundwater beneath the summit area is what is referred to in Hawai'i as "high-level," which means that the groundwater is impounded by subsurface geologic structures, such as intrusive dikes, which act to compartmentalize the groundwater. Although groundwater is the primary source of drinking water in Hawai'i, there are no wells extracting groundwater near the summit. The nearest wells are located approximately 12 miles away in Waiki'i Ranch along Saddle Road. Ground elevation at these wells is 4,260 feet above mean sea level and the static water level is about 1,280 feet above mean sea level. The TMT Project's use of a zero-discharge wastewater system means that wastewater will not be released from the TMT Project into the environment and therefore will not percolate into the groundwater at a depth below the TMT Observatory. WDT Nance at 4; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 110:9-114:16.
869. The composition of Mauna Kea consists of very porous lavas that naturally treat and filter water percolating downward. Any discharge on the summit would be naturally treated and filtered through thousands of feet of the porous lavas, thereby removing any contamination in that discharge by the time it reaches groundwater. Therefore, contamination of groundwater is very unlikely. The effectiveness of this natural filtering phenomenon is evidenced by the Kahalu'u Shaft and the Kealakehe Wastewater Treatment Plant in Kona on Hawai'i Island. The horizontal tunnel from which water is

derived from the Kahalu'u Shaft sits approximately 800 to 1400 feet below the more than 30 residences that are upgradient of the Shaft. Ex. A-44. Wastewater from these homes is disposed of in cesspools and septic system leach fields. As the wastewater percolates downward through the unsaturated lavas to finally reach the basal lens below, a natural treatment process occurs such that there is no evidence of wastewater contamination in the drinking water pumped from the basal lens by the Kahalu'u Shaft. The Kealakehe Wastewater Treatment Plant secondarily treats effluent by pumping it into a pit that is approximately 3,750 feet inland of Honokohau Harbor. Testing and various occasions at the harbor indicates that this trickling effect works and that there are no definable adverse impacts occurring from what people may think is an otherwise alarming way of discharging effluent. Tr. 12/13/17 at 114:20-116:24; Ex. C-37. As such, for the TMT Project sitting atop porous lavas at over 10,000 feet above the existing water lens, there is no reasonable prospect of the TMT Project adversely impacting groundwater. WDT Nance at 4-5; (Nagata) Tr. 12/13/16 at 99:20-103:6, 113:9-116:24; Ex. A-44.

870. The primary watershed recharge areas for Mauna Kea occur at lower elevations where it rains, and not in alpine deserts, where precipitation is minimal. It is extremely unlikely that any spill would be large enough to have any impact on the drinking water for Hawai'i County. The main threats to Mauna Kea's aquifer occur at lower elevations in areas of heavier population and use. Ex. A-24 at 48.
871. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors expressed generalized "concerns" about water issues, including runoff, Lake Waiau, and groundwater. Pisciotta testified to her fear or belief that the TMT Project will impact Lake Waiau, but presented no data to support the contention that the TMT Project site will in any manner impact or contaminate the snow, ice, or water. Tr. 2/13/17 at 192:11-192:22, 194:7-12.
872. KAHEA presented Kanahele to argue that the water sources on Mauna Kea would be negatively impacted. Kanahele is educated in the field of Hawaiian Studies, and her background and experience is in matters relating to Hawaiian culture and traditions. Ex. B-11.b. She testified as to native Hawaiian knowledge of the water resources on Mauna Kea, as demonstrated through chants that have been passed down through the generations. Ex. B-11.a at 2-3; Tr. 1/24/17 at 141:11-20. Kanahele recited various chants indicating the native Hawaiian understanding of the water resources and hydrology cycles of Mauna Kea. Ex. B-11.a at 2-3; Tr. 1/24/17 at 141:24-147:13. She believes that Mauna Kea plays an integral role in the hydrology cycles on the mountain, and on Hawai'i Island as a whole, due to its ability to collect clouds and mist, which recharge the aquifer. Tr. 1/24/17 at 144:12-146:16, 150:6-12, 163:1-164:1. Kanahele testified that further building on Mauna Kea should not be allowed in order to prevent damage to the water resources. Ex. B-11.a at 3; Tr. 1/24/17 at 147:10-13.
873. Kanahele's testimony is based on her personal beliefs and interpretation of traditional Hawaiian chants, which, she admits are subject to different interpretations. Tr. 1/24/17 at 170:3-16, 185:8-23, 196:8-21. Her anecdotal evidence is not supported by any scientific data or research.
874. Teale testified that placing a "5,000-gallon hazardous chemical storage tank directly

above" the "healing waters of Mauna Kea" which "are sourced deep within the mountain" is harmful to practitioners, and that construction of the TMT Project could cause harm to waters and plants in the area. B.15.a (WDT Teale) at 2. Teale did not provide any scientific or empirical evidence to support these concerns or fears, and her opinions on these issues are speculative. B.15.a (WDT Teale) at 2-3.

875. Tajon expressed his unsupported opinion that the TMT Project would negatively impact the spring water that feeds his farm. The basis of Tajon's beliefs are taken from his reading of traditional native Hawaiian stories regarding Mauna Kea. Tr. 2/27/17 at 39:18-39:24.
876. Michael Lee claimed that the water resources used for cultural practices would be affected by the TMT Project. *See* Tr. 1/23/17 40:13-25. Lee is not an expert in land use and has never been qualified as an expert in land use in any proceeding. Tr. 1/23/17 at 24:21-25:17, 27:15-23, 31:10- 33:8, 103:4-105:16. Notwithstanding his objections to the proposed TMT Project and speculative allegations that there must be spills by the observatories, Lee testified that the waters "have always been clean," even despite the presence of the existing observatories. Tr. 1/23/17 at 31:10-13.
877. Petitioner Ward testified to her concerns regarding hydrology and existing plant and animals species in the area; however, she is not a hydrologist, botanist, entomologist, archaeologist, land use expert, or an attorney. She did not provide any credible evidence to support her concerns. Tr. 1/31/17 at 24:20-28:3, 44:3-9, 84:7-88:6, 106:7-21, 116:17-117:7, 131:13-133:12.
878. Susan Rosier, appearing on behalf of C. Freitas, referred to alleged oil leaks occurring during pre-construction activities for the TMT Project. Ex. S-17a; Tr. 2/16/17 at 223:22-248:19; Tr. 2/21/17 at 32:22-72:21. Rosier was a mechanic assistant for over 33 years. In the late 1980's and 1990's, along with her husband, Alan Freitas, and Henry Akima, she moved all the heavy equipment for union shops on Maui. WDT of Susan Rosier, page 1. She feels that mechanical malfunctions may lead to oil leaks from heavy machinery used during construction of the TMT Project, and that the possibility of such leaks is heightened by the harsh conditions present on Mauna Kea (increasing the likelihood of hose malfunctions, etc.). *Id.*
879. Opposing Intervenor C. Freitas also testified that TMT Project will negatively impact the aquifer, based on the possibility of oil leaks on Mauna Kea. She testified as to past leaks at the CSO site in 2009, as well as her own personal observations of leaks on Mauna Kea in 2015. Ex. S-2a at 1-2; Tr. 2/21/17 at 78:18-84:3.
880. The 2009 oil leak was properly remedied and there is no evidence of any resulting impact to the water resources on Mauna Kea. Ex. S-18d. With regards to the alleged 2015 oil leaks, Dr. Sanders testified that some observed fluid leaks were likely moisture from condensation. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 23:14-25:16. He further testified that all of the alleged leaks were addressed appropriately. *Id.* A protocol requires an oil drip pan be placed next to each piece of machinery to catch leaking fluids. *Id.* Any oil that spattered to the ground was removed by removing the material, dirt, and rocks around the drip pan.

The amount of material was very small and fit in a Ziploc bag. *Id.* at 25:11-16. Dr. Sanders' testimony established that the alleged 2015 oil leaks were limited in nature and addressed thoroughly.

881. Opposing Intervenor C. Freitas offered her own personal opinion that oil leaks will negatively impact the aquifer. This opinion was based on C. Freitas's personal beliefs. Tr. 2/21/17 at 155:1-5.
882. Opposing Intervenor W. Freitas claimed that chemicals from Mauna Kea were leaching into the water source at Kiholo Bay; however, he admitted to not seeing a study confirming the identity of the aquifer feeding Kiholo Bay. He acknowledged that his claim of contamination came only from his own "logic." Tr. 3/2/17 at 254:20-258:15, 278:3-279:25.
883. Furthermore, after review of Figure 1 of the Commission on Water Resource Management, DLNR's *A Study of the Ground-Water Conditions in North and South Kona and South Kohala Districts, Island of Hawai'i, 1991-2002* (Sept. 2003), W. Freitas acknowledged that Kiholo Bay is fed from the Kiholo aquifer, whose boundaries are not within the areas associated with aquifers below Mauna Kea. Tr. 03/02/17 at 254:12-258:15; Ex. A-156.
884. N. Ho opposes development on Mauna Kea. He conceded that the TMT Project's use of a zero-discharge wastewater system mitigates the impacts related to cesspools at the summit. Tr. 2/22/17 at 134:2-22. Nonetheless, his position is that mitigation should occur beyond the requirements of the current law. Tr. 2/22/17 at 136:7-9.
885. Opposing Intervenor Camara testified to his belief that Mauna Kea holds an important water resource, but was unable to answer specific questions about Mauna Kea's hydrology. He admitted that he was not a hydrologist, and that there is not enough information about the Mauna Kea aquifer. He briefly reviewed the hydrology section of the FEIS for the TMT project and did not review the testimony of Nance. He was unaware of any existing water sources at the TMT Project site. Tr. 3/1/17 at 127:20-130:4, 134:16-18, 140:19-141:17, 191:16- 192:2.
886. Opposing Intervenor Kanaele testified that the TMT Project would degrade the water supply, but did not provide any credible or scientific evidence to support that assertion. Kanaele presented no prior experience or knowledge of hydrology that would enable him to opine on the effect of the TMT Project on water resources. Tr. 3/1/17 at 222:19-224:21.
887. UH Hilo witnesses established through reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence, including but not limited to the testimonies of Nance and Hayes, that Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenor's concerns about water issues are highly speculative and lack scientific basis or are otherwise not credible evidence.
888. The reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project will not have a substantial adverse impact on the water resources and hydrology of Mauna Kea, including Lake Waiau and the groundwater underlying Mauna Kea.

vi. Hazardous Waste, Solid Waste, and Wastewater

889. Like other existing observatories, the TMT Observatory will utilize vehicle and generator fuel, alcohols used for optics and general cleaning, liquid adhesives for optics bonding, various metals used for coating deposition materials, lubricants, hydraulic fluid, glycol coolants, and small quantities of acids, paints, and solvents. No mercury will be used by or at the Observatory, and no hazardous waste is anticipated to be generated at the TMT Observatory. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-29 to 2-30; WDT Hayes at 23; Tr. 10/25/16 at 126:5-8.
890. The TMT Observatory will store all hazardous materials in a secondary containment area that will be inspected daily for leaks. Fuel storage and piping will also be double-walled and will be equipped with leak monitors. Therefore, the chance of a spill entering the surrounding environment is negligible. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-30; WDT Hayes at 23-24.
891. Like many of the other observatories, mirror washing will be the primary maintenance activity associated with the TMT Observatory. Mirror washing wastewater is not a hazardous waste. However, the TMT Observatory has been designed to ensure that the possibility of mirror wash wastewater entering the surrounding environment will be negligible. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-31; WDT Hayes at 24.
892. The TMT Observatory design includes a separate mirror laboratory for mirror washing. The laboratory is designed to collect waste from the mirror washing and coating area floor drain and laboratory sinks into double contained piping. The piping will drain by gravity to a holding tank. The tank will either be double walled or will be placed in a concrete basin. The tank will be sized to accommodate at least one week's worth of normal use. Each point of exit from the mirror stripping area will have a trench drain that will drain to the storage tank. All exposed concrete in areas of chemical use will have a chemical resistant coating applied. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-31; WDT Hayes at 24.
893. A leak detection system will be installed and will monitor the double contained pipes and tank. A level control system will monitor the tank and will be equipped with an overflow alarm in the event that the level in the tank reaches 90 percent capacity. The waste collected from the mirror washing process will be collected, removed, and transported off site for treatment and disposal. It is estimated that such removal will occur approximately once a month (more often if needed), and the likelihood of an accident is slight. To minimize the potential for an accidental spill while wastes are in transit down the mountain to the proper disposal site, no tank or containers being transported will be filled to the top. To further ensure the safe transport and disposal of hazardous waste, the Observatory will utilize only Environmental Protection Agency-permitted and licensed contractors to transport hazardous wastes. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-30 to 2-31; WDT Hayes at 24-25; (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 75:21-76:9.
894. In compliance with existing regulations and requirements, TIO will develop and implement a SPRP. Both the SPRP and the engineering measures (such as double-walled pipes) will protect against the release of chemicals or fuel to the environment. The SPRP will require inspections to ensure that systems are working properly, no leaks are occurring, and any necessary maintenance measures are taken. The SPRP will also spell

out protocols for proper handling, storage, use, and disposal of liquid and solid materials and wastes. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-30; WDT Hayes at 25.

895. As a result of the TMT Project's design plus implementation of the plans, programs, and built-in safeguards detailed in the TMT FEIS, all of which were designed to comply with applicable rules and requirements, the TMT Project's impact related to hazardous materials and hazardous waste will be negligible. The possibility of an accidental release to the environment of any hazardous materials or waste is extremely remote. WDT Hayes at 25; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-30.
896. The TMT Project will provide the training, equipment, and procedures for proper waste handling and disposal. The TMT Project will have a person on-site to monitor compliance. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 196:12-197:19; 203:1-204:23. The TMT Project will: (1) collect all solid waste in secured and covered storage containers and truck it down the mountain for proper disposal at an off-site disposal facility; (2) implement a Materials Storage/Waste Management Plan, a component of which will be the SPRP; and (3) implement a Waste Minimization Plan that includes an annual audit to identify waste produced by the Project and how that waste could be reduced, reused, or recycled, among other mitigation measures. These measures will be implemented during both construction and operational phases of the TMT Project. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 2-28 to 2-30; WDT Hayes at 25-26.
897. Several components of the Waste Management Plan will address the construction phase specifically, including the following requirements: (1) repacking large shipments of construction materials prior to transporting them to Mauna Kea so that only essential packing material is used for final transportation to the construction site, thus reducing the amount of waste generated at the construction site; (2) securing to the ground outdoor trash receptacles with attached lids, thus ensuring that the receptacles, their lids, and their contents will not be blown away; (3) storing hazardous materials, fuel, and waste in designated areas in containers suitable and appropriate for such storage; and (4) covering construction materials with heavy tarps and steel cables anchored to the ground to hold materials down. WDT Hayes at 26. Disposal of packing materials will be in accordance with rules and regulations. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 203-04.
898. The TMT Project will use three 5,000-gallon tanks—one for water storage, one for domestic waste storage, and one double-walled for chemical waste storage. It will also have two 25,000-gallon tanks containing fire-suppression water and above-ground 5,000-gallon tank for storing diesel fuel to power the emergency generator. Those tanks will not have a substantial impact on the natural environment. Page 3 to 5 of Ex. B to Ex. A-1/R-1; Tr. 12/6/16 at 175:1-21.
899. Mandatory compliance with existing regulations and requirements will ensure that the TMT Project will not result in a significant impact to the environment due to its solid and hazardous waste management. The implementation of the identified mitigation measures, such as the Waste Minimization Plan, will further reduce the Project's potential impacts. WDT Hayes at 26.

900. Petitioner Ward sits on the advisory OMKM Environment Committee, and testified that she did not have any concerns regarding the above-ground storage of liquids at TMT, but that her concerns were more focused on the transport of those liquids to and from the TMT Project site. Ward acknowledged that she was unaware of any previous spills on Mauna Kea resulting from vehicles overturning en route to the MKSR. Tr. 1/31/17 at 32:6-35:25, 41:3-24, 62:6-10.
901. Dr. Kahakalau, a witness for the Opposing Intervenors Flores-Case 'Ohana, testified that because telescopes are cleaned with highly toxic chemicals, there are all kinds of pollution that are possible if an accident occurs. Tr. 1/9/17 at 124:15-18. Dr. Kahakalau did not provide any evidence to substantiate either that telescopes are cleaned with highly toxic chemicals or the general assertion that all kinds of pollution are possible if an accident occurred.
902. Marti Townsend, appearing on behalf of KAHEA, is a graduate of the University of Hawai'i William S. Richardson School of Law with a Certificate in Environmental Law. In her words: "My professional career has focused on improving implementation of Hawai'i's environmental legal protections and educating Hawai'i's communities about those environmental protections. I served as staff for KAHEA: The Hawaiian-Environmental Alliance from 2005 to 2012; from 2007 through 2011, I was the Program Director; from 2011-2012 I was the interim Executive Director. Currently, I serve on KAHEA's Board of Directors in a volunteer capacity.

KAHEA has been working with local communities to protect the unique natural and cultural resources of Mauna Kea since 2001. KAHEA is a community-based organization working to improve the quality of life for Hawai'i's people and future generations through the revitalization and protection of Hawai'i's unique natural and cultural resources. We advocate for the proper stewardship of our resources and for social responsibility by promoting cultural understanding and environmental justice."

WDT of Marti Townsend, Esq.; Ex. B.03a.

Townsend believes the impact analysis and mitigation measures in the FEIS and CDUA are inadequate. Tr. 1/10/17 at 41:1-21, 50:24-51:3, 67:10-72:2, 75:2-76:2. She acknowledged that she would oppose the TMT Project even if there was minimal impact. Tr. 1/10/17 at 84:10-85:23. She never formally challenged the FEIS for the TMT Project within the appropriate legal challenge time. Tr. 1/10/17 at 136:5-20. Townsend further acknowledged that she has never been designated as a land use expert in any proceeding, and that she was not a scientist, botanist, hydrologist, entomologist, or geologist. Tr. 1/10/17 at 80:25-81:16, 136:21- 137:11.

903. Based on the above factual findings, the TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region.

- E. CRITERION FIVE, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(5): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE, INCLUDING BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES, AND FACILITIES, SHALL BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE LOCALITY AND SURROUNDING AREAS, APPROPRIATE TO THE PHYSICAL CONDITIONS AND CAPABILITIES OF THE SPECIFIC PARCEL OR PARCELS[.]"
904. Astronomy facilities in the locality of the TMT Project are expressly permitted uses under HAR § 13-5-24.
905. The Astronomy Precinct is the site of many existing astronomical observatories so the TMT Project will be compatible with existing land uses. WDT White at 9-10; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 63:18-24, 94, 218:17-220:2; 10/24/16 at 22:11-23.
906. The TMT Project will be located on an approximately five-acre site within the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR, which is a clearly defined, highly specialized area set aside specifically for astronomical facilities, and was first leased to the University of Hawai'i in 1968 for this express purpose. Ex. A-1/R-1, App. A at A-3.
907. The proposed location of the TMT Observatory is in relatively close proximity to the eleven other previously developed facilities for astronomy within the Astronomy Precinct, which is the only area now designated for astronomical facilities on Mauna Kea. Ex. A-31 at 3.
908. From most vantage points within the Astronomy Precinct where the TMT Project will be visible, other astronomy facilities are already visible. Ex. C-18.
909. The TMT Project will not be visible from the culturally sensitive areas of the summit of Kūkahau'ula, Lake Waiau, Pu'u Līlinoe, and Pu'u Wēkiu. WDT Hayes at 7-8; Ex. A-36 at 2; Tr. 10/25/16 at 13:5-18.
910. The TMT Project should be assessed in the physical context within which it is proposed to be built. The Astronomy Precinct encompasses 525 acres, and the MKSR covers 11,288 acres. Ex. A-9 at 3-1. Combined, the TMT Observatory and Access Way will result in the disturbance of approximately 8.7 acres, including 2.5 acres that were previously disturbed. Ex. A- 3 at S-6. The Project proposes disturbance of only 6.2 acres of previously undisturbed land. Ex. A-9 at 3-26. New disturbance for the TMT Project represents less than 1.2% of the 525-acre Astronomy Precinct, and only about 1/20th of 1% of the MKSR.
911. The summit of Mauna Kea and other parts of Mauna Kea are substantially developed. There are 13 telescopes and related roads, structures, and buildings on the summit of Mauna Kea along with the food service and dormitory facility for 500 people and the Visitor's Center at the approximately 9,000-foot elevation, as well as other parking facilities, roadways, and trails. Tr. 12/16/16 at 41:18-41:25.
912. The TMT Observatory dome will also be coated with a reflective aluminum-like finish which reflects the colors of the sky and ground, helping the dome to blend in with the surrounding setting. Ex. C-3. Furthermore, because the TMT Observatory will be

purposely located at a lower elevation than most of the other observatories on Mauna Kea, the Observatory will not be visible from the significant historic properties of Lake Waiau, Pu'u Lihine, and the summit of Mauna Kea. WDT White at 10; Tr. 10/25/16 at 124:3-125:17, 137:9-19; Ex. C-18.

913. Mauna Kea is particularly well suited for astronomy. Due to the stability of the atmosphere above Mauna Kea, low mean temperature, atmospheric clarity, distance from light pollution, and other factors identified above, the summit area of Mauna Kea is uniquely suitable for astronomical research and for a project like the TMT Observatory. *See supra* at FOF Section II.F.
914. The existing access road from the summit ridge area to the TMT Project site follows an existing 4-wheel drive road that has existed since the 1960s. A section of approximately 200 feet of this 3,400-foot-long Access Way does not follow the current road alignment. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-11; Tr. 10/25/16 at 134:11-14. The Batch Plant Staging Area will be used in exactly the same manner as during past construction of other observatories and roads. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 1-13. Currently, utility services exist along the Mauna Kea Access Road to a point across the road from the SMA building. The necessary switch boxes to provide power and communication to the TMT Observatory will be placed above ground next to the existing ones across the road from the SMA building. To the extent possible utilities from that point will be placed beneath the road to reduce the footprint of disturbance. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 2-18. None of these uses will add any new elements that might be incompatible with the existing locality and surrounding areas.
915. The TMT Project should also be viewed in the context of the historical physical disturbance of the summit area by native Hawaiians. Directly adjacent to the Astronomy Precinct is the NAR, which contains most of the Mauna Kea Adze Quarry Complex, "the largest ancient quarry of its type, anywhere." Ex. A-9 at 3-15 n.9. As early as 1100 A.D., and continuing through the 1700s up until the time of Western contact, native Hawaiians utilized the mountain as a vital resource. They excavated the slopes of Mauna Kea for high quality durable stone to produce some of the best Neolithic tools in the Pacific. The Mauna Kea adze quarry, the largest in the world, offers conclusive evidence that the ancients recognized the importance of Mauna Kea's rich resources and its ability to serve its community by producing the tools to sustain daily life. They ventured to Mauna Kea, shaped the environment by quarrying rock, left behind evidence of their work, and took materials off the mountain to serve their communities, within the presence and with full consent of their gods. WDT Baybayan at 2; Ex. A-9 at 5-11 to 5-15.
916. The Mauna Kea Adze Quarry Complex "occupies an area of at least 4,800 acres." Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at 33. Archaeological evidence indicates that the Mauna Kea Adze Quarry was used by prehistoric Hawaiians for obtaining basalt to make stone implements. Ex. A-9 at 3-15, n.9. The Adze Quarry Complex represents a physical disturbance of the summit area of Mauna Kea that is 774 times larger than the new disturbance proposed for the TMT Project. *Compare* Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D at 33 (noting the Adze Quarry Complex is at least 4,800 acres) *with* Ex. A-3/R-3 at S-6 (stating the TMT Project will disturb 8.7 acres, of which roughly 2.5 acres are previously disturbed).

917. Townsend claimed that the TMT Project constitutes desecration of a sacred place. Tr. 1/10/17 at 119:4-9. This testimony is unpersuasive. Ms. Townsend is not a native Hawaiian and does not engage in traditional or cultural practices related to Mauna Kea. Tr. 1/10/17 at 68:9-11. Ms. Townsend's assertion that the TMT Project constitutes desecration is contradicted by her own admission that the lower part of Mauna Kea was used as an adze quarry. Tr. 1/10/17 at 140:4-141:5. Ms. Townsend's testimony is unpersuasive based on her personal negative feelings against the TMT Project. She admitted that she would oppose the TMT Project even if there was minimal impact. Tr. 1/10/17 at 85:12-22. Ms. Townsend's credibility was questioned based on alleged inconsistent statements. Ex. A-150; Tr. 3/1/17 at 123
918. Importantly, witnesses for the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors admitted that the summit area was already substantially, if not completely, developed for astronomy use. Townsend described the summit as follows, "There are nearly a dozen telescopes crowded together creating an industrial park atmosphere. It is "urban sprawl and intensifying of land uses". Tr. 1/10/17 at 15:10-17. She goes on to say that there are 20-25 buildings at the summit and that it is "an industrial park up there." Tr. 1/10/17 at 95:13-19. Townsend also testified that during a site visit to Mauna Kea in June 2011, she observed that the landscape at the summit was dominated by industrial land uses, including many telescope facilities and ancillary structures. WDT Townsend at 2; Tr. 1/10/17 at 15:8-15, 67:4-22.
919. Flores is more direct, acknowledging that the Astronomy Precinct is substantially developed. (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 234:5-8.
920. Ward testified that she "went back in 1996, and was shocked at how much change there had been in terms of development of the telescopes and the roads and the trash". Tr. 1/31/17 at 109:4-7.
921. Similarly, Pisciotta claims that "[t]he summit area is developed so much so that the TMT cannot fit on it. And the development is now... falling off the side of the summit." Tr. 2/13/17 at 198:7-10.
922. Kihoi "had no idea that all of those structures and telescopes were – had been up there. I didn't know that there was that much". Tr. 2/14/17 at 117:12-14. She admitted there were already 13 observatories atop the mountain, paved roads, power lines, and parking spaces for the various observatories. Tr. 2/14/17 at 120:6-23.
923. Prof. Osorio testified that the Astronomy Precinct is an industrial park, and, essentially a developed area. Tr. 01/12/17 at 137:1-138:12. He also testified that the whole mountain is sacred, but that things are fluid and can change, noting that ali'i can change things; practices can change as well. Tr. 01/12/17 at 140:1-13.
924. Dr. Kahakalau argued the TMT Project is not compatible with the locality and surrounding area because TMT is not compatible with a sacred place. Tr. 1/9/17 at 125:13-125:25. Although it is undisputed that some native Hawaiians view Mauna Kea as sacred, HAR § 13-5-24 expressly permits astronomical observatories and facilities to be

constructed within the Astronomy Precinct. The Board cannot adopt Dr. Kahakalau's position that her native Hawaiian values and native Hawaiian beliefs concerning Mauna Kea should prevail over any "outsider" opinion. Tr. 1/9/17 at 95:8-95:12.

925. Dr. Abad's opinion that the CDUA does not meet the criterion stated in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(5) ("The proposed land use, including buildings, structures, and facilities, shall be compatible with the locality and surrounding areas, appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the specific parcel or parcels") is based solely on her view that the CDUA does not meet HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4). Ex. B.08 (WDT Dr. Abad) at 20.

926. The reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project is compatible with the locality and surrounding areas and is appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the area.

F. CRITERION SIX, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(6): "THE EXISTING PHYSICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF THE LAND, SUCH AS NATURAL BEAUTY AND OPEN SPACE CHARACTERISTICS, WILL BE PRESERVED OR IMPROVED UPON, WHICHEVER IS APPLICABLE[.]"

927. The evidence presented demonstrates that the existing physical and environmental aspects of the land, such as natural beauty and open space characteristics, will be preserved or improved upon by the TMT Project. This criterion must be analyzed in the context of the purpose and goals of the resource subzone of the conservation district.

928. Visual or other impacts of a proposed project are site specific. In considering visual impacts here, the TMT Project provides information in the context of the preexisting conditions in the area proposed for a use. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 7-1 to 7-15.

929. The visual landscape in the summit area of Mauna Kea has already been substantially altered and impacted. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 7-1 to 7-2; WDT Hayes at 4-5. It will remain so with or without the TMT Project.

930. Because certain resources such as a clear night time viewing sky location are available only in particular places, limited alternatives for locating properties requiring those resources would outweigh visual or other impacts, even if such impacts are "obvious." The location for the TMT Project is dictated by the combination of natural resources that makes the Project's site uniquely ideal for astronomical observation. *See supra* at FOF Section II.F.

931. Even with some potential environmental or visual impacts to the Conservation District, the TMT Project incorporates appropriate measures and conditions to mitigate the project's adverse impacts. WDT Hayes at 7-22.

932. The TMT Project mitigation does appropriately consider measures designed to diminish although not eliminate altogether the impact of the project visually and in its effect on practices through its chosen location in Area E. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-26.

933. For visual impacts, "mitigation" is understood to require reducing adverse impacts, not

eliminating them, which the TMT Project accomplishes here with its design. *See* Ex. C-6 (WDT Callies) at 8.

934. The mitigation measures discussed herein, including the location of the telescope, reduction of the dome to the smallest size physically possible, the finishing of the dome and supporting structure to reduce the visibility of the structures, and other measures, reduce the visual impacts for the TMT Project to the greatest extent feasible. WDT Hayes at 7-22.
935. Design of the TMT Project is consistent with (and in many aspects, improves upon) the design of the other existing telescopes within the Astronomy Precinct, which also includes various support buildings, roads and other facilities. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-30 to 4-31.
936. The size, dimensions and dome structure were conceived to minimize and enhance the natural beauty of the surrounding areas to the extent practicable. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-30.
937. Fluids such as gas, water, wastewater systems will be contained in underground tanks to minimize any possible contamination of the subsurface areas. Ex. A-1/R-1, App. D at D2.
938. The structural design considered ways to minimize visual impacts to optimize viewpoints around the facility. Ex. A-1/R-1 at 7-13.
939. Based on Petitioner's and Opposing Intervenor's interpretation of HAR 13-5-30(c)(6), no telescope could ever have been built on Mauna Kea, and nothing could be permissibly built on Conservation District land in the State of Hawai'i.
940. Such a reading would render "Astronomy facilities" in the Resource subzone meaningless.
941. The TMT Project will be consistent with and will preserve the existing physical and environmental aspects of the land directly and through the numerous mitigation commitments. The objective of the resource subzone is to ensure, with proper management, the sustainable use of the natural resources of those areas. HAR § 13-5-13.
942. This criterion focuses on the impacts of the proposed land use rather than the cumulative impacts of existing or past projects under other permits at the summit ridge area of Mauna Kea. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 70:23-71:2.
943. The TMT Project will be an astronomy facility under an approved management plan with an expressly permitted land use in the Resource subzone, so the type of use in this area has already been considered when allowing observatories to be utilized in this environment, so long as there is an approved management plan in place. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 61; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 17-18.
944. The TMT Project is not proposed to be built on a bare mountaintop. Rather, it is being added to an Astronomy Precinct, and to a visual landscape, that has already been substantially altered and is already populated by numerous observatories and other

- related facilities. Tr. 10/25/16 at 125, 154, 230; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 63, 94, 218-19. The addition of another observatory will not substantially alter the present physical characteristics of the surrounding area. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 73-74.
945. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have acknowledged the developed nature of the summit, and practitioners like Pisciotta have adapted their practices due to the development on the summit of Mauna Kea. Tr. 2/13/17 at 198:4-198:13.
 946. The University envisions a future of sustainable and responsible astronomy on the summit of Mauna Kea. This includes the decommissioning and deconstruction of observatories, site recycling, and the siting of observatories in certain areas so as to minimize the effects of astronomy-related development. The University recognizes that future plans for Mauna Kea require balanced management to preserve, protect, and enhance the cultural and natural resources of Mauna Kea. WDT White at 10; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 59, 61-62.
 947. The University's long-term goal is to eventually have fewer observatories in the summit region, while maintaining Mauna Kea's status as a world class center for education and research. This reduction in the number of telescopes will improve upon the physical and environmental aspects of the region by reducing the presence of the structures, physically and visually, from the most culturally sensitive sites on Mauna Kea. WDT White at 10; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 86-87. To that end, OMKM is in the process of evaluating CSO and Hoku Ke'a's filed notices of intent to decommission. Tr. 12/12/16 at 94:21-95:7, 97:9- 97:22.
 948. As set forth above, the decision to locate the TMT Project on Mauna Kea was the result of an extensive worldwide study to evaluate potential locations. A unique combination of environmental factors indicated the summit area of Mauna Kea as the best location for the Project. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 10.
 949. A next generation large telescope like the TMT would not be appropriate to be placed on a redeveloped existing observatory site. Ex. A-48 at IX-37; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-32.
 950. The TMT Observatory site location – in Area E on the Northern Plateau of Mauna Kea – was in part chosen to avoid more culturally and visually sensitive areas. The TMT Observatory will not be visible from the summit of Mauna Kea, from Lake Waiau, or from Pu'u Lili'noe. WDT Nagata at 9-10; Ex. A-48 at IX-37 – IX-39; Tr. 10/25/16 at 123; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 62-63.
 951. The TMT Observatory will be visible within the Northern Plateau and from the northern ridge of Kūkahau'ula; however, other observatories are already visible from those locations. Because other astronomical facilities are already located on the northern ridge of Kūkahau'ula, views there are presently dominated by other astronomical facilities including Subaru, Keck, and the CFHT observatory. WDT White at 10-11; WDT Hayes at 16-17; Tr. 10/25/16 at 124.
 952. Current observatories are visible from 43 percent of Hawai'i Island's area. The TMT Project will increase that slightly to 44.2 percent. The TMT Observatory itself will be

visible to approximately 15 percent of the Island's population, including from Waimea and along portions of Highway 250. The TMT Observatory will be visible among already visible existing observatories. WDT White at 11-12; WDT Hayes at 5-23; Tr. 10/25/16 at 120-21; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-80 to 3-103.

953. The TMT EIS incorporates a number of techniques to evaluate the existing visual resources and the potential impacts of the TMT Project, including reviewing community plans, view plans within the viewshed of the TMT Project, silhouette analysis, and photo simulations. Tr. 10/25/16 at 119.
954. The TMT EIS (Ex. A-3/R-3 at vol. 1, p. 3-91) contains a photograph of Mauna Kea taken from Waimea that approximates the "naked eye" view of the existing observatories. Because of their color and shape, these are clearly man-made structures along the summit ridge, but appear as tiny bumps because of the distance.
955. At vol. 1, p. 3-91 to 3-99, the TMT FEIS has a number of "binocular view" photo-simulations of the summit of Mauna Kea, showing what it would look like with the TMT Observatory having various surface coatings, from Waimea, Honoka'a, and Waikoloa. Even with the extreme magnification in the "binocular view", the TMT Observatory appears as just one additional observatory in a cluster of observatories. At 180' in height, it is larger than the existing observatories, but not dramatically larger. (Gemini—151', Subaru—141', CFHT—125', Keck I and II (111') (FEIS, Ex. A-3/R-3, vol. 1, p. 3-81.) It does not significantly affect either the overall natural beauty or open space qualities of the Mauna Kea summit, compared to the existing conditions, even in the "binocular" view.
956. Waimea, Honoka'a, and Waikoloa views are representative of the major populated areas and connecting highways from which the TMT Observatory would be visible. *Id.*, Fig. 3-8.
957. No "naked eye" photo-simulations of the TMT Observatory from populated areas were prepared because it would be "not discernable" in a naked eye view. EIS, Ex. A-5, vol. 3, Appendix "M", at p. 31. Given this statement, and given the evidence of the "binocular views", the TMT Observatory would not affect the existing views of Mauna Kea from the major populated areas from which it will be visible, or the highways between those populated areas. It would be another tiny bump near the summit. It would not affect either the open space or natural beauty characteristics of the summit area for people viewing them from distant populated areas.
958. Apart from the distant views from populated areas, the TMT Observatory will be visible at some points to summit visitors. Because of terrain, the TMT Observatory would not be visible to people approaching the summit until they reached the summit area itself. *Id.*, vol. 1, Fig. 3-8, p. 3-87. Almost all of those visitors use the summit access road, Ex. A-12, Public Access Plan, at p. 3-1 to 3-15, and will see several large observatories in the foreground before TMT Observatory comes into view.
959. About 25% of those who go to the summit are observatory staff. Another 45% of visitors

come on commercial tours which often include stargazing. Ex. A-12, at 3-5, 3-7. Another 30% come in independent vehicles. These are usually tourists. *Id.* at 3-8. Some of the commercial visitors and other tourists come, at least in part, to see the observatories. Ex. A-7 at 52. The number of Hawaiian cultural practitioners is not separately tracked; their vehicles would be counted with the "independent" group. *Id.* at 3-16.

960. If it were not for the summit access road, which was built to foster the use of the summit for astronomy, only a few hardy hikers and horseback riders would ever enjoy close-hand views of the summit area. About 600 hikers per year are seen on trails or the road leading to the summit, although not all of these are actually hiking to the summit. *Id.* at 3-14.
961. Visual simulations in the EIS and used in the CDUA depict what the TMT Observatory would look like during most of the day. View studies show the TMT Observatory will not block views of Haleakalā, the setting sun, the shadow of Mauna Kea, the Southern Cross constellation from the northern ridge of Kūkahau‘ula, or views from the summit of Pu‘u Poli‘ahu. Tr. 10/25/16 at 122-24; Ex. A-109.
962. The TMT Observatory will not be visible from Kūkahau‘ula, Lake Waiau, and Pu‘u Līlīnoe, which are the three traditional cultural properties designated by SHPD within the summit area. Tr. 10/25/16 at 123.
963. Prof. Fujikane, a witness for KAHEA, testified that locating the TMT Project in Area E should not be considered mitigation since native Hawaiian practitioners conduct ceremonies and look at viewplanes from all over the mountain, not just from these specific sites. WDT Prof. Fujikane at 4. Other than her testimony, Prof. Fujikane did not offer any other evidence in support of her generalized statement that the TMT Project will have a substantial negative impact on traditional or historic cultural practices.
964. From points on the access road north of the existing observatories, a viewer can look north toward Haleakalā, with no large observatories in the field of view, because the existing observatories are behind the viewer. The landscape is not entirely natural because of the pads and roads of the SMA. Ex. A-3/R-3, Fig. 3-23, p. 3-100. If the TMT Observatory is built, it will be in this field of view, although it will not block views of Haleakalā from the summit ridge. If, after the TMT is built, someone seeks a view of Haleakalā from near the Mauna Kea summit, but does not want to see any observatories, the person could drive a short distance down the access road, and then walk a short distance to get north of the TMT Observatory. The person could also use a jeep road that goes to Area F. *Id.*, Fig. 2-3.
965. Although the TMT Project will add a visual impact to the Northern Plateau, numerous measures, involving both its location and its design, have been incorporated into the Project to minimize and integrate its visual impacts to the greatest extent feasible:
 - a. The TMT Observatory will be sited at a lower elevation than other observatories; therefore, it will not affect viewplanes vertically from the summit ridge areas. WDT White at 11; WDT Hayes at 13-14, 17-19; Tr. 10/25/16 at 122-23.

- b. The TMT Observatory has been designed to have the lowest focal ratio possible, resulting in the shortest telescope possible to accommodate a mirror of its size. The dome has been designed to fit closely around the telescope, reducing the dome size. While the 30-meter mirror is larger than the mirrors of other observatories, the TMT Observatory's dome height is barely taller than existing observatories like Gemini and Subaru, the mirrors of which are 10 and 8 meters in diameter, respectively. WDT White at 11; WDT Hayes at 19; Tr. 10/25/16 at 124-25; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-101; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 7-13; Ex. C-23.
 - c. The TMT Observatory dome finish has been designed to minimize the Observatory's visibility. Although operationally and from a cost perspective it would have been preferable to color the dome white, the dome will have a reflective aluminum-like coating, which view studies show will be the least visible alternative. WDT White at 11; WDT Hayes at 20; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-103; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 7-13; Tr. 10/25/16 at 125.
 - d. The TMT Observatory's support facilities will be relatively small and low to the ground, and will use materials and natural colors designed to blend with the surrounding landscape. WDT White at 11; WDT Hayes at 20-21; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 7-13.
 - e. Additional mitigation measures will be employed that will improve upon the existing physical and environmental aspects of the land. The TMT Access Way will be rendered less visible by shading the pavement in various areas to blend in with its surroundings. The existing utility pull boxes in certain locations will be camouflaged to reduce their visibility. The former jeep trail up Pu'u Poli'ahu, which was cut in 1964, will be restored to its natural state. Following completion of construction of the TMT Observatory, the Batch Plant Staging Area, which has been used for several prior observatory construction projects, will be partially re-naturalized. WDT White at 7; WDT Hayes at 22, 30-31.
966. For those wanting to access the Northern Plateau, improving the road is a benefit and advantage and improves upon the existing physical characteristics of the area. Tr. 01/04/17 at 80:13-20.
967. Hansen testified that, in his opinion, the CDUA does not meet criterion 6 because the development of the TMT Project will "dig into the mountain, move rocks and alter substrate." Ex. B.10a (WDT Hansen) at 2. The mere fact that a project will require excavation does not automatically disqualify a project from approval under HAR § 13-5-30(c). Since allowable uses in the Resource subzone specifically include "mining and extraction of any ... natural resource..." Hansen's position is contradicted by regulations governing the conservation district. HAR § 13-5-24(c); R-6.
968. Criterion Six provides that "the existing physical and environmental aspects of the land such as natural beauty and open space characteristics, will be preserved or improved upon, whichever is applicable." This requires the Board to decide what area is the proper unit of analysis to consider as "the land" whose characteristics must be "preserved or

improved upon." Also, when considering the natural beauty and open space characteristics, "the land" must be analyzed with respect to the major vantage points from which people will experience it. The major vantage points are those from distant populated areas, and those of visitors to the summit.

969. The appropriate unit of analysis for Criterion Six could be either the Astronomy Precinct, the 525 acre area designated by the UH for astronomy facilities, or more holistically, the unit of analysis could be the entire MKSR of about 11,288 acres. Using either unit of analysis as "the land" to be considered, the result is the same: existing open space and natural beauty characteristics are preserved.
970. The Astronomy Precinct is an appropriate unit of analysis because it is a specific area designated for astronomical use in the 2000 Master Plan, and contains almost all of the existing telescope facilities. It also contains the summit ridge, which is the most visible area and also culturally significant. It is, therefore, like the HO site that was analyzed in *Kilakila 'O Haleakalā v. Bd. Of Land and Natural Resources*, 138 Hawai'i 383, 406-407, 382 P.3d 195, 218-219 (2016): an area specifically designated for astronomical use, in which astronomical facilities had historically been placed. Although the Astronomy Precinct is larger than the HO site, the existing facilities on Mauna Kea are also much larger and much more spread out than those on Haleakalā.
971. The MKSR could also be an appropriate unit of analysis. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have repeatedly emphasized the importance of the mountain as a whole. The MKSR contains the entire area leased to the UH and set aside by Executive Order specifically for astronomical facilities and related buffers.
972. It would not be appropriate to use a smaller unit than the Astronomy Precinct, such as the actual TMT site, or the immediately surrounding area, to analyze the effect on natural beauty or open space characteristics. If one chooses a sufficiently small area, any significant building will reduce its open space characteristics. This interpretation would make any new building impossible and be an absurd interpretation of a set of rules that explicitly allow astronomical facilities as a potential use.
973. Any area chosen to analyze the effect of TMT on natural beauty or open space must include the summit ridge. This is the most visually prominent area and the destination of most visitors.
974. No credible evidence shows that either the TMT site, the immediate vicinity, or Northern Plateau, were considered particularly important areas of open space or natural beauty in themselves, apart from the broader summit region, prior to the TMT project becoming a public issue. None of the credible testimony supports the concept that the TMT site or its immediate vicinity, rather than some broader area including the summit, should be the appropriate unit in analyzing the effects on open space or natural beauty. The Northern Plateau contains some shrines, but the band of shrines goes around the mountain and is more dense to the northeast and east of the summit, not to the northwest where TMT is located. (Nees, Tr. 12/05/16 at 68:17-21, 115:7-19.)

975. From the populated areas on Hawai'i Island, the TMT Project will not affect the current natural beauty or open space characteristics of either the Astronomy Precinct or the MKSR.
976. Visitors to the summit using the summit access road will see several other very large telescope structures before they even see the TMT Observatory. From most viewpoints on the summit ridge, if the TMT is visible, other large telescopes are also visible. People seeking a view of Haleakalā without seeing any observatories will still be able to get this view if the TMT Project is built.
977. The TMT Project will not meaningfully reduce the existing open space or natural beauty aspects of either the MKSR or the Astronomy Precinct for visitors to the summit area. The existing open space and natural beauty aspects of this area are the cinder cones and expanses of bare lava, interspersed with large observatories. This basic setting will remain after construction of the TMT Project. The overall visual experience of the visitor will be the same. Like the ATST reviewed by the court in *Kilakila*, because of the existing buildings, the effect on views of the TMT will not be significant. 138 Hawai'i at 403, 382 P.2d at 215.

The TMT dome and attached support building will occupy less than 1.5 acre. Ex. A-3/R-3 at p. 2-15 to p. 2-17. This is less than 0.3% of the Astronomy Precinct and less than .0015% of the MKSR. This further demonstrates that the basic aspects of the land will not be changed.

978. Placed in context with existing observatories and the minimal or nonexistent obstruction of existing views from the summit ridge region, the visual impact of the TMT Observatory will be less than significant. Therefore, when viewed from the perspective of the summit region, which already includes astronomy facilities, the physical and environmental aspects of Mauna Kea will be preserved by the TMT Project, and, in some respects, will be improved upon. WDT White at 7-8, 11-12; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-230 – 3-232; HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6).
979. The reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project satisfies Criterion Six.

G. HAR § 13-5-30(C)(7), CRITERION SEVEN: "SUBDIVISION OF LAND WILL NOT BE UTILIZED TO INCREASE THE INTENSITY OF LAND USES IN THE CONSERVATION DISTRICT..."

980. HAR § 13-5-2 defines a "subdivision" as a "division of a parcel of land into more than one parcel." The TMT Project does not utilize a subdivision of land to increase the intensity of land uses in the conservation district.
981. To subdivide land in the conservation district requires an application to subdivide a parcel pursuant to the conservation district rules. HAR § 13-5-22(b)(P-10) applies in the Protective subzone; the same clause is carried forward in the other subzones. HAR §§ 13-5-23(a), -24(a), -25(a).

982. No land will be subdivided to construct and operate the TMT Project. WDT White at 2; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 185.
983. As will be discussed in the conclusions of law, *infra*, the Hawai'i County subdivision code does not apply within the conservation district. The County Planning Department, which administers the county subdivision code, Haw. Cty. Code Chap. 23, reviewed the TMT CDUA, confirmed that there was no county zoning for the site, and declared it had "no comments." Ex. A-8, p. 205-206.
984. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors further contend that the TMT Project does not satisfy HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7) because, in their view, the TIO Sublease constitutes an impermissible "subdivision of land ... utilized to increase the intensity of land uses in the conservation district." *See e.g.*, Petitioners' Collective PHS at 6.
985. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors argue the University's subleases to observatories constitute a "subdivision" of land simply because they include references to use areas in parcel "metes and bounds descriptions." Ex. B.03a at 1 (asserting that the exhibits to Ms. Townsend's testimony "include maps denoting the metes and bounds of the land area to be demised"). The documents referenced by Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors do not, however, contain metes and bounds descriptions. In any case, whether metes and bounds descriptions are used or not, the subleases are not subdivisions for the reasons discussed in the conclusions of law, *infra*.
986. Designating areas within a parcel for uses by persons does not create a subdivision. The subdivision process in the conservation district requires an application to subdivide pursuant to the above-mentioned conservation district rules.
987. It is undisputed that University has not sought a subdivision of land and none is required by the CDUA or FEIS. No evidence exists that any governmental agency has received a request to subdivide and the prior sublease document does not create or require a subdivision. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 222-23.
988. Any increase in the intensity of land use due to the TMT Project is only that allowed by the CDUP. The sublease does not authorize any physical development beyond that already allowed by the CDUP. The CDUP authorizes the construction of the project; the sublease only transfers site control and management. If the University had applied to build and run the TMT Project on its own, no sublease would have been necessary, but the analysis of the environmental, cultural, and other impacts of the project would have been the same. Hence, besides the fact that the sublease is not a subdivision, the sublease is not being used to increase the intensity of land use.
989. Since there is no evidence of the utilization of a subdivision of land to increase the intensity of land use in the conservation district, the TMT Project complies with the Seventh Criterion.

H. CRITERION EIGHT, HAR § 13-5-30(C)(8): "THE PROPOSED LAND USE WIL NOT BE MATERIALLY DETRIMENTAL TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE"

990. The eighth criterion of HAR § 13-5-30 states that a proposed land use should not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. It does not require that a proposed land use be affirmatively beneficial to public health, safety, or welfare. Nonetheless, educational, research, and economic benefits to the public are properly part of the consideration for this criterion. Here, there is evidence that several aspects of the TMT Project will be strongly beneficial to the public welfare. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 13-15, 17-19.

991. Petitioners presented the testimony of Dr. Maile Taulii, who has a background in public health, specifically with regards to indigenous communities. Ex. B.04.b; Tr. 1/24/17 at 7:9-23. In her words:

"I, Maile Taulii, holding a doctorate in Health Services, with expertise in public health informatics, epidemiology, genetics and Indigenous health, submit this testimony as a leading expert in health for Native Hawaiians.

The research of myself and my colleagues demonstrate three key findings: 1) desecrating sacred spaces impacts cultural identity and health, 2) participation in traditional practices are protective factors against distress, and 3) health disparities of Native Hawaiians cannot be explained by standard determinants of health (e.g. poverty or low education) and that causes, such as forced assimilation are causal factors in poor health outcomes."

WDT of Dr. Maile Taulii; Ex. B.04a.

992. Dr. Taulii testified that she conducted statistical research, which found that desecration of sacred spaces negatively impacts the cultural identity and health of native Hawaiians. Ex. B.04.a. Dr. Taulii testified that the TMT Project would further contribute to these negative impacts and cause damage to the physical health of native Hawaiians. Tr. 1/24/17 at 11:9-15:22.

993. Dr. Taulii is not a practitioner on the summit area of Mauna Kea. She provided no evidence of how the TMT Project would prevent or halt any of her practices in the vicinity of the TMT Project area. *See generally*, Ex. B.04a (WDT Dr. Taulii).

994. Dr. Taulii's testimony is insufficient to support a finding that the TMT Project will have materially detrimental impacts on the physical health of native Hawaiians, or the general public for the following reasons:

- First, Dr. Taulii's opinion is based on an unproven theory set forth in her unpublished research, which has yet to undergo the peer review process designed to subject such research to scrutiny by other individuals in the field in order to confirm or deny its legitimacy. Tr. 1/24/17 at 36:20-37:5, 48:11-12, 132:20-137:21. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors did not submit Dr. Taulii's research and resulting report into evidence because it was not public as of the

evidentiary proceeding. Tr. 1/24/17 at 51:18-19, 86:6-11. Accordingly, the Parties and the Hearing Officer were unable to examine the statistics underlying Dr. Taulii's assertions.

- Second, Dr. Taulii's research was limited in scope, and does not address the welfare of the general public. Dr. Taulii's research was confined to a study of the TMT Project's impacts on native Hawaiians who opposed the TMT Project. Tr. 1/24/17 at 77:8-78:14. The research did not account for impacts on the health of native Hawaiians who support the TMT Project, nor did it consider the impacts on general public beyond the native Hawaiian community. Tr. 1/24/17 at 134:3-135:7.
- Third, even if Dr. Taulii's research is accepted as true, it does not establish that the TMT Project alone will be materially detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare. This is because the TMT Project would be one of many factors that ostensibly impacts cultural identity, and therefore, health. Dr. Taulii testified that cultural identity and health are affected by factors such as the destruction of sacred spaces, loss of native language, loss of connection to the land, and environmental deprivation. Ex. B-04.a. Cultural identity and health are also impacted by factors contributing to the colonization, assimilation, and learned helplessness of native Hawaiians. Ex. B-04. a, Tr. 1/24/17 at 12:17-15:22, 23:11-24:15, 46:22-47:11, 61:6-62:12, 96:6-97:4, 113:7-11.
- Finally, Dr. Taulii's personal bias tainted the outcome of her research and opinion. Dr. Taulii initially requested to be a party to this proceeding to oppose the TMT Project. Tr. 1/24/17 at 131:18-132:3. Additionally, Dr. Taulii was not aware of any peer review studies that supported her claims of trauma to native Hawaiians as a result of the TMT Project. Her own study was developed after forming a belief or bias that would oppose the TMT Project so the scientific credibility of her study is unverified. See Tr. 1/24/17 at 132:12-19.

995. Other witnesses who generally testified about the perceived health impacts on native Hawaiians were: Dr. Aluli Meyer, Prof. Osorio, Prof. Kaholokula, Perreira and Teale.

996. Dr. Manulani Aluli Meyer, a witness called by Petitioner Flores-Case `Ohana, who is educated and experienced in the field of Indigenous Epistemology (philosophy of knowledge), testified in opposition to the TMT Project, generally stating that the TMT Project will negatively impact Hawaiian culture and cultural practices on Mauna Kea, as well as public health, safety, and wellness. *See generally*, Ex. B.05a. Here is her story:

"Ke welina mai nei. I am Manulani Aluli Meyer, the fifth daughter of Emma Aluli and Harry Meyer. The Aluli ohana hail from Mokapu, Kailua, Kamamalu, Kohala, Hilo One and Wailuku – Oahu, Hawaii, Maui. I am a 30+ year practitioner of hooponopono [healing process through ritualized communication], and a scholar-practitioner of Hawaiian knowledge working as a Wilderness Instructor and Outdoor Educator for 20+ years, and as a Professor of Education for 15+. My work is in the field of Indigenous Epistemology or Philosophy of Knowledge as it applies to world-wide awakening within

systems [ie: education, economics, evaluation, prison reform, health]. I earned my Doctorate from Harvard University in 1998 on this topic and have taught at the University of Hawaii at Hilo - Education Department; at Te Wananga o Aotearoa - largest Maori University in NZ; and currently as the Director of Indigenous Education at the University of Hawaii West Oahu. I now evaluate Indigenous PhD's from around the globe, and discuss/write about native knowledge systems throughout multiple countries and universities. My job now is to assist the University of Hawaii to become a clearly definitive and inspiring Indigenous serving higher education system."

WDT of Dr. Manulani Aluli Meyer; Ex. B.05a.

Dr. Aluli Meyer's opinion is based on the theory that modern science and academia are unable to capture the intangible features of Hawaiian culture and practices, and that these intangible features will be negatively impacted by the TMT Project. Ex. B.05a; Tr. 1/26/17 at 30:3-39:23.

997. Dr. Aluli Meyer's testimony is that the TMT Project will have a substantial adverse impact on Hawaiian culture and cultural practices or public health, safety, and wellness. Dr. Aluli Meyer's testimony/theory is not supported by any empirical data. Ex. B.05a; Tr. 1/26/17 at 68:20-69:21. Dr. Aluli Meyer did not otherwise establish the validity of her theory. Dr. Aluli Meyer conceded that, under the "one truth epistemology" approach of modern academia, the TMT Project will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. Tr. 1/26/17 at 88:8-18. Accordingly, there is no persuasive rational basis to accept Dr. Aluli Meyer's theories as factually true. Dr. Aluli Meyer conceded that she did not read the CDUA or related documents. Tr. 1/26/17 at 35:3-7.
998. Prof. Osorio opined that the results of mismanagement have severe cumulative effects on the peoples' trust and faith in government. Tr. 01/12/17 at 117:16-118:5. Even if that were true, the recent 2014 audit shows that the management of Mauna Kea has improved significantly. Moreover, Prof. Osorio presented no evidence that the TMT Project will be mismanaged. To the contrary, Prof. Osorio acknowledged that in terms of the telescopes, there has been a gradual increase in attentiveness to the environment and culture, even though those things may not have been present in the early approval processes. Tr. 01/12/17 at 83:3-7.
999. Professor Joseph Keawe`aimoku Kaholokula, a witness called by Opposing Intervenor Tiffnie Kakalia, is a professor of native Hawaiian health at the John A. Burns School of Medicine, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. In his words:

"I am the Chair and Professor of Native Hawaiian Health at the John A. Burns School of Medicine, University of Hawaii at Manoa. I hold a PhD in clinical psychology, completed a clinical health psychology post-doctoral fellowship at Tripler Army Medical Center, and hold a license to practice in Hawaii. I have over 20 years of clinical and research experience regarding issues of Native Hawaiian health, to include mental and physical health. I have over 50 scientific publications specific to Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander health in national and international peer-reviewed journals and provided numerous keynotes, talks, consultations on Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander health

nationally and internationally. I sit on several boards of organizations whose mission is focused on either Native Hawaiians or public health issues to include Queen's Health Systems and Papa Ola Lokahi Native Hawaiian Health Board. I am also a member of a Native Hawaiian cultural group known as Halemua o Kualii and have been involved in various Hawaiian cultural practices (e.g., hula and lua) throughout my life."

Ex. F-7b (Statement of Prof. Kaholokula).

1000. Prof. Kaholokula offered testimony about the psychological impacts to specific native Hawaiians and testified that the perception of the desecration of Mauna Kea is detrimental to the health and well-being of native Hawaiians. Tr. 2/23/17 at 121:13-123:9. He has not done any research directly targeting the issue of the TMT Project. Tr. 2/23/17 at 143:12-17. Nor is he aware of any studies with regard to partitioning the cause of stress from TMT and Mauna Kea from all other stress-causing factors for native Hawaiians. Tr. 2/23/17 at 175:13-17.
1001. Prof. Kaholokula has not performed clinical examinations upon any of the opponents of the TMT Project and his opinions are not based on any definitive studies or analyses on specific individuals. Tr. 2/23/17 at 175:13-176:5. Prof. Kaholokula is aware of native Hawaiians that support the TMT Project, but has not spoken to either proponents or opponents of the project as part of his research. Tr. 2/23/17 at 143:4-6. Prof. Kaholokula further testified that native Hawaiians, coming from a tradition of seafarers and skilled navigators, can appreciate astronomy's quest to understand the mysteries of the universe and our collective existence in, and connection to, this universe. Ex. O-12 (WDT Prof. Kaholokula). Prof. Kaholokula is familiar with the Native Hawaiian Educational Assistance studies, and confirmed that these studies identified causes of stress in native Hawaiian families, including poverty, single parenthood, parental incarceration, drug abuse, homelessness, intra-family abuse and systemic diseases. He also believes that a history of social displacement impacts the health of native Hawaiians. Tr. 2/23/17 at 164-168. He is not aware of any study that has partitioned the cause of stress from TMT from all other stress causing factors. He has not performed any clinical examination of any of the TMT protesters. Tr. 2/23/17 at 172:21-176:5.
1002. Perreira was a witness for her eldest sibling, Kakalia. Ex. O-14 (WDT Perreira). Perreira testified generally that the TMT Project would affect native Hawaiians psychologically. Tr. 2/23/17 at 191:1-4. Contrary to Kakalia's representation, Perreira does not specialize in trauma care. Tr. 02/23/17 at 197:17-20. Nor is Perreira currently a member of the American Psychotherapists Association. Tr. 2/23/17 at 200:14-16. Perreira testified that her family believes in scientific inquiry, and values education and science, but nonetheless did not support the granting of the CDUA for the TMT Project. Ex. O-14 (WDT Perreira). During her testimony, Perreira admitted that her views only represented those of her family; she was not speaking for the community at large. Tr. 02/23/17 at 199:2-200:10.
1003. Teale holds a Master's Degree in public health from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. Ex. B.15a (WDT Teale) at 1; Ex. B.15b. Teale testified that she has worked to gather signatures for a petition to "protect" Mauna Kea from the TMT Project and she assisted

125 people in filing complaints of desecration of Mauna Kea with DLNR. Ex. B.15a (WDT Teale) at 4. In terms of public health, Teale testified that the TMT Project is having trauma-related impacts upon the community, including a surge of heart attacks, stroke and other impacts from stress, especially among cultural practitioners associated with Mauna Kea. Ex. B.15a (WDT Teale) at 5.

1004. Kihoi testified that she is a victim of prior domestic violence and suffered physical and emotional trauma, as well as deep psychological and emotional pain from that violence. Ex. F-1 (WDT Mehana Kihoi) at 1. Kihoi was present during the April 2, 2015 and June 24, 2015 protests on Mauna Kea, and admitted to standing in the road to block the TMT vehicles from accessing the site. Tr. 2/14/17 at 78:16-80:12, 99:4-12. Similarly, S. Kihoi testified generally about her daughter's trauma arising from domestic violence and the healing process through Mauna Kea. Ex. F-2 (WDT Sarah Kihoi); Tr. 2/14/17 at 157:11-160:2.
1005. Public opinion surveys referenced in the hearing demonstrated a majority of citizens supported the construction of the TMT Project, notwithstanding the protests of a select few who claim political or other reasons outside the traditional concepts of public health, safety and welfare. *See, e.g.*, Ex. I-1.
1006. Additional considerations designed to impact the concerns of the general public over safety and health concerns were fully considered by the CDUA and its supporting documents, addressed in more detail below.
1007. The TMT Observatory facilities will use a zero-discharge sanitary waste system. All sanitary wastewater will be collected, held in tanks designed for that purpose, and transported off the mountain for treatment and disposal at facilities approved by the State of Hawai'i Department of Health. WDT White at 12; WDT Hayes at 24-25; WDT Nance at 1.
1008. All solid waste will be collected and stored indoors in closed trash containers and will be disposed of appropriately off of Mauna Kea. TIO has committed to developing and implementing a Waste Minimization Plan and Materials Storage/Waste Management Plan and to implementing recycling measures to reduce and appropriately manage solid waste disposal. WDT White at 12; WDT Hayes at 25-26.
1009. In handling all hazardous materials, TIO will comply with existing federal and state laws. Hazardous materials will be stored in areas with secondary containment that will capture any material that may accidentally escape the primary storage unit. The TIO will utilize Environmental Protection Agency-licensed contractors to transport any hazardous waste off of Mauna Kea to be disposed of appropriately. WDT White at 12; WDT Hayes at 24-26.
1010. Although not a hazardous waste, mirror washing wastewater will be treated in a manner similar to hazardous waste, will be stored in units with secondary containment, and will be regularly transported off-site and off the mountain for appropriate treatment and disposal. WDT White at 12-13; WDT Hayes at 24-25; (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 75:8-

76:9; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-234.

1011. There have been allegations of oil leaks from heavy machinery at the project site by party C. Freitas, and her witnesses, Rosier and Munroe. Dr. Sanders testified that some of the alleged oil leaks were just moisture from condensation. He further testified that all of the alleged leaks were addressed appropriately. A drip pan is placed next to each piece of machinery to catch oil leaks. Any oil that spattered to the ground was removed by removing the material, dirt, and rocks around the drip pan. The amount of material was very small and fit in a Ziploc bag. (Dr. Sanders) Tr. 1/3/17 at 23:22-25:16.
1012. Nanci Munroe, a witness called by Opposing Intervenor C. Freitas, is someone who has joined protectors of Mauna A Wakea. In her words:

"I was born in Portland, Oregon & raised in Tucson, Arizona. I moved to Hawai`i in August 1976 to attend college at the University of Hawaii at Hilo. I enrolled in prerequisite courses for the Dental Hygiene Program at University of Hawai`i at Manoa, as well as classes in Hawaiian language with Pua Kanahale & Hawaiian studies with Auntie Edith Kanaka`ole, who gave me the Hawaiian name of Nohea. I was hired at GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company in Hilo on April 24, 1979. I was accepted into the dental hygiene program in Vancouver, Washington in August of 1979, but declined. I was able to continue attending classes part-time at UH-Hilo from which eventually earned an Associate of Arts degree in Liberal Arts in 1984 at a point for which I would have only required 15 more credit hours to earn a Bachelor's degree. I retired from Hawaiian Telcom in Honolulu on August 10, 2012 with over 33 years of service. Since then I also have done some part-time work for Laulima Title Search & Claims.

* * *

On approximately April 14, 2015 I joined other protectors of Mauna A Wakea at Hale Pōhaku in anticipation of resumption of work for the Thirty Meter Telescope project. I stayed most nights on the Mauna until approximately June 28, 2015. I began to document activities on the Mauna with my cell phone and shared on social media almost daily. I began a routine of regular site visits with others on Monday mornings to the location of the TMT Access Road to monitor any activity for which we may have been unaware of during the previous week. As security guards were always on duty at the top of the TMT Access Road preventing access to walk on the portion of the road which appeared to have been already ripped & graded, we would hike beyond the construction zone delineated by stanchions & wire over difficult terrain of both a`a & pahoehoe types of lava in order to view the equipment which had remained there from the initial attempts to create the road. There were two excavators & two bulldozers on the new TMT Access Road, and I was able to photograph each of these pieces of machinery with evidence of some type of dark, apparently liquid substance leaking from each of them. In addition, there was a large truck with a trailer type of rig on the Mauna Kea road from which the TMT Access Road began which had 2 very large "oil leaks" nearby. It is unknown what type of liquid was leaking from the equipment, whether it was some type of motor oil, transmission oil, or some other oil or fuel used in heavy machinery, I refer to them as "oil leaks". There were no mitigation measures visible. The four machines on the TMT Access Road each had

some type of absorbent pad, or pads, held down with loose rocks, which to me would be best described as looking like training pads for puppies, or incontinence pads used on beds for medical patients. On at least one bulldozer, the pad had been blown loose to the point that it was no longer effective in catching the oil, which then leaked onto the ground. On at least one bulldozer there were pads above the 'tractor' treads as well as below, indicating that the volume of leakage was more than what the upper pad could absorb, so an additional pad was required below. Under one of the excavators was some type of rectangular yellow tray which appeared to me to be similar to what may be used to drain oil into from an automobile during a regular oil change but on a larger scale."

WDT of Nanci Munroe of evidence of oily substance leaking from machinery at the site of the TMT Access Road in May & June of 2016; Ex. S-14.

1013. Munroe took photos related to the purported oil spills and of some absorbent material near heavy machinery which was established to collect oil, but apparently some had missed the pads. See Exs. S-14e, S-14f, S-14g, S-10, S-11, S-12; (Munroe) Tr. 02/16/17 at 189:2- 195:17. She could not identify the source of the fluid leak in one of the photos purportedly showing an oil leak (Ex. S-9). (Munroe) Tr. 02/16/17 at 213:24-214:1. Munroe took a sample of the alleged oil spills but never tested the sample. (Munroe) Tr. 02/16/17 at 189:2- 195:17. Munroe further testified that the oil spills were not located on the TMT Project site, but rather on the loop road at the very head of the TMT Access Way. (Munroe) Tr. 02/16/17 at 205:2-14, 206:1; see Exs. S-9, S-10, S-14c.
1014. The drip trays and absorbent pads in Ex. S-14e and S-14f are standard construction drip pans and equipment used for heavy equipment. Munroe did not research those equipment prior to making her allegations, but has some knowledge that they are used for that purpose. (Munroe) Tr. 02/16/17 at 214:2-215:17.
1015. OMKM has a set of best management practices for construction activities and as part of the means and methods that the contractors will need to implement during construction. (Munroe) Tr. 02/16/17 at 213:19-23.
1016. Rosier testified that she previously hauled equipment for Goodfellows and is familiar with hydraulic systems. She also testified that Goodfellows is a "really good" company. (Rosier) Tr. 02/16/17 at 244:6-9.
1017. Rosier testified that the aquifer on Mauna Kea is going to be exposed to oil spill if the TMT Project is developed, however she presented no evidence to support that conclusory statement. (Rosier) Tr. 02/16/17 at 223:22-231:3.
1018. The noise generated by the TMT Observatory will be below the daytime Class A allowable limits (55 dBA) at a distance of 270 feet from the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning ("HVAC") system. The sound does not project very far under most conditions. Tr. 10/25/16 at 173:18-25. Anyone standing at least 270 feet from the TMT Observatory HVAC system during the day will not be exposed to noise levels exceeding the Class A daytime standard. WDT Hayes at 27-28; Ex. A-1/R-1 at 4-36; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-179.

1019. The noise generated by the TMT Observatory will be below the nighttime Class A allowable limits (45 dBA) at a distance of 850 feet from the HVAC system. Anyone standing at least 850 feet from the TMT Observatory HVAC system during the night will not be exposed to noise levels exceeding the Class A nighttime standard. WDT Hayes at 27-28; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-179.
1020. Identified noise-sensitive areas in the summit region, including the trailhead and summit of Pu‘u Wēkiu/Kūkahau‘ula, Lake Waiau, and Pu‘u Līlīnoe, are more than 850 feet from the TMT Observatory HVAC system. WDT Hayes at 28; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-179.
1021. Operation of the TMT Project will not contribute to a noticeable increase in noise levels at the identified recreational sites in the surrounding area recognized as sensitive to noise. WDT Hayes at 28. The TMT Project will implement several mitigation measures with regard to noise, including: (1) placing HVAC equipment indoors; and (2) furnishing the openings between the interior of the TMT Observatory and the outdoors, such as air intake locations, with measures like acoustical louvers to reduce noise discharging outside of the Observatory. WDT Hayes at 28; WDT White at 13; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-180 to 3-181.
1022. The method used to regulate and mitigate construction noise relies on the State of Hawai‘i Department of Health’s rules and generally accepted standards. (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 33:4-34:5. There will be a temporary impact to recreational visitors who expect to traverse near the construction site during construction. Tr. 10/25/16 at 175:15-20; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-179 to 3-180.
1023. Overall, the TMT Project will not detrimentally affect the ambient noise levels or result in a substantial degradation of environmental quality in noise-sensitive areas, and therefore, any noise impact from the Project will be less than significant. WDT Hayes at 28; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-180.
1024. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors also point to the testimonies of Townsend, Ward, Prof. Fujikane, C. Freitas, and Fergstrom, in contending that the TMT Project will be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
1025. Townsend testified that during the 2011 site visit, she observed heavy machinery, construction material, the clatter of telescope operations, and trafficked roads. Ex. B.03a (WDT Townsend) at 2. She also testified that she found it challenging to find a place where she was not interrupted by the noise and industrial land uses already on the summit. Ex. B.03a (WDT Townsend) at 2. Ward testified that there has been "intensified industrial land use" at the summit of Mauna Kea, and there currently exists view plane obstructions, and noise at the summit, including sounds from observatory air conditioning, blowers, generators, vehicles and industrial activity. Ex. 17a (WDT Ward) at 2-3.
1026. During the September 2016 site visit, there was little noticeable ambient noise from the existing telescopes. Moreover, other than the participants in the site visit itself, there was minimal traffic on the roads. There were no heavy machinery operations or construction

activity at the TMT Project site at the time of the September 2016 site visit, although some machinery was present but was not being used at the time.

1027. Prof. Fujikane testified that the 5,000-gallon tanks that will be placed underground along with the 2,000-gallon tank that will be used to store fuel are detrimental to public health and that the CDUA's plan regarding the tanks is inadequate. Tr. 1/9/17 at 230:5-230:22.
1028. C. Freitas testified as to the potential dangers of using the Manitowoc 2250 Crane for construction activities on Mauna Kea. C. Freitas testified that the high winds on Mauna Kea may cause the crane to tip, thereby endangering public health, safety, and welfare. Tr. 2/21/17 at 88:22-97:18. However, C. Freitas acknowledged that the cranes come with an anemometer (wind measuring device) and that the Manitowoc 2250 product guide instructs operators to lower and secure the boom when certain wind speeds are exceeded. Tr. 2/21/17 at 139:3-140:16.
1029. C. Freitas also testified as to her general concerns regarding the use of heavy machinery on unpaved roads, and the potential risk for landslides or other damage to the roads. Tr. 2/21/17 at 101:7-102:21.
1030. Fergerson testified that the TMT Project will cause some underground caves to collapse, but did not provide any credible evidence to support his assertion. Tr. 1/23/17 at 231:6-7.
1031. Certain protestors blocked the access road by standing in the road, placing rocks in the road, and building ahu and rock walls in the road in 2015 for the purpose of halting pre-construction activities and vehicular traffic. *See* Tr. 3/2/17 at 284:5-22; (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 92:2-10; (Munroe) Tr. 02/16/17 at 183:12-20; (Prof. Johnson) Tr. 02/16/17 at 94:7-11; Ex. A-157; Ex. A-158; Ex. A-159. W. Freitas admitted that ahu construction on the roadway created a public health and safety issue. Tr. 3/2/17 at 284:11-22. Similarly, Prof. Johnson admitted that persons standing in the middle of the road for the purpose of stopping vehicular traffic posed a health and safety concern. Tr. 2/16/17 at 94:7-11.
1032. The TMT Project will provide long-term employment in Hawai'i County for a wide range of positions including engineers, software and information technology engineers, scientific support, staff to maintain equipment, administrative personnel, and public outreach personnel. It is anticipated that TMT Observatory operations will need up to 140 full-time employees. The TMT Project will also result in the creation of additional employment opportunities by contracting for work and services with local companies, including for services such as web site design and construction of the TMT Project. The TMT Project is committed to hiring as many local staff as possible. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 11; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-136. Moreover, the State of Hawai'i will not need to pay for the TMT Project. Rather, there will be income for the State for the duration of the sublease. (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 109:24-110:6; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 3-4.
1033. The TMT Project is committed to funding a CBP and implementing a WPP. The CBP will be funded by TIO and will be administered via local charitable organizations. The

THINK Fund purposes could include: (1) scholarships and mini-grants; (2) educational programs; (3) college awards; (4) educational programs specific to Hawaiian culture; (5) educational programs specific to astronomy; (6) educational programs specific to math and science; and (7) community outreach. The TMT Project is committed to partnering with UH Hilo, HawCC, and the DOE to help develop, implement, and sustain a comprehensive, proactive, results-oriented WPP that will lead to a highly qualified pool of local workers who could be considered for hiring into most job classes and salary levels. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 13-14; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-137 to 3-140; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 5-6.

1034. The TMT Project is participating in a County of Hawai‘i Workforce Investment Board initiative with the Mauna Kea observatories. The purpose of this initiative is to explore opportunities for marshaling existing community resources to introduce focused programs within the Hawai‘i Island community to provide the observatories with a broader and stronger qualified local labor pool, as candidates for careers in the local astronomy enterprise. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 14-15.
1035. The TMT Project has the potential to substantially benefit the public welfare. There will be direct economic benefits through construction contracts, new jobs, incoming research grants, provision of the CBP and WPP, and substantial educational benefits. There is also the less tangible but no less important benefit of increasing humanity’s overall pool of knowledge about the Universe and our origins. *Id.* at 13-15; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-135 to 3-140; Ex. A-7/R-7 at 60; WDT Dr. Hasinger at 1-6.
1036. Prof. Fujikane did not agree that the educational and employment opportunities created by the TMT Project would benefit the native Hawaiian community because she believes that the TMT Project will result in physical and emotional trauma. Tr. 1/11/17 at 61:23-62:9. Prof. Fujikane offered no supporting evidence for this assertion. Prof. Fujikane admitted that she had never been to the TMT Project site until the September 2016 site visit. Tr. 1/11/17 at 79:8-79:16.
1037. Overall, the TMT Project will result in a beneficial socioeconomic impact by directly and indirectly generating new revenues for local and state economies, contributing to the State’s gross domestic product, generating new employment opportunities for local residents and the State, and sharing the benefits of astronomy with the larger Hawai‘i County community. Ex. C-2 (WDT Dr. Sanders) at 13-15, 18; Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3- 136.
1038. There are significant educational benefits that will derive from the astronomy programs that utilize the TMT Project. TMT’s advanced capabilities will allow it to observe any class of astronomical objects much farther than current telescopes. TMT will be sensitive enough to see things formed billions of year ago that could never be seen using Keck. (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 8:9-9:2, 14:3-16:15. TMT’s reach will enable it to essentially look back in time, which will enable astronomers to answer fundamental questions regarding the origins of the universe. TMT will enable discoveries about the nature and origins of the physical world, from the first formation of galaxies in the distant past and distant regions of the Universe to the formation of planets and planetary systems today in the Milky Way Galaxy. (Dr. Stone) Tr. 12/19/16 at 15:23-16:6. TMT may also aid in the

quest to find and study Earth-like planets which are close enough that future generations might be able to fly there. WDT Dr. Hasinger at 2.

1039. Considering all of the evidence, including but not limited to the testimonies of Dr. Taulii, Dr. Aluli Meyer; Prof. Kaholokula, Perreira, Teale, Townsend, Ward, Prof. Fujikane, C. Freitas, Fergerstrom, Munroe, Rosier, Kihoi, White, Hayes, Nance, Dr. Hasinger, and Dr. Sanders, and giving such evidence due weight, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have not offered reliable, probative, substantial, or credible evidence, scientific or otherwise, to suggest that the TMT Project will be harmful to the health, safety, and welfare of native Hawaiians or anyone else.
1040. Based on these factual findings, the TMT Project is not materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. Thus, the TMT Project satisfies HAR § 13- 5-30(c)(8).

V. PETITIONERS' AND OPPOSING INTERVENOR'S ARGUMENTS THAT UHH FAILS TO MEET CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF PERMIT

1041. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors rely on the testimony of Dr. Fujikane in challenging UHH's contention that it meets all eight criteria.
1042. Dr. Fujikane's testimony was made in two parts: the first part focused on a rhetorical problem: the faulty and self-contradictory logic in the TMT's Conservation District Use Application (CDUA) that attempt to make substantial, adverse, and significant impacts "disappear." The second part focused on the cultural value of the integrity of land embodied in mo'o'aina land divisions, where relationships between land forms are inseverable. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 207:15-208:17.
1043. Dr. Fujikane stated that the TMT CDUA cannot fulfill the eight Conservation District Use Criteria because cumulatively, the TMT project would add to the impacts of existing observatories that are "substantial, adverse, and significant." Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 209-210.
1044. Dr. Fujikane reaffirmed NASA's 2005 Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Outrigger Telescopes project on Mauna Kea where it concluded that the impact of existing astronomical activities on Mauna Kea has been substantial, adverse and significant: "From a cumulative perspective, the impact of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities on cultural and biological resources is substantial, adverse and significant" (Ex. 813d at 4-124).
1045. Dr. Fujikane stated that as NASA's FEIS for the Outrigger Telescopes Project indicates, Mauna Kea is already overbuilt. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17at 211.
1046. Dr. Fujikane testified that the TMT's FEIS Vol.1 also acknowledges that cumulatively, the TMT can only add to the substantial, significant and adverse impact on Mauna Kea: "From a cumulative perspective, the impact of past and present actions on cultural, archaeological, and historic resources is substantial, significant, and adverse; these impacts would continue to be substantial, significant, and adverse with the consideration of the Project and other reasonably foreseeable future actions" Ex. 832 at S-8. Vol. 23,

Tr. 1/9/17at 210.

1047. Dr. Fujikane stated that the TMT's CDUA claims, "As detailed in this CDUA, locating the TMT Project in Area E will result in less than significant impact on historic properties, cultural practices and native Hawaiian rights, as well as viewplanes, species habitat and existing facilities." (Ex. A002 at 2-27, cited in Ex. 8.13a at 3) is contrary to the CDUA which points out that "As the Astronomy Precinct is the site of many existing astronomical observatories, the TMT project will be compatible with existing land uses" (Ex. A002 at 2-27).
1048. Dr. Fujikane testified that, instead, the proposed TMT site is located in a pristine area that falls in the Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District and the TMT site is an integral part of the cultural and natural resources of Mauna Kea. Ex. A002 at 2-6, Exhibit 8.13c at 2-31, cited in Ex. 8.13a at 3.
1049. Dr. Fujikane has conducted research on the ways Hawaiians culturally valued the integrity of land, and that cultural value is encoded in a land division known as "mo'o'aina." Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17at 214-215.
1050. "Mo'o'aina" is defined by Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert as a "narrow strip of land, smaller than an 'iii.'" Ex. B.13j at 253-254. Mo'o'aina as a series of smaller land divisions that is part of a larger land base. Mo'o'aina foreground the relationality between land formations. Mo'o'aina are defined by what lies on their borders, by their relationality to other mo'o'aina. Exhibit 8.13c is LCA Award 3131 illustrating a mo'o'aina land division. Key here is that mo'o'aina are not defined by abstract cardinal directions north, south, east or west but in their relation to other land formations. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17at 214-215.
1051. The term "mo'o'aina," then, indicates that Mo'o'oinanea's presence on Mauna Kea is also about the integrity of land there, and that the undivided ahupua'a of Ka'ohe represents an even higher expression of this integrity of land. Ex. 8.13.m at 2-5, cited in Ex. 8.13a at 10. As surveyor Curtis J. Lyons explained in 1875, "The whole main body of Mauna Kea belongs to one land from Hamakua, viz., Ka'ohe." Ex. 8.130 at 14, cited in Ex. 8.13a at 10. Siting the TMT on the northern plateau would violate this integrity of the land.
1052. Dr. Fujikane stated that the CDUA failed to address the State desecration law. Ex. 8.13h, cited in Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17at 214-215. "if all of Mauna a Wakea is considered sacred from Saddle Road up to the summit, and the NASA Environmental Impact Statement for the Outrigger project deemed that there is already adverse, substantial-that there is cumulative, adverse, substantial and significant impact, the building of the TMT would be desecrating a place that is held sacred by Hawaiians and by many who are not Hawaiian. And in that sense, I think that the CDUA doesn't address the Desecration Law at all, and I'm not sure why there's that huge omission, because one of the questions has to do with the protection of Native Hawaiian rights and cultural practices." Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17at 222-223. Dr. Fujikane also recalled charges of desecration proposed by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs in a letter to Stephanie Nagata, Director of the Office of Mauna Kea Management (OMKM) calling for the investigation of an **OMKM** staff

member who bulldozed an ahu (altar) erected at the TMT site. Tr. 01/9/2017, V. 25 at 68-69.

1053. Dr. Fujikane testified that the CDUA fails to address Mauna Kea itself as a cultural resource. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 249-250. Dr. Fujikane states that this is a result of a discrepancy between the TMT's CDUA quoting the State Land Use Law (Chapter 183C, Hawai'i Revised Statutes) instead of HAR §13-5-1 as it is cited in the first application question (Exhibit B.13f: HAR §13-5-1). Ex. 8.13a at 3-4.

1054. Dr. Fujikane stated, "what the CDUA is trying to say is that cultural practices will not be infringed upon, but it says nothing about the cultural resources, and the land is a cultural resource because it reminds us of the mo'olelo. Some people will try to argue that you can still remember the mo'olelo if you build the TMT, but it will not be the same. So the land itself is a map that reminds us of the mo'olelo, and certain features of the land will trigger connections that we can make to other mo'olelo. But if it's built upon we will lose that capacity to connect mo'olelo through, you know, being in those places." Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 225.

The application states, "The purpose of the Conservation District to conserve, protect, and preserve the natural and cultural resources of the State through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety and welfare" (emphasis mine). The TMT project cannot "conserve, protect, and preserve" the natural or cultural resources of the northern plateau, the sacred ground that will be desecrated by the construction of the TMT. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 225.

1055. Dr. Fujikane stated that viewplanes are an important cultural resource on Mauna Kea, and that city and county ordinances in Honolulu recognize that viewplanes are an important aspect of preserving natural beauty. Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 90.

"So viewplanes are recognized in the CDUA application itself when it asks whether a development project will preserve open space and natural beauty. That to me is a recognition of the importance of viewplanes, and it's also again reinforcing other kinds of city ordinances, where you need height variance applications when you build a building beyond a certain height." Vol. 23, Tr. 1/9/17 at 90.

1056. Dr. Fujikane specifies the importance of the viewplanes of Mauna Kea: "So the viewplanes in the mo'olelo are very important because there are recognized viewplanes from Mauna a Wakea all the way to Kaua'i where there is an ahu, the Ahu o Poli'ahu on Kaua'i. And I have heard on a clear day--and this is in the Cultural Impact Assessment of the TMT--you can see Kaua'i from--I think you can see Kaua'i from Mauna a Wakea, but why do you have an ahu on Kaua'i, Ahu o Poliahu, unless there is a viewplane and a connection between these sacred points?" Vol. 23, Tr. 01/9/2017 at 90-91.

1057. Contrary to Dr. Fujikane's testimony and based on the factual findings in FOF sections IV.A. through H., the TMT Project satisfied all eight criteria of HAR § 13-5-30.

VI. PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE

1058. Prof. Callies, a witness for TIO, is one of the foremost recognized experts in planning and land use in Hawai‘i. He is an elected member of both the College of Fellows of the American Institute of Certified Planners and the American College of Real Estate Lawyers. He is a professor at the William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa and teaches courses focused on land use planning and development permitting at the local, state and national levels, with a particular emphasis on land use controls in Hawai‘i. He is the author of several publications concerning eminent domain, land use, and other real property issues. He is also the author of the Hawai‘i land use law treatise, *Regulating Paradise: Land Use Controls in Hawai‘i*. Ex. C-6 (WDT Callies) at 1; Tr. 12/16/16 at 44:17-45:7.
1059. Prof. Callies reviewed numerous documents related to the CDUA for the TMT Project, including the appellate court pleadings and opinions in this matter. He is familiar with the issues presented to the BLNR and the Hearing Officer in this contested case hearing. Prof. Callies visited the TMT Project site in August 2016. Ex. C-6 (WDT Callies) at 2.
1060. Prof. Callies testified that "the public trust doctrine does not require pristine and absolute preservation." *Id.* at 2. "Instead, the public trust doctrine requires a balancing process between protection and conservation of public resources, on the one hand, and the development and utilization of these resources, on the other." *Id.* The public trust doctrine contemplates a balancing of private and public uses, and not the elimination of one at the expense of the other. *Id.* In other words, "a public trust doctrine resource does not foreclose private uses of that public trust doctrine resource." *Id.* at 3.
1061. Prof. Callies also testified that not all public resources held in trust are impressed with or subject to the Public Trust Doctrine. He testified that while it is a truism to state that government holds resources for its public, its citizens, if all such resources were impressed with or held subject to the Public Trust Doctrine, government could never sell or exchange such resources since it is black letter law that resources held by government subject to the Public Trust Doctrine cannot be sold or transferred. This, according to Prof. Callies, would lead to an absurd result. *Id.* at 3-4; Tr. 12/16/16 at 45:8-22.
1062. Prof. Callies also testified that the public trust doctrine in Hawai‘i appears to have been "constitutionalized" to the extent that once a resource like water or submerged land is impressed with the public trust doctrine, Article XI, Section 1 of the Hawai‘i State Constitution reinforces the obligation of state and county agencies in their decision-making to carefully examine any proposed use of or on that resource to ensure that the public use of that resource remain paramount and intact. Ex. C-6 (WDT Callies) at 3.
1063. Prof. Callies testified that the eight criteria set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c) already incorporate the considerations of the public trust doctrine. *Id.* at 3.
1064. Notwithstanding the above, Prof. Callies testified that in his opinion the public trust doctrine does not apply to the TMT Project because the TMT project is not located on land impressed with or subject to the Public Trust Doctrine nor does it restrict or impair

any water resources. He noted that the public trust doctrine has traditionally been exclusively connected to water, and stated that the Hawai‘i Supreme Court has interpreted the scope of the public trust doctrine as applying to water resources. *Id.* at 4. He also stated that the applicable literature has almost never extended the public trust doctrine beyond water resources. *Id.* at 2.

1065. Prof. Callies further testified that if the land use is public or quasi-public, then the public trust doctrine would not require a balancing between public and private uses. *Id.* at 4. Prof. Callies noted that the TMT Project is not a private undertaking, but rather "involves public and quasi-public entities for an education use that will benefit the public and is consistent with the designated conservation use of that area." *Id.* at 4. Therefore, Prof. Callies concluded that based on his experience, "the TMT Project easily qualifies as a public or quasi-public use and is thus consistent with most, if not all, other public uses so that the need to balance public and private uses does not apply." *Id.* at 4.
1066. Prof. Callies testified that even if the public trust doctrine applied and the proposed TMT Project constitutes a private use of a public trust resource, the TMT Project is consistent with the public trust doctrine due to "[t]he absence of adverse impacts [to the public's use of a water resource] combined with the obvious benefits of the project to the public." *Id.* at 6.
1067. In rebuttal to Prof. Callies' testimony, KAHEA offered the testimony of David Frankel, a Hawai‘i land use attorney with litigation experience in, *inter alia*, state land use law, conservation district law, the coastal zone management act, environmental impact statement law, and the public trust doctrine. Ex. B.53 (WDT Frankel) at 1-2. Frankel represented the appellant in the recent *Kilakila ‘O Haleakalā* case before the Hawai‘i Supreme Court. The *Kilakila ‘O Haleakalā* case was the only case identified by Frankel in his written direct testimony that involved a CDUA. Tr. 1/11/17 at 43.
1068. In his testimony, Frankel testified that he disagreed with Prof. Callies' opinion that the public trust doctrine is exclusively connected to water. To support his argument, Frankel cites to dicta within a footnote in the Hawai‘i Supreme Court case, *Morgan v. Planning Dep't*, 104 Hawai‘i 173, 86 P.3d 982 (2004). There, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court stated that the scope of the public trust doctrine is set forth in Article XI, Section 1, which provides for the conservation and protection of "Hawai‘i's natural beauty and all natural resources, including land, water, air, mineral and energy sources...." Ex. B.53 (WDT Frankel) at 4; Tr. 1/11/17 at 29-30. Frankel also relies on the concurring opinion of the recent *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou* opinion, in which two members of the Hawai‘i Supreme Court stated that the public trust doctrine under the Hawai‘i State Constitution applied to conservation land and the summit of Mauna Kea. B.53 at 4 (quoting *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. Bd. of Land & Natural Res.*, 136 Hawai‘i 376, 407 P.3d 224, 255 (2015)(concurring opinion)). Ex. B.53 (WDT Frankel) at 4.
1069. In his testimony, Frankel also accused Prof. Callies of a pro-development bias. *Id.* at 2. Frankel, however, conceded that everyone has their biases, including himself. *Id.*; Tr. 1/11/17 at 39:10-17. He acknowledged that others may accuse him of having an anti-development bias. Tr. 1/11/17 at 39:18-22.

1070. Frankel also acknowledged that in his former position as an attorney for the Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation, he represented some of the Petitioners to this contested case, specifically Flores and Ching, in other matters. Tr. 1/11/17 at 36-39.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This contested case hearing requires the BLNR to consider whether the proposed land use as provided in the CDUA for the TMT Project, complies with:
 - (1) the statutory and regulatory requirements for a development within the Conservation District;
 - (2) Article XII, Section 7 of the Hawai‘i State Constitution and *Ka Pa ‘akai O Ka ‘Āina v. Land Use Comm’n State of Hawai‘i*, 94 Hawai‘i 31, 7 P.3d. 1068 (2000); and, **if applicable**,
 - (3) Article XI, Section 1 of the Hawai‘i State Constitution and the public trust doctrine.
2. In evaluating whether the proposed land use for the TMT Project is consistent with the statutory and regulatory requirements for a development within the Conservation District, the BLNR is required to consider and apply the eight criteria set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c).
3. The following issues are not material or relevant to this proceeding:
 - a. the sovereignty of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i or any other issues relating to the purported existence of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i;
 - b. challenges to the legal status of the State of Hawai‘i; and
 - c. challenges to the State’s ownership of and title to, the lands related to this contested case hearing. Minute Order No. 19 [Doc. 281]
4. If any statement denominated a COL is more properly considered a FOF, then it should be treated as a FOF; and conversely, if any statement denominated as a FOF is more properly considered a COL, then it should be treated as a COL.
5. Certain facts set forth within specified criteria addressed herein may apply to one or more criteria, issue, or legal standard. To the extent such facts or findings are addressed within a particular heading or section below does not limit it to that heading or section, but instead all such facts or findings are incorporated by reference for each applicable criteria section, as if specifically set forth within that heading or section.
6. The Hearing Officer and the BLNR considered the testimony of all witnesses at the evidentiary hearings and all exhibits received into evidence. The mere fact that a

particular witness' testimony or exhibit may not be specifically referred to below does not and shall not be construed to mean that said testimony or exhibit was not considered. Rather, specific reference to said witness testimony or exhibit was excluded because, after due consideration of said testimony or exhibit, it was determined to be: (i) immaterial, (ii) irrelevant, (iii) contrary to law, (iv) less credible or persuasive, and/or (v) cumulative of other testimonies or exhibits specifically referred to below.

II. JURISDICTION AND STANDING

A. JURISDICTION

7. This contested case is before the BLNR pursuant to the Supreme Court of Hawai'i's December 2, 2015 opinion in *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. Board of Land and Natural Resources*, 136 Hawai'i 376, 363 P.3d 224 (2015) and, consequently, the Circuit Court of the Third Circuit, State of Hawai'i's Order for Remand filed February 22, 2016, in Civil No. 13-1- 0349.
8. The CDUA for the TMT Project involves land designated in the Resource subzone of the Conservation District.
9. The BLNR has jurisdiction and authority over lands designated in the Resource subzone of the Conservation District pursuant to HRS Chapter 183C, and HAR chapters 13-1 and 13-5.
10. The BLNR has the authority and jurisdiction, pursuant to HRS chapter 183C to act upon and approve a CDUA.
11. The BLNR has authority and jurisdiction to conduct this contested case hearing pursuant to HRS Chapter 183C, HRS § 91-9, and HAR § 13-1-28.
12. The BLNR has the authority and jurisdiction to approve the CDUA for the TMT Project as a conditional use of the Conservation District.
13. The State of Hawai'i is the lawful government of the Hawaiian Islands. *See State v. Kaulia*, 128 Hawai'i 479, 487, 291 P.2d 377, 385 (2013).
14. The State of Hawai'i's title to ceded land is unclouded; it holds title in such lands in "absolute fee," and by extension, the BLNR has jurisdiction over the land subject to this Proceeding. *Hawai'i v. Office of Hawaiian Affairs*, 556 U.S. 163, 174 (2009); HRS § 183C-3.
15. The BLNR lacks subject matter jurisdiction to consider issues relating to the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i and the legality of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States, as those issues are nonjusticiable political questions. *See Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 212 (1962); *Sai v. Clinton*, 778 F.Supp.2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2011), *aff'd sub nom. Sai v. Obama*, No. 11-5142, 2011 WL 4917030 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 26, 2011).
16. Even if these issues were justiciable, the BLNR has no statutory authority to adjudicate

these issues. *See* HRS § 183C-3 (Powers and duties of the board and department).

B. STANDING OF THE PARTIES

17. HAR § 13-1-2 defines "Petitioner" as "the person or agency on whose behalf a petition or application is made," and a "Person" as "appropriate individuals, partnerships, corporations, associations, or public or private organizations of any character other than agencies."
18. HAR §§ 13-1-31(b) and (c) set forth the standards for admission of persons and agencies as parties in a contested case proceeding.
19. HAR § 13-1-31(b) sets forth the standard for the mandatory admission of persons or agencies as parties:

The following persons or agencies shall be admitted as parties:

- (1) All government agencies whose jurisdiction includes the land in question shall be admitted as parties upon timely application.
 - (2) All persons who have some property interest in the land, who lawfully reside on the land, who are adjacent property owners, or who otherwise can demonstrate that they will be so directly and immediately affected by the requested action that their interest in the proceeding is clearly distinguishable from that of the general public shall be admitted upon timely application.
20. HAR § 13-1-31(c) sets forth the standard for the discretionary admission of persons or agencies as parties:

Other persons who can show a substantial interest in the matter may be admitted as parties. The board may approve such requests if it finds that the requestor's participation will substantially assist the board in its decision making. The board may deny any request to be a party when it appears that:

- (1) The position of the requestor is substantially the same as the position of a party already admitted to the proceedings; and
 - (2) The admission of additional parties will not add substantially new relevant information or the addition will make the proceedings inefficient and unmanageable.
21. HAR § 13-1-10 sets out the standard for who can appear in a representative capacity in proceedings before the BLNR. It states in relevant part:
 - (a) A person may appear in the person's own behalf, a partner

may represent the partnership, an officer, trustee, or authorized employee of a corporation may represent the corporation, trust or association, and an officer or employee of an agency may represent the agency in any proceeding before the board.

(b) A person may be represented by counsel in any proceeding under these rules.

(c) A person shall not be represented in any proceeding before the board or a Hearing Officer except as stated in subsections (a) or (b).

22. Standing is an aspect of justiciability focusing on the party seeking a forum rather than the issues the party wants adjudicated. *Life of the Land v. Land Use Comm.*, 63 Haw. 166, 172 (1981).
23. The Hawai'i Supreme Court has been liberal in recognizing standing in land use cases. *Id.*

C. TIO'S STANDING

24. Several of the parties challenged TIO's standing as a party, particularly in light of the Circuit Court's decision to vacate BLNR's consent to the sublease between TIO and the University. *See, e.g.*, [Docs. 427 and 429]. However, TIO's admission as an intervenor was not predicated on the status of the sublease consent. Rather, TIO's motion to intervene was granted "due to TIO's substantial interest in the subject matter and because TIO's participation will substantially assist the Hearing Officer in her decision making." Minute Order 13 at 4 [Doc. No. 115]. TIO still has a valid sublease with the University and will be the entity responsible for building and operating the TMT Observatory, if it is built. Thus, TIO continues to maintain a substantial interest in the subject matter. Moreover, TIO's participation has substantially helped the Hearing Officer in her decision making. Therefore, TIO is properly a party to the contested case hearing.

D. HEARING OFFICER WITNESSES

25. Pursuant to Minute Order No. 41 [Doc. 446], on January 26, 2017, the Hearing Officer scheduled the testimony of the remaining witnesses that had yet to testify at the contested case hearing.
26. On January 26, 2017, Holi was given a hearing date for her live testimony to be scheduled in February 2017. Ms. Holi subsequently testified on February 23, 2017.
27. No other Hearing Officer Witness appeared on January 26, 2017 and, as a result, no other Hearing Officer Witness was given a hearing date for their live testimony.
28. Prior to the close of the contested case hearing on March 2, 2017, none of the Hearing Officer Witnesses other than Holi provided the Hearing Officer with their availability to testify nor did they request to testify after they were not given a hearing date for their live

testimony on January 26, 2017.

29. On April 20, 2017, Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553] was issued to address the admission of documentary evidence. In that Minute Order, the Hearing Officer noted that Holi was the only Hearing Officer witness to testify during the hearing.
30. On April 24, 2017, TIO filed its *Motion for Clarification, or in the Alternative, Reconsideration Re: Minute Order No. 44* [Doc. No. 553], requesting confirmation that the remaining Hearing Officer witnesses, Kealamakia, McIntosh, and West, had waived any right to testify at the contested case hearing or to claim they were deprived of an opportunity to provide their position and information as part of these proceedings. [Doc. 555]. TIO's motion was served by e-mail and certified mail on Hearing Officer Witnesses Kealamakia, McIntosh, and West.
31. On April 24, 2017, UH Hilo filed its substantive joinder to TIO's motion for clarification, in which UH Hilo argued that the Hearing Officer witnesses had ample notice and opportunity to formally raise an objection or otherwise make a claim there were precluded from testifying or presenting evidence at the hearing, if that is what they believed. [Doc. 556]. UH Hilo also served its substantive joinder on Hearing Officer Witnesses Kealamakia, McIntosh, and West by email and certified mail.
32. Hearing Officer Witnesses Kealamakia, McIntosh, and West did not file any response to either TIO's motion for clarification or UH Hilo's joinder.
33. On May 8, 2017, TIO and UH Hilo filed proof of service of the motion for clarification and substantive joinder, respectively, confirming receipt by certified mail by Hearing Officer Witnesses Kealamakia, McIntosh, and West. [Docs. 625 & 626].
34. On May 23, 2017, Minute Order No. 51 was issued to address, in part, *Motion for Clarification, or in the Alternative, Reconsideration Re: Minute Order No. 44* [Doc. 433]. In that Minute Order, the Hearing Officer ordered that Minute Order 44 will be amended to reflect that Hearing Officer Witnesses Kealamakia, McIntosh, and West have waived any right to testify at the contested case hearing or to claim they have been deprived of an opportunity to provide their position and information as part of these proceedings.
35. Minute Order No. 44 was subsequently amended as noted in Minute Order No. 51. [Doc. 649].

III. DENIAL OF OUTSTANDING MOTIONS

36. Any motions made by any party, either oral or written, that have not been specifically addressed herein and that have not yet been specifically ruled upon are hereby denied.
37. All motions to stay the CDUP pending appeal are denied as premature and pursuant to HRS § 91-14(c) which clearly states that there is no stay of an agency decision unless the court hearing the appeal orders the stay.

IV. AUTHORITY OF HEARING OFFICER

38. Under HAR Title 13, Chapter 1, a Hearing Officer has broad authority over the conduct of a contested case hearing including, but not limited to, powers to: examine witnesses; certify to official acts; issue subpoenas; rule on offers of proof; receive relevant evidence; hold conferences; rule on objections or motions; fix times for submitting documents and briefs; limit rebuttal evidence; limit the number of witnesses; limit the extent of direct or cross examination, or the time for testimony upon a particular issue to "avoid unnecessary or repetitive evidence"; and "dispose of other matters that normally and properly arise in the course of a hearing authorized by law that are necessary for the orderly and just conduct of a hearing." HAR § 13-1-32.
40. The Hearing Officer may also "exercise discretion in the admission or rejection of evidence and the exclusion of immaterial, irrelevant, or unduly repetitious evidence as provided by law with a view of doing substantial justice." HAR § 13-1-35(a).
41. Under the BLNR rules, a Hearing Officer also has the authority to formulate or simplify the issues and determine "such other matters as may expedite the orderly conduct and disposition of the proceeding as permitted by law." HAR § 13-1-36(a).
42. A Hearing Officer has discretion in exercising the authority vested under HAR Title 13, Chapter 1 to implement the generally more flexible procedures typical for an administrative proceeding, if those procedures do not affect the substantial rights of the parties. *See Cariaga v. Del Monte Corp.*, 65 Haw. 404, 409, 652 P.2d 1143, 1147 (1982) ("The administrative tribunal or agency has been created to handle controversies arising under particular statutes. It is characteristic of these tribunals that simple and non-technical hearings take the place of court trials and informal proceedings supersede rigid and formal pleadings and processes.") *See also Application of Wind Power Pac. Investors—III*, 67 Haw. 342, 343, 686 P.2d 831, 832-33 (1984) (refusing to reverse a Public Utilities Commission decision based on procedural irregularities because the irregularities complained of did not prejudice the substantial rights of the appellant) (citing HRS § 91-14(g)); *Survivors of Timothy Freitas, Dec. v. Pac. Contractors Co.*, 1 Haw. App. 77, 85, 613 P.2d 927, 933 (1980) (finding that the Labor and Industrial Relations Appeals Board's failure to state whether it had applied presumption that claim was for covered work injury did not prejudice substantial rights where there was no reasonable doubt that employee's fatal accident was not work connected) (citing HRS § 91-14(g)).
43. Throughout the course of the contested case hearing, accusations of bias and prejudice were freely advanced by Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors. Adverse rulings, without more, are insufficient to establish bias or prejudice of an administrative officer. *See Peters v. Jamieson*, 48 Hawai'i 247, 264, 397 P.2d 575, 586 (1964) ("We adhere to the rule that mere erroneous or adverse rulings by the trial judge do not spell bias or prejudice and cannot be made the basis for disqualification.")
44. It is well-established that "pro se litigants are not excused from following court rules," *Briones v. Riviera Hotel & Casino*, 116 F.3d 379, 382 (9th Cir. 1997), and that they

"must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants," *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987), *overruled on other grounds* (citation omitted). In this Contested Case Hearing the *pro se* status of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors was fully considered throughout this matter in establishing and administering procedures and processes for the hearing to ensure that all parties were afforded due process.

45. As set forth in the findings of fact above, reasonable procedures within the scope of authority were set under HAR Title 13, Chapter 1 to expedite the orderly conduct and disposition of this proceeding for all parties, while also ensuring that all parties had an opportunity to present evidence and argument on all material issues without prejudicing any substantial rights.

V. EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS

46. Under HRS § 91-10(1):

"Except as provided in section 91-8.5, any oral or documentary evidence may be received, but every agency shall as a matter of policy provide for the exclusion of irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence and no sanction shall be imposed or rule or order be issued except upon consideration of the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party and as supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence. The agencies shall give effect to the rules of privilege recognized by law[.]"

47. Consistent with the Hawai‘i Administrative Procedures Act, HRS Chapter 91 ("**HAPA**"), the administrative rules governing procedures before the BLNR broadly provide that the Hearing Officer "may exercise discretion in the admission or rejection of evidence and the exclusion of immaterial, irrelevant, or unduly repetitious evidence as provided by law with a view of doing substantial justice." HAR § 13-1-35.
48. "The rules of evidence governing administrative hearings are considerably more relaxed than those governing judicial proceedings." *Price v. Zoning Bd. of Appeals*, 77 Hawai‘ 168, 176 n.8, 883 P.2d 629, 637 n.8 (1994). This means, for example, that hearsay which would be inadmissible in court proceedings is nonetheless admissible in administrative hearings.
49. In construing the HAPA (and specifically, HRS § 91-10), the Hawai‘i Supreme Court noted that the act’s mandate that "[a]ny oral or documentary evidence may be received" by an agency must be liberally construed. *Dependents of Cazimero v. Kohala Sugar Co.*, 54 Haw. 479, 482, 510 P.2d 89, 92 (1973).
50. The court in *Cazimero* observed that the legislative history of HAPA also supported the liberal admission of evidence, as the history indicated "that the direction chosen [by the Legislature] was towards the admission of *any and all evidence* [in administrative hearings] limited *only* by considerations of relevancy, materiality and repetition." *Id.* at 482-83, 510 P.2d at 92 (emphasis added).

51. The standard for determining relevancy in agency proceedings under Chapter 91 is that of Haw. R. Evid. *Id.* (HRE) 401. *See Loui v. Bd. of Med. Examiners*, 78 Hawai'i 21, 31, 889 P.2d 705, 715 (1995). HRE Rule 401 defines relevant evidence as "evidence having any tendency to make the existence of *any fact that is of consequence* to the determination of the action more probable than it would be without the evidence." HRE 401 (emphasis added); *Loui*, 78 Hawai'i at 31, 889 P.2d at 715 (quoting Rule 401).
52. Because the rules of evidence applied in administrative hearings are more relaxed than in court proceedings, doubts about admissibility are to be resolved in favor of admitting the evidence:
- [W]hen an agency is faced with evidence of doubtful admissibility, it is preferable that it allow the admission of such evidence rather than to exclude the same, for the very practical reason stated in *Donnelly Garment Co. v. National Labor Relations Board*, 123 F.2d 215, 224 (8th Cir. 1941), as follows: "If the record on review contains not only all evidence which was clearly admissible, but also all evidence of doubtful admissibility, the court which is called upon to review the case can usually make an end of it, whereas if evidence was excluded which that court regards as having been admissible, a new trial or rehearing cannot be avoided.
- Cazimero v. Kohala Sugar Co.*, 54 Haw. 479, 483, 510 P.2d 89, 93 (1973).
53. The liberal standard of the admissibility of evidence in administrative hearings is also reflected in the established rule that even when ostensibly irrelevant or incompetent evidence is admitted during a hearing, the admission of such evidence alone is not grounds for reversal if there is "substantial evidence in the record to sustain the agency's determination" and the aggrieved party is not prejudiced. *Shorba v. Board of Education*, 59 Haw. 388, 398, 583 P.2d 313-19 (1978). Stated another way, unless an aggrieved party can show prejudice resulting from the admission of ostensibly irrelevant or incompetent evidence, admission of such evidence alone is not grounds for reversal. *Id.*
54. Although the admission of evidence in administrative hearings is less formal than those governing judicial proceedings, the Hearing Officer still has the authority to limit or entirely exclude evidence that does not meet the basic criteria of relevancy, materiality and avoidance of repetition. HRS § 91-10(1).
55. As reflected in the record, the Hearing Officer provided numerous notices and reminders to the parties that testimony and other evidence had to meet the basic evidentiary standards of relevancy, materiality and avoidance of repetition. *See, e.g.*, Tr. 08/29/16 at 45:20-46:2 (requiring offer of proof for all witnesses prior to testimony); Tr. 10/25/16 at 49:3-50:1 (repeatedly sustaining objections to repetitious questions and requesting party to ask another question); Tr. 10/26/16 at 64:18-21 (instructing questioning party that questions have to be designed to lead to a material point); Tr. 10/27/16 at 52:21-22 (noting that Hearing Officer must have information to make a decision on the relevancy

and materiality of evidence); Tr. 12/01/16 at 143:1-13 (reminding party that Hearing Officer will allow relevant testimony beyond time limits, but will not permit time to be wasted); Tr. 01/23/17 at 157:18-22 (reminding party that "we had many discussions" about issues that are material to the hearing).

56. As reflected in the findings of fact above, the Hearing Officer's factual determinations fully considered the admissibility of evidence under the liberal standards in contested case hearings, while also limiting or excluding evidence that did not meet the basic criteria of relevancy, materiality, and avoidance of repetition.
57. None of the witnesses in this proceeding were formally received or qualified as expert witnesses because the Hearing Officer determined at the outset that such designation was unnecessary given the informality of the proceedings and the ability of the Hearing Officer to ascribe appropriate weight, if any, to each witness' testimony; the written direct testimony of each witness was admitted into evidence for consideration; the Hawai'i Rules of Evidence did not govern the proceedings; and under the authorities cited above, the rules of evidence governing administrative hearings are considerably more relaxed than those governing judicial proceedings.
58. "[T]he competence, credibility and weight" of the testimony of all witnesses (including witnesses who represent that they have expertise in one or more subject areas), "is exclusively in the province of the trier of fact." *See Hawai'i Prince Hotel Waikiki Corp. v. City & County of Honolulu*, 89 Hawai'i 381, 390, 974 P.2d 21, 30 (1999) (quoting *State v. Pioneer Mill Co.*, 64 Haw. 168, 179, 637 P.2d 1131, 1139 (1981)).
59. As with the testimony of any witness, a Hearing Officer can believe or disbelieve the testimony of a witness claiming to have expertise in one or more areas, in whole or in part, and to give such testimony the weight the Hearing Officer deems appropriate.
60. Determining the weight, if any, to be given to the opinions and testimony of a witness claiming subject matter expertise is within the discretion of the Hearing Officer, just as it is within the discretion of the Hearing Officer to determine the weight to be given the testimony of any witness.
61. In addition, even though a witness represents that he or she has expertise in one or more areas, such proffered "expert" testimony -- as with all admissible and reliable evidence -- must also meet the basic requirement that such evidence is material, relevant and non-repetitious. HAR § 13-1-35.
62. As reflected in the findings of fact above, determinations regarding the admissibility, weight and credibility of the testimony and opinions of the various witnesses in this matter were fully weighed and considered in conjunction with the evidence received on a witness-by-witness basis to determine whether such testimony and opinions are logical, credible, persuasive, and supported by evidence.

VI. CROSS EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

63. The Hearing Officer may limit the "extent of direct or cross examination or the time for

testimony upon a particular issue" to avoid repetitive or unnecessary evidence. HAR § 13-1-32(h).

64. Based on the Hearing Officer's inherent discretion, the parties were permitted considerable latitude to conduct cross examination (including extensive "friendly" cross examination) of all witnesses who appeared in this matter. Cross-examination was properly and reasonably limited where appropriate to avoid repetitive, unnecessary and irrelevant evidence.
65. On October 31, 2016 (after observing the parties' cross examinations over the first five hearing days in which a total of two witnesses had completed their testimony) a thirty-minute time limit on cross examinations was established, subject to extensions of the time limit for good cause shown. The time limit was imposed pursuant to HAR § 13-1-32(h), in order to avoid repetitive or unnecessary evidence, and is consistent with due process. *See Korean Buddhist Dae Won Sa Temple of Hawai'i v. Sullivan*, 87 Hawai'i 217, 243, 953 P.2d 1315, 1341 (1998) ("Determination of the specific procedures to satisfy due process requires a balancing of several factors."); *Martin v. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd.*, Civ. No. 03-1- 0186, 2013 WL 639320, at *6 (Haw. Ct. App. Feb. 21, 2013) ("The Circuit Court did not abuse its discretion by imposing time limits on the presentation of evidence and cross-examination of Defendant's witnesses.")

VII. REBUTTAL WITNESSES

66. A party's right to submit rebuttal evidence is not absolute and is "subject to limitations" by the Hearing Officer. HAR § 13-1-32(g).
67. Under HAR § 13-1-35(a), "[t]he [hearing] officer may exercise discretion in the admission or rejection of evidence and the exclusion of immaterial, irrelevant, or unduly repetitious evidence as provided by law with a view of doing substantial justice."
68. It is well established that "the introduction of evidence in rebuttal and in surrebuttal is a matter within the discretion of the trial court[.]" *Takayama v. Kaiser Foundation Hosp.*, 82 Hawai'i 486, 495, 923 P.2d 903, 912 (1996) (citing *Yorita v. Okumoto*, 3 Haw.App. 148, 156, 643 P.2d 820, 826 (1982)).
69. In addition, as a general rule with respect to the admission of rebuttal evidence, "in the interests of expediency and limiting surprise, all evidence in support of a party's position should be presented when the issue it addresses is first presented." *Takayama*, 82 Hawai'i at 497, 923 P.2d at 914.
70. Although a party is not required "to call every conceivable witness who might contradict a potential defense witness," it is also generally true that "[a] party cannot, as a matter of right, offer in rebuttal evidence which was proper or should have been introduced in chief, even though it tends to contradict the adverse party's evidence and, while the court may in its discretion admit such evidence, it may and generally should decline to admit the evidence." *Takayama*, 82 Hawai'i at 497, 923 P.2d at 914 (emphasis added) (quoting *Gassen v. Woy*, 785 S.W.2d 601, 605 (Mo. Ct. App. 1990)).

71. As reflected in the findings of fact above, and based on sound discretion, certain witnesses proposed or sought to be called as rebuttal witnesses in this proceeding were properly precluded from testifying.

VIII. OFFICIAL NOTICE

72. The DLNR's Rules of Practice and Procedure provide that during contested case proceedings, "[o]fficial notice may be taken of such matters as may be judicially noticed by the courts of the State of Hawai'i." HAR § 13-1-35(i).
73. HRE Rule 201 provides that judicial notice is properly taken of "adjudicative facts." "Adjudicative facts" are "the kind of facts that are ordinarily decided by the trier of fact . . ." *Estate of Herbert*, 90 Hawai'i at 466, 979 P.2d at 62 (citations omitted).
74. Under HRE Rule 201, "if requested by a party and supplied with the necessary information," "[a] court *shall* take judicial notice" of a fact that "is not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court, or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." HRE 201(b), (d) (emphasis added). If a court is supplied with the necessary information and the information meets the criteria stated in the Rule, judicial notice is mandatory.
75. Judicial notice of certain adjudicative facts was taken in this proceeding.
76. Judicial notice of certain representations in this proceeding was not accepted because those representations did not meet the standard under HRE Rule 201.

IX. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A. BURDEN OF PROOF

77. The BLNR rules provide that "[t]he applicant shall have the burden of demonstrating that a proposed land use is consistent with" the criteria set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c). As the party proposing a land use in the Conservation District, UH Hilo is clearly the "applicant" in this matter.
78. HAPA states that, "[e]xcept as otherwise provided by law, the party initiating the proceeding shall have the burden of proof, including the burden of producing evidence as well as the burden of persuasion. The degree or quantum of proof shall be a preponderance of the evidence." HRS § 91-10(5).
79. HAR § 13-1-35(k) similarly provides:
- "The party initiating the proceeding and, in the case of proceedings on alleged violations of law, the department, shall have the burden of proof, including the burden of producing evidence as well as the burden of persuasion. The quantum of proof shall be a **preponderance of the evidence.**" (emphasis added)

80. A "proceeding" is defined as:

"...the board's consideration of the relevant facts and applicable law and action thereon with respect to a particular subject within the board's jurisdiction, initiated by a filing or submittal or request or a board's notice or order, and shall include but not be limited to:

* * *

(3) Petitions or applications for the granting or declaring of any right, privilege, authority, or relief under or from any provision of law or any rule or requirement made pursuant to authority granted by law"

HAR § 13-1-2.

81. UH Hilo has the initial burden of proof in showing that its CDUA warrants approval upon consideration of the criteria in HAR § 13-5-30(c).
82. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors are required to carry the burden of proof on issues asserted by them. In particular, to the extent that Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors are claiming to assert native Hawaiian rights based on customary and traditional practices, the burden is on them to establish that the claimed right is constitutionally protected as a customary and traditional native Hawaiian practice. The standards for establishing constitutional protection of practices that are claimed to be customary and traditional are set forth in *State v. Hanapi*, 89 Hawai'i 177, 186, 970 P.2d 485, 494 (1998) and *State v. Pratt*, 127 Hawai'i 206, 277 P.3d 300 (2012), and are discussed in detail below.

B. STATE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

83. Article XI, section 1 of the Hawai'i State Constitution provides:

"For the benefit of present and future generations, the State and its political subdivisions shall conserve and protect Hawai'i's natural beauty and all natural resources, including land, water, air, minerals and energy sources, and shall promote the development and utilization of these resources in a manner consistent with their conservation and in furtherance of the self-sufficiency of the State."

84. Article XI, section 9 of the Hawai'i State Constitution provides:

"Each Person has the right to a clean and healthful environment, as defined by laws relating to environmental quality, including control of pollution and conservation, protection and enhancement of natural resources. . ."

85. Article XII, section 7 of the Hawai'i State Constitution provides:

"The State reaffirms and shall protect all rights, customarily and traditionally exercised for subsistence, cultural and religious purposes and possessed by ahupua'a tenants who are descendants of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778, subject to the rights of the State to regulate such rights."

86. In explaining this proviso, the framers of Article XII, section 7 explained that, while the state has the power and obligation to protect native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices, the state also has the power to regulate those rights: "Your Committee did not intend these rights to be indiscriminate or abusive to others. While your Committee recognizes that, historically and presently, native Hawaiians have a deep love and respect for the land, called aloha aina, reasonable regulation is necessary to prevent possible abuse as well as interference with these rights." Stand. Comm. Rep. No. 57, reprinted in 1 *Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of Hawai'i of 1978*, at 639.

C. STATUTE AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

87. Under Hawai'i's Land Use Law, HRS Chapter 205, the Conservation District is defined to include:

...areas necessary for protecting watersheds and water sources; preserving scenic and historic areas; providing park lands, wilderness, and beach reserves; conserving indigenous or endemic plants, fish and wildlife, including those which are threatened or endangered; preventing floods and soil erosion; forestry; open space and areas whose existing openness, natural condition or present state of use, if retained, would enhance the present or potential value of abutting or surrounding communities, or would maintain or enhance the conservation of natural or scenic resources; areas of value for recreational purposes; other related activities; and other permitted uses not detrimental to a multiple use conservation concept.

HRS § 205-2(e).

88. The DLNR administers public lands "through appropriate management and use" within the Conservation District pursuant to Chapter 183C of the Hawai'i Revised Statutes. Chapter 183C articulates this public policy:

The legislature finds that lands within the state land use conservation district contain important natural resources essential to the preservation of the State's fragile natural ecosystems and the sustainability of the State's water supply. It is therefore, the intent of the legislature to conserve, protect, and preserve the important natural resources of the State through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety and welfare.

HRS § 183C-1.

89. In evaluating the merits of a proposed land use in the Conservation District, the Board shall consider the following eight criteria found in HAR § 13-5-30(c):
1. The proposed land use is consistent with the purpose of the conservation district;
 2. The proposed land use is consistent with the objectives of the subzone of the land on which the use will occur;
 3. The proposed land use complies with provisions and guidelines contained in chapter 205A, HRS, entitled "Coastal Zone Management", where applicable;
 4. The proposed land use will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region;
 5. The proposed land use, including buildings, structures, and facilities, shall be compatible with the locality and surrounding areas, appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the specific parcel or parcels;
 6. The existing physical and environmental aspects of the land, such as natural beauty and open space characteristics, will be preserved or improved upon, whichever is applicable;
 7. Subdivision of land will not be utilized to increase the intensity of land uses in the conservation district; and
 8. The proposed land use will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
90. Conservation District lands are categorized into subzones. HAR § 13-5-10.
91. The TMT Project is proposed to be located in the Resource subzone. The Resource subzone includes, *inter alia*, lands (1) necessary for providing future parkland and lands presently used for national, state, county, or private parks; (2) suitable for growing and harvesting of commercial timber or other forest products; and (3) suitable for outdoor recreational uses. HAR § 13-5-13.
92. Under the version of HAR § 13-5-13 that was in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, the stated objective of the Resource subzone was to develop, with proper management, areas to ensure sustained use of the natural resources of areas within that subzone. Under the recently amended version of that Section, the stated objective of the Resource subzone is to ensure, with proper management, the sustainable use of the natural resources of those areas.
93. Identified permissible land uses in the Resource subzone include, among others, the following: (1) aquaculture; (2) artificial reefs; (3) sustainable commercial forestry; (4) marine construction, such as dredging and filling; (5) mining and extraction of natural

resources; and (7) single family residences. HAR § 13-5-24.

94. Astronomy facilities are expressly identified as permissible land uses in the Resource subzone (R-3). HAR § 13-5-24.
95. The legislature specifically enacted statutes intended to ensure that land development in the State is "for those uses for which they are best suited[.]" S. Stand. Comm. Rep. 104, 1961 Senate Journal 1027; *accord* HRS § 183C-3 (giving DLNR the authority to zone and define land use within conservation districts).
96. In so doing, the legislature specifically defined "land use" as including "[t]he construction, reconstruction, demolition, or alteration of any structure, building, or facility on land[.]" HRS § 183C-2; *accord* HAR § 13-5-2. In keeping with the legislative intent and specific delegation of authority, DLNR identified astronomy facilities within the Resource subzone. HAR § 13-5-24(a), (c).
97. In other words, when the governing administrative rules and the legislative intent and plain language of the statute are read together, it is clear that astronomy facilities were identified by DLNR precisely because they are uses for which land within the Resource subzone is "best suited." *See, e.g.*, S. Stand. Comm. Rep. 104, 1961 Senate Journal 1027; *accord* HRS § 183C-3; HAR § 13-5-24(a).
98. Astronomy facilities in the Resource subzone require a BLNR permit and an approved management plan. HAR § 13-5-24. Under the recently amended version of HAR § 13- 5-24, a management plan "approved simultaneously with the permit" is required.

D. CASE LAW

i. **PASH**

99. In *Public Access Shoreline Hawai‘i v. Hawai‘i County Planning Comm’n*, 79 Hawai‘i 425, 903 P.2d 1246 (1995) ("**PASH**"), the Hawai‘i Supreme Court stated:

"The State’s power to regulate the exercise of customarily and traditionally exercised Hawaiian rights . . . necessarily allows the State to permit development that interferes with such rights in certain circumstances . . . Nevertheless, the State is obligated to protect the reasonable exercise of customary and traditionally exercised rights of Hawaiians to the extent feasible."

PASH, 79 Hawai‘i at 450 n.43, 903 P.2d at 1271 n.43 (citations omitted).
100. Under *PASH*, to fall within the protection of Hawai‘i law, Hawaiian customary usage must have been established in practice by November 25, 1892. *Id.* at 447, 903 P.2d at 1268. Moreover, the ancient Hawaiian usage must be based on actual traditional practice in a particular area of undeveloped land, and cannot be based on assumptions or conjecture. *Id.* at 449, 903 P.2d at 1270. *See also Id.* at 447, 903 P.2d at 1268 ("We stress

that unreasonable or non-traditional uses are not permitted under today's ruling.").

101. The State therefore retains the responsibility to reconcile competing interests under article XII, Section 7, and the Court in *PASH* recognized that even certain traditional and customary practices may be subject to regulation. *See id* at 447, 903 P.2d at 1268 (citing *United States v. Winans*, 198 U.S. 371, 379 (1905) (noting that the trial court held that it would not be justified in issuing process to compel land owner to permit native Americans to make a camping ground while engaged in fishing permitted by treaty). *See, also Id.* at 447 n. 38, 903 P.2d at 1268 no. 38 (citing *Lyng v. Northwest Cemetery Protective Ass'n.*, 485 U.S. 439 (1988) (holding that attempts by religious practitioners to exclude all other uses, including timber harvesting, from sacred areas of public lands unreasonable traditional practice); *Oregon v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872 (1990) (holding that the use of the hallucinogenic drug peyote unreasonable traditional practice)).
102. Thus, the Hawai'i Supreme Court recognized in *PASH* that the rights granted under Article XII, Section 7 are not absolute, and the "State is authorized to impose appropriate regulations to govern the exercise of native Hawaiian rights in conjunction with permits issued for the development of land previously undeveloped or not yet fully developed." *Id.* at 451, 903 P.2d at 1272.

ii. *Hanapi*

103. In *State v. Hanapi*, 89 Hawai'i 177, 970 P.2d 485 (1998) ("***Hanapi***"), the Hawai'i Supreme Court ruled that a person claiming constitutional protection for a right under *PASH* has the burden of proving the existence of such a right.
- 103A. *Hanapi* was a criminal prosecution. In a CDUA, under *Ka Pa'akai o Ka 'Āina v. Land Use Comm'n*, 94 Hawai'i 31, 7 P.3d 1068 (2000) ("***Ka Pa'akai***"), the BLNR, prior to granting a permit, must establish what protected traditional and customary rights might be affected by the project, even if there is no opposition to the permit and no one comes forward to claim any rights. In the context of the present application, where exhaustive efforts were made to investigate and determine the extent of traditional and customary practices even before the application was filed, and a contested case hearing has been held, *Hanapi's* burden of proof should apply to any new claims of traditional and customary rights asserted by a party or other individual that were not previously identified by the applicant. In other words, it is the claimant's burden to present evidence sufficient to establish the existence of the right; it is not the applicant's burden to negate the claimed right.
104. To prove the existence of a right that is entitled to constitutional protection under *PASH*, the party claiming that right must show, at a minimum, the following three factors:

First, he or she must qualify as a "native Hawaiian" within the guidelines set out in *PASH*...*PASH* stated that those persons who are "descendants of native Hawaiians who inhabited the island prior to 1778," and who assert otherwise valid customary and traditional Hawaiian rights are entitled to [constitutional]

protection, regardless of their blood quantum.

Second, once [a person claiming a *PASH* right] qualifies as a native Hawaiian, he or she must then establish that his or her claimed right is constitutionally protected as a customary or traditional native Hawaiian practice...

Finally, a [person] claiming his or her conduct is constitutionally protected must also prove that the exercise of the right occurred on undeveloped or "less than fully developed property."

Hanapi, 89 Hawai‘i at 177, 970 P.2d at 494 (citations and emphasis omitted).

105. Under the Hawai‘i Supreme Court’s holding in *Hanapi*, "[t]o establish the existence of a traditional or customary native Hawaiian practice, . . . there must be an adequate foundation in the record connecting the claimed right to a firmly rooted traditional or customary native Hawaiian practice." *Id.* at 187, 970 P.2d at 495 (footnote omitted).

iii. Pratt

106. In *State v. Pratt*, 127 Hawai‘i 206, 277 P.3d 300 (2012) ("**Pratt**") the Hawai‘i Supreme Court held that even if a person meets all three elements of the *Hanapi* test, the rights articulated in article XII, section 7 are not absolute and are explicitly "subject to the right of the State to regulate such rights." *Id.* at 214, 277 P.2d at 308.
107. The Court observed that "A common thread tying all of these cases together [*i.e.*, *PASH*; *Kalipi v. Hawaiian Trust Co., Ltd.*, 66 Haw. 1, 656 P.2d 745 (1982); and *Pele Defense Fund v. Paty*, 73 Haw. 578, 837 P.2d 1247 (1992)] is an attempt to balance the protections afforded to Native Hawaiians in the State, while also considering countervailing interests." *Pratt*, 127 Hawai‘i at 215, 277 P.2d at 309.
108. Under *Pratt*, the balancing of interests must consider the *totality of the circumstances*, including *all* of the parties’ respective interests. *Id.* at 217, 277 P.3d at 311.

iv. Ka Pa‘akai

109. In *Ka Pa‘akai o Ka ‘Āina v. Land Use Comm’n*, 94 Hawai‘i 31, 7 P.3d 1068 (2000) ("**Ka Pa‘akai**"), the Hawai‘i Supreme Court provided an analytical framework "to effectuate the State’s obligation to protect native Hawaiian customary and traditional practices while reasonably accommodating competing private interests[.]" *Id.* at 46-47, 7 P.3d at 1083-84.
110. Under *Ka Pa‘akai*, an agency, in order to fulfill its duty to preserve and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights to the extent feasible, must examine, and make specific findings and conclusions as to:

(1) the identity and scope of "valued cultural, historical, or natural resources in the [application] area, including the extent to which traditional and customary native

Hawaiian rights are exercised in the [application] area; (2) the extent to which those resources – including traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights – will be affected or impaired by the proposed action; and (3) the feasible action, if any, to be taken by the [agency] to reasonably protect native Hawaiian rights if they are found to exist.

Id. at 47, 7 P.3d at 1084 (footnotes omitted).

111. A *Ka Pa ‘akai* analysis may be conducted by an agency within the context of a contested case hearing. *See generally, Id.* (analyzing the Land Use Commission’s findings of fact and conclusions of law following contested case hearing).

v. *Morimoto*

112. In *Morimoto v. BLNR*, 107 Hawai‘i 296, 113 P.3d 172 (2005) ("***Morimoto***"), the Hawai‘i Supreme Court held:

[W]hen an applicant submits its application for a CDUP, the public and interested parties know that BLNR will evaluate the application in accordance with the eight criteria in HAR § 13-5-30(c), that BLNR will look to any draft EIS or EA that must be submitted as part of the application, and that BLNR will incorporate any representations in the EIS or EA (relevant to mitigation) as a condition of the CDUP. These rules provide sufficient guidance to CDUP applicants and the public, offsetting the threat of "unbridled discretion."

Morimoto, 107 Hawai‘i at 304, 113 P.3d at 180 (citation omitted).

113. BLNR may properly consider mitigation measures in an EIS when reviewing an application for a CDUP to determine if it is consistent with the criteria set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c). *Id.* at 302-04, 113 P.3d at 178-80.

vi. *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou*

114. In *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. Board of Land and Natural Resources*, 136 Hawai‘i 376, 363 P.3d 224 ("***Mauna Kea Anaina Hou***"), the Hawai‘i Supreme Court held that where a party is entitled to a contested case hearing before the BLNR on a CDUA, due process requires that the contested case hearing be held prior to the BLNR voting on the issuance of a CDUP.

vii. *Kilakila ‘O Haleakalā*

115. In *Kilakila ‘O Haleakalā v. Bd. of Land and Natural Resources*, 138 Hawai‘i 383, 382 P.3d 195 (2016) ("***Kilakila***"), the Hawai‘i Supreme Court affirmed the BLNR’s findings and conclusions with respect to the issuance of a CDUP for a proposed advanced solar telescope in the general subzone of the conservation district near the summit of Haleakalā and within the 18.166-acre Haleakalā High Altitude Observatory ("**HHAO**").

116. The Court held that the BLNR properly analyzed all eight criteria under HAR § 13-5-30(c), and that the evidence supported BLNR's findings and conclusions with respect to the five criteria in HAR § 13-5-30(c) at issue on appeal: HAR § 13-5-30(c)(1), (2), (4), (5), and (6). *Id.* at 402-08, 382 P.3d at 214-20.
117. With respect to HAR § 13-5-30(c)(1) and (2) ("The proposed land use is consistent with the purpose of the conservation district" and "The proposed land use is consistent with the objectives of the subzone of the land on which the use will occur"), the Court held that BLNR, regardless of a telescope's physical characteristics, may properly determine that a telescope is consistent with the purpose of the conservation district and applicable subzone since the BLNR rules specifically permit astronomy facilities in certain subzones and "do not specify a limit as to size, appearance, or other characteristics" of an astronomy facility. *Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 408, 382 P.3d at 220. The Court further held that BLNR may properly conclude that a telescope complies with the broad purposes of the statutes and rules regulating conservation districts, including BLNR's mandate to manage natural and cultural resources to "promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety, and welfare". *Id.*
118. With respect to HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4) ("The proposed land use will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community or region"), the Court held that:
- a. While the BLNR was required to consider the findings of the project EIS, "it was not bound by these findings and still retained discretion over its decision." *Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 402, 382 P.3d at 214 (citing *Mauna Kea Power Co. v. Bd. Of Land & Natural Res.*, 76 Hawai'i 259, 265, 874 P.2d 1084, 1090 (1994) (affirming the BLNR's decision despite conflicting conclusions in EIS));
 - b. The impacts of a project must be viewed within the context of the applicable area. *Id.* at 403, 382 P.3d at 215 (upholding the BLNR's analysis that the impact of the ATST Telescope on cultural and visual resources would be incremental and not substantial because the ATST Telescope "must be viewed in the context of the HO," which housed astronomy facilities since the 1950s, was created specifically for astronomy uses, and currently housed eleven facilities.);
 - c. The BLNR may consider that the level of impacts on natural resources of a project would be substantially the same even in the absence of the project;
 - d. The BLNR may consider the various mitigating measures proposed for a project including the compact design of the telescope, creating a native Hawaiian working group, setting aside areas solely for use by native Hawaiians, removing unused facilities, and decommissioning the ATST Telescope within 50 years. *Id.* at 404, 382 P.3d at 216); and
 - e. The BLNR may consider the scientific, cultural, and educational benefits of a project as mitigating effects under HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4) (*i.e.*, the "scientific,

economic, and educational benefits" of the ATST Telescope, the expected "advancement of scientific knowledge" and the opportunity to "foster a better understanding of the relationships between native Hawaiian culture and science"), even if those factors are not specifically set forth in HAR § 13-5- 30(c) *Id.*

119. With respect to HAR § 13-5-30(c)(5) ("The proposed land use, including buildings, structures, and facilities, shall be compatible with the locality and surrounding areas, appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the specific parcel or parcels"), the Court held that under this criterion, the BLNR may focus its analysis on the permitted land use within the context of a specific area within a Conservation District designated for similar uses (*i.e.*, the Court concluded that the BLNR's interpretation of its own rule as limiting its consideration only to the "locality" of the telescope site and the HO area as the "surrounding area" was not clearly erroneous because the telescope would be located in a small subsection of the HO site, which is a clearly defined, specialized area set aside for astronomical purposes, is the only site within Haleakalā used for that purpose, and the BLNR was not required to consider the broader "surrounding area" of Haleakalā National Park). *Id.* at 406-07, 382 P.3d at 218- 19.
120. With respect to HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6) ("The existing physical and environmental aspects of the land, such as natural beauty and open space characteristics, will be preserved or improved upon, whichever is applicable"), the Court held that even though the BLNR may conclude that a project, standing alone, does not "enhance the natural beauty or open space characteristics" of a specific site, the BLNR may properly consider whether the project is similar to existing facilities (and thus will preserve the existing physical and environmental aspects of the land), and the BLNR may also properly consider the project's mitigation commitments in determining whether the proposed land use meets this criteria.

X. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

A. THE TMT PROJECT SATISFIES THE EIGHT CRITERIA OF HAR § 13- 5-30(C)

121. HAR § 13-5-30(c) states that "[i]n evaluating the merits of a proposed land use, the department or board shall apply the following criteria," and enumerates the list of eight criteria quoted above.
122. As set forth herein, the TMT Project satisfies the eight criteria for a BLNR-approved CDUP under HAR § 13-5-30(c). WDT White at 13; Ex. A-31; (White) Tr. 10/20/16 at 218:3- 28:5; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 24:17-23.
123. Many of the Petitioners, Opposing Intervenors, and their witnesses claimed during their testimonies that the TMT Project does not comply with the eight criteria in HAR § 13-5-30. However, in offering their respective testimonies, the Petitioners, Opposing Intervenors, and their witnesses repeatedly admitted that they did not even consider or read the Hawai'i Supreme Court's recent decision in *Kilakila 'o Haleakalā v. Board of Land and Natural Resources*, 138 Hawai'i 383, 382 P.3d 195 (2016), which extensively

discussed several of the same eight criteria. *See* (Prof. Fujikane) Tr. 1/11/17 at 84:25-85:15; Tr. 1/19/17 at 129:2-11 (Dr. Abad); Tr. 1/25/17 at 147:18-24 (Prof. Mills); (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 229:3-6 (Flores); Tr. 1/31/17 at 135:7-10 (Ward); Tr. 2/22/17 at 132:20-133:8 (Ho); Tr. 2/28/17 at 263:15-20 (Trask); Tr. 3/1/17 at 202:22-25 (Camara). While Frankel, who testified on behalf of KAHEA in this proceeding, represented the appellant in the *Kilakila* case, he testified on cross examination that he did not consider *Kilakila* in offering his testimony in this proceeding because it did not involve the public trust doctrine, which his testimony in this proceeding was limited to. Tr. 1/11/17 at 49:9-17.

124. Based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law contained herein, the TMT Project is consistent with the eight criteria of HAR § 13-5-30(c), and UH Hilo has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it meets the requirements for the granting of the CDUP for the TMT Project.

i. The TMT Project Satisfies the First Criterion

125. The first criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(1), states: "The proposed land use is consistent with the purpose of the conservation district[.]"
126. The purpose of the Conservation District is "to conserve, protect and preserve the important natural resources of the State through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety and welfare." HRS § 183C-1.
127. The purpose of the Conservation District rules is "to regulate land-use in the conservation district for the purpose of conserving, protecting, and preserving the important natural and cultural resources of the State through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety, and welfare." HAR § 13-5-1.
128. Therefore, the issue under the first criterion is whether the proposed land use will be appropriately managed and used to protect, preserve and promote the long-term sustainability of important natural resources, public health, safety and welfare.
129. The 11,288-acre MKSR is within the Conservation District, and the proposed TMT Project is within the MKSR's 525-acre Astronomy Precinct, which currently houses eight optical and/or infrared observatories, and three submillimeter observatories.
130. The proposed use within the already-developed Astronomy Precinct is consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District to conserve, protect, preserve and promote the long-term sustainability of the surrounding areas within the MKSR.
131. In addition, the TMT Project provides for "appropriate management and use" that promotes the long-term sustainability of resources and the public health, safety, and welfare within the Conservation District.
132. As noted in the findings of fact above and in these conclusions, the TMT Project will promote the health, safety and welfare of the public through the advancement of scientific

study, providing educational benefits in the form of telescope viewing time for the University students and researchers, advancing STEM educational opportunities for Hawai‘i residents through the community benefits package, and other measures.

133. The TMT Project will be subject to management through the BLNR-approved CMP and sub-plans, TMT Management Plan, which complies with Ex. 3 of Section 13-5 of the Hawai‘i Administrative Rules, and the BLNR-imposed conditions to the CDUP, as well as the University’s internal Master Plan. The TMT Project is consistent with the foregoing plans, and this comprehensive management framework appropriately addresses cultural and natural resources, public access, and the ultimate decommissioning of the Project and restoration of its site.
134. By following the applicable provisions of the various relevant plans, sub-plans, and permit conditions, UH Hilo and the TIO will conserve, protect, and preserve the important natural and cultural resources of the State, will promote the long-term sustainability of those resources, and will promote the health, safety, and welfare of the public.
135. By following the applicable provisions of the various relevant plans, sub-plans, and permit conditions, the TMT Project will comply with the Conservation District rules and applicable laws and regulations.
136. The characteristics that make Mauna Kea uniquely suitable for astronomy (including its altitude, stable atmospheric clarity and absence of light pollution), which make it arguably the single best location in the northern hemisphere to conduct astronomical research, are also "important natural resources of the State" that must be appropriately managed and used to "promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety, and welfare."
137. Given the TMT Project’s design, mitigation efforts, planned financial contributions to the management of MKSR, and consistency with the objectives and provisions of the applicable plans, the TMT Project will conserve, protect and promote these unique and important astronomical natural resources of the State.
138. For all of these reasons, and for the reasons set forth in the findings of fact above, the TMT Project is therefore consistent with the broad purposes of the Conservation District, in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(1). *See Kilakila*, 138 Hawai‘i at 408, 382 P.3d at 220.

ii. *The TMT Project Satisfies the Second Criterion*

139. The second criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(2), states: "The proposed land use is consistent with the objectives of the subzone of the land on which the use will occur[.]"
140. The TMT Project is consistent with the objectives of the subzone of the land on which the use will occur, in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(2).
141. The TMT Project is located in the Resource subzone.

142. Under the version of HAR § 13-5-13(a) that was in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, "[t]he objective of this [Resource] subzone is to develop, with proper management, areas to ensure sustained use of the natural resources of those areas." The current version of HAR 13-5-13(a) states: "The objective of this subzone is to ensure, with proper management, the sustainable use of the natural resources of those areas."
143. Thus, the Resource subzone expressly contemplates and permits use and development within the subzone, and the TMT Project, as an astronomy facility, is specifically and expressly permitted as an allowed use within the Resource subzone of the Conservation District. HAR § 13-5-24(c) R-3.
144. As noted in the findings of fact above and conclusions herein, although the BLNR has reviewed and considered the physical characteristics of the TMT Project and proposed mitigation measures in connection with its analysis of various criteria, the BLNR notes that for purposes of the criteria in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(1) and (c)(2), these rules do not specify limits as to the size, appearance or other characteristics of an astronomy facility within the subzone.
145. As an astronomy facility, the TMT Project falls under an appropriate use and is consistent with the purposes of the Resource subzone.
146. One of the objectives of the subzone is to develop and promote science through astronomy facilities constructed in the approved geographic areas, including Area E within the Mauna Kea Astronomy Precinct.
147. The TMT Project develops, with proper management, the areas involved in the Project to ensure sustained use of the natural resources of those areas. These include the elevation, clear skies, humidity, minimal light pollution, and stable wind flow.
148. Under the version of HAR § 13-5-24(c) that was in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, "Astronomy facilities under an approved management plan" are permitted in the Resource subzone. Astronomy facilities under a management plan approved by the Board are also permitted in the Resource subzone under the current version of the HAR.
149. Under the version of HAR § 13-5-2 that was in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, "'Management plan' means a comprehensive plan for carrying out multiple land uses."
150. The CMP, with its sub-plans, is a comprehensive plan for carrying out multiple land uses that had already been approved by the BLNR and was in place when the CDUA for the TMT Project came before the BLNR.
151. The TMT Project, as set forth in the CDUA and supporting documents, is consistent with the provisions of the CMP and sub-plans.
152. Under the amended version of HAR § 13-5-13(a) that is currently in place, "[t]he objective of this [Resource] subzone is to ensure, with proper management, the sustainable use of the natural resources of those areas."

153. The TMT Project ensures, with proper management, the sustainable use of the natural resources of the areas involved in the Project.
154. Under the amended version of HAR § 13-5-24(c) that is currently in place, "Astronomy facilities under a management plan approved simultaneously with the permit" are permitted in the Resource subzone.
155. Under the amended version of HAR § 13-5-2 that is currently in place, "'Management plan' means a project or site based plan to protect and conserve natural and cultural resources."
156. The TMT Management Plan, which is a project or site based plan to protect and conserve natural and cultural resources, was appended to the CDUA.
157. The TMT Management Plan is consistent with the CMP and sub-plans, and provides for implementation of all relevant action items and plans of the CMP and sub-plans on a site-specific basis.
158. Petitioner Flores-Case `Ohana's position is that the University is not in compliance with the CMP because it has not been updated. Ex. B.02a at 4; (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 31:16-17. When the BLNR approved the CMP, it only required the University or its designee to submit and present annual reports on the status of the CMP management actions. The BLNR does not require the University to prepare a five-year update, as Mr. Flores argued, but provides that OMKM may do one. Ex. B.02z at § 4.2.2 at 17. This language is permissive, not mandatory. OMKM's position is that a separate five-year review and a five-year amendment is premature because five years is too short a period to fully vet all management actions. If OMKM were to amend the CMP, it would be relatively minor edits, such as the spelling of place names and eliminating redundancies. Moreover, a five-year review is not necessary because OMKM's annual reports are cumulative and reflect everything that was done since the CMP was first implemented. Ex. A-133 at 5-6; Tr. 12/12/16 at 180:8-181:1. Therefore, all information that would have been included in a five-year review was and is incorporated in annual reports, such as OMKM's 2015 annual report. Exhibit A-21; Tr. 12/12/16 at 182:17-184:1.
159. Thus, under both versions of HAR § 13-5-24(c), the requirement of a management plan has been satisfied.
160. Furthermore, the proposed use does not significantly, adversely, or cumulatively impact the natural resources present in the Mauna Kea Summit Region Historic District, alpine stone desert, or other land area designation that encompasses either the breadth or endemic suite of resources present on Mauna Kea. See HAR § 13-5-1.
161. To the extent HAR § 13-5-13(a) requires protection of other natural resources within the Resource subzone beyond those proposed to be used, the reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the comprehensive management plans, design elements, and mitigation measures described herein and in the CDUA and supporting documents and evidence provide for the sustainable use and protection of those natural resources.

162. For all these reasons, and for the reasons set forth in the findings of fact above, the proposed land use is consistent with the objectives of the subzone of the land on which the use will occur.

iii. The TMT Project Satisfies the Third Criterion

163. The third criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(3), states: "The proposed land use complies with provisions and guidelines contained in chapter 205A, HRS, entitled 'Coastal Zone Management', where applicable[.]"
164. The TMT Project complies with provisions and guidelines contained in chapter 205A, HRS, entitled "Coastal Zone Management", in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(3).
165. Under HRS § 205A-1, "'Coastal zone management area' means all lands of the State and the area extending seaward from the shoreline to the limit of the State's police power and management authority, including the United States territorial sea."
166. Under HRS § 205A-22, "'Special management area' means the land extending inland from the shoreline as delineated on the maps filed with the authority as of June 8, 1977, or as amended pursuant to section 205A-23."
167. The TMT Project is not in the special management area, and Part II of Chapter 205A, HRS §§ 205A-21 – 205A-33, which applies only to lands within the special management area, does not apply to the TMT Project.
168. Many of Chapter 205A's objectives, such as protection of historic resources, scenic and open space resources, and recreational resources, parallel the objectives of the Conservation District.
169. For the same reasons that the TMT Project is consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District, and given the mitigation measures to reduce and minimize the impacts of the project on surrounding areas as discussed in the findings of fact above and conclusions herein, it is also consistent with the objectives of Chapter 205A.
170. The TMT Project satisfies all of the applicable objectives of Chapter 205A that do not overlap with the Conservation District but are unique to Chapter 205A.
171. Specifically, Chapter 205A describes objectives relating to coastal ecosystems (including the impact of upland areas on coastal ecosystems), which are intended to promote and protect water quality.
172. As noted in the findings of fact above, the TMT Project will have no significant or adverse impact on water resources, including no significant impacts upon Lake Waiau and ground water, and no significant effects upon the surrounding areas through surface water runoff or through wastewater (which will be collected and transported off the summit for treatment and disposal).
173. Therefore, the TMT Project satisfies all of the objectives of Chapter 205A as to water

quality issues.

174. Based on the above findings and applicable law, the proposed land use is consistent with provisions and guidelines contained in Chapter 205A, HRS, entitled "Coastal Zone Management," where applicable.

iv. *The TMT Project Satisfies the Fourth Criterion*

175. The fourth criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4), states: "The proposed land use will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region[.]"
176. The TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region, in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4).
177. Under the version of HAR § 13-5-2 that was in effect when the CDUA was submitted to the BLNR, "Natural resource" is defined as meaning "resources such as plants, aquatic life and wildlife, cultural, historic and archeological sites, and minerals." The amendment added to this definition "recreational" and "geologic" sites, "scenic areas, ecologically significant areas," and "watersheds."
178. By mandating that BLNR consider impacts to the resources that are "existing," within the surrounding area, this criterion requires that a proposed project be assessed within the context of what is already there.
179. The impacts of the TMT Project must therefore be viewed in the context of the Astronomy Precinct, which is within the MKSR that was specifically established by the community and the State for astronomy uses on Mauna Kea, has housed astronomy facilities since the 1960's, and currently has eight optical / infrared observatories, three submillimeter observatories and a radio telescope.
180. In the context of the existing summit area cumulative impacts—and under the assumption that such cumulative impacts will continue—the TMT Project does not create or cause substantial adverse impacts to existing natural resources in the applicable area. The existing uses and resources are already committed to astronomical uses and objectives, and otherwise based upon commitments of the CDUA and University proposals, several facilities will be removed thereby significantly reducing substantial existing adverse impacts on the more sensitive and visible summit ridge areas within the Astronomy Precinct.
181. All of the current astronomy facilities (except the radio telescope), as well as the proposed site of the TMT Project, are within the 525-acre Astronomy Precinct, which is less than five percent of the 11,288 acre MKSR.
182. Under the MKSR Master Plan, astronomy development is further restricted to a defined 150-acre portion within the Astronomy Precinct.

183. It is undisputed that without the TMT Project, the cumulative effects of astronomical development and other uses in the summit area of Mauna Kea have previously resulted in impacts that are substantial, significant and adverse.
184. The TMT Observatory will not tip the balance of any existing impact from a level that is currently less than significant to a significant level. Tr. 10/25/16 at 181:6-10.
185. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have argued repeatedly that because UH Hilo acknowledges that the summit area of Mauna Kea has already sustained significant and adverse impacts, it "admits" the TMT Project will itself have substantial adverse impacts. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors misconstrue UH Hilo's position. The UH Hilo has never made such an admission, and, as set forth in these findings of fact and conclusions of law, the TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impacts.
186. By arguing that the summit area of Mauna Kea has suffered "unlawful" significant and adverse impacts in the past, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors also imply that no project can be undertaken in that area without first *reducing* the *existing* cumulative impacts to a level that is less than significant and adverse. Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' arguments are legally unsupported.
187. In other jurisdictions, where projects have been proposed for locations that were already substantially impacted by previous development, courts have assessed the proposed new projects on their own merits, found impacts not to be significant, and approved the projects without first requiring the existing impacts in the surrounding area to be reduced to a less-than-substantial level. *See, e.g., Geer v. Fed. Highway Admin.*, 975 F. Supp. 47, 73-74 (D. Mass. 1997) ("although there were noise and visual impacts those impacts were not substantial given the urban context of the project and the existing impacts under a no-build option").
188. Moreover, the Hawai'i Supreme Court recognizes the difference between developed and undeveloped land, and acknowledges the treatment of resources (specifically including cultural resources) varies depending upon whether land is developed or undeveloped. *See, e.g., Kalipi*, 66 Haw. at 8-9, 656 P.2d at 749-50.
189. Specifically, HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4) does not require an analysis of whether (and how) *existing* cumulative impacts should be mitigated. Rather, the proper analysis is whether, viewed within the context of such existing cumulative impacts – and under the assumption that such cumulative impacts will continue – a new proposed land use will cause substantial adverse impacts to existing natural resources in the applicable area. *See Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 402-05, 382 P.3d at 214-17.
190. The plain language of the criterion itself directs BLNR to consider whether the "proposed land use" itself – *not* other existing uses and/or conditions – will cause "substantial adverse impact to *existing* natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region[.]" HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4).
191. The reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence, specifically including but not limited to the testimonies of White, Hayes, Nees, Dr. Smith, Nance, Dr. Sanders, and

Rechtman, and applicable exhibits, demonstrates that the TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing plants, aquatic life and wildlife, cultural, historic, and archaeological sites, minerals, recreational sites, geologic sites, scenic areas, ecologically significant areas, and watersheds.

192. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors did not offer reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence, whether from witnesses or exhibits, that would support the conclusion that the TMT Project would cause substantial adverse impact to existing plants, aquatic life and wildlife, cultural, historic, and archaeological sites, minerals, recreational sites, geologic sites, scenic areas, ecologically significant areas, or watersheds.
193. The surrounding pāhoehoe lava rock upon which the structure will be constructed is a common lava foundation feature for the surrounding areas upon which existing astronomy facilities have been constructed.
194. Under HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4), BLNR may properly consider that the level of impacts on natural resources of a proposed land use would be substantially the same even in the absence of the project.
195. The level of impacts on natural resources within the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR would be substantially the same even in the absence of the TMT Project within the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR.
196. The incremental nature of a project's impacts, standing alone, cannot endlessly justify development within an existing developed area (*See Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 404-05, 382 P.3d at 216-17); however, the TMT Project, given the specific findings of fact herein, and based on the weight of the reliable, probative and substantial evidence, will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region. HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4).
197. In some situations, incremental changes add up to a qualitative difference and create a tipping point. A small increase in temperature can cause coral bleaching. *Center for Biological Diversity v. NHTSA*, 508 F.3d 508 (9th Cir. 2007.) Small increases in the number of cars can push traffic to an unacceptable level of service. *Dept. of Land Conservation & Development v. Klamath Cty.*, LUBA 2001-029 (Or. LUBA 2001.)
198. Mauna Kea is unlike these examples. TMT opponents who emphasize Mauna Kea's cultural and religious significance and natural beauty basically contend that a large building such as the TMT would detract from the spiritual and aesthetic experience of the mountain in its natural state. This perspective envisions Mauna Kea as a natural landscape, free of large buildings. But the summit of Mauna Kea ceased to be a natural landscape over forty years ago, when the first large observatory, the 80' high UH 2.2 meter telescope, was completed in 1970. The 125' high CFHT followed in 1979, the 100' high JCMT in 1987, the 111' high Keck I and II observatories were completed in 1992 and 1996, respectively, and the 151' Gemini and 141' Subaru observatories were completed in 1999. (Dates of completion from Ex. A-3/R-3, vol. 1, p. 3-151; dome heights from *Id.*, p. 3-81.) Large observatories have been a major visual element on the

summit for decades. A 13th observatory – the 7th over 100' in height – would not change that. This is exactly like *Kilakila*, where the "level of impacts on natural resources would be substantially the same even in the absence" of the new observatory. *Id.* at 405.

199. The record lacks any evidence, reason, or coherent argument that the TMT is significantly more offensive from an aesthetic or spiritual standpoint than the other large observatories. In some ways it should be considered less offensive: it is not on the summit ridge, and it incorporates more environmental safeguards.
200. The record also lacks any evidence, reason, or coherent argument that the TMT, added to the previous observatories, will create a tipping point where impacts become significant.
201. Each of the twelve observatories now on Mauna Kea received a CDUP, Ex. A-7 at p. 7, a public process that included the opportunity for contested case hearings, *see Stop H-3 Ass'n v. DOT, supra*, and for judicial review. None of these twelve permits were judicially challenged; the first judicial challenge was to the Keck "Outrigger" project in 2004. Ex. A-9 at p. 3-8. The BLNR approved the CDUP for the SMA project in November 1994 after receiving "no objections". Ex. A-155, p. 3. The validity of the prior twelve CDUP decisions, and the specific reasoning that went into them, are not at issue in this proceeding; the time for any judicial action expired decades ago. The administrative rules specifically allow the continuation of existing permitted uses. HAR §§ 13-5-22(a)(P-8), -23(a), -24(a), -25(a). Today's decisions, and our options, are shaped by decisions made in the past.
202. The reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impacts to cultural, historical, and archaeological sites.
203. Under the definition of "Natural resource" in HAR § 13-5-2, cultural, historical, and archaeological "sites" are "natural resources"; but cultural *practices* are not necessarily.
204. In accordance with the express language of the Conservation District Rules, cultural practices are not "natural resources" and so are not required to be considered in an analysis of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4). (The effect on cultural practices is analyzed elsewhere.)
205. In any case, while the presence of the TMT Project in the Astronomy Precinct will introduce a new element in the Northern Plateau for certain cultural practitioners and may affect the setting in which certain contemporary practices occur, given the findings above, the reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impacts to cultural practices established prior to 2015.
206. No existing critical habitat, natural resources, or customary and traditional native Hawaiian practice can be considered endangered or substantially impacted in the specified area for the TMT Project site.
207. There is no credible proof that any historic feature, traditional practice, or viewplane will

be substantially or adversely impacted by construction at the proposed TMT Project site.

208. The Hawai'i Supreme Court has instructed that in assessing a proposed land use under HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4), mitigation measures for a project may be considered even if "mitigation" is not expressly stated in the rule. *See Morimoto*, 107 Hawai'i at 302-04, 113 P.3d at 178-80; *see also Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 402-04, 382 P.3d at 214-16 (finding it appropriate to consider mitigation measures as part of the assessment of impacts under this criterion).
209. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors, many of whom conceded during cross-examination that they had not reviewed *Kilakila*, claimed in this proceeding that the proposed mitigation measures for the TMT Project could not be considered in connection with HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4) because those mitigation measures, in their view, do not specifically address the environmental and cultural impacts of the project. *See e.g.* Petitioners' Collective Prehearing Statement at 4.
210. While the TMT Project's location in the Northern Plateau section of Area E will introduce a new visual element in that area for certain individual practitioners which may affect the setting in which certain practices occur; the reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project itself and otherwise in conjunction with its mitigation efforts, will not cause substantial adverse impact to recognized historic traditional and cultural practices.
211. Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' argument is factually and legally incorrect.
212. As noted in the findings of fact above, numerous proposed mitigation measures for the TMT Project are specifically designed to address the environmental and cultural impacts of the TMT Project, including, but not limited to:
 - a. The site selection and physical design of the project itself and related infrastructure to mitigate its visual, cultural and environmental impact;
 - b. The TMT Access Way design;
 - c. Implementing a cultural and natural resources training program;
 - d. Developing educational exhibits;
 - e. Restoring of Pu'u Poli'ahu;
 - f. Providing a sense of place within the TMT facilities;
 - g. Providing financial contributions to support cultural programs;
 - h. Implementing specific cultural and community outreach efforts;
 - i. Implementing cultural observance days;

- j. Continuing consultation with the State Historic Preservation Division and Kahu Kū Mauna Council regarding the protocols for the relocation of the modern shrine at the 13N site;
 - k. Implementing arthropod monitoring;
 - l. Working with OMKM to develop and implement a wēkiu bug habitat restoration study;
 - m. Developing and implementing an invasive species prevention and control program; and
 - n. Continuing consultations with cultural practitioners.
213. Moreover, under *Morimoto*, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court held that all mitigation measures set forth in an EIS (regardless of whether direct or indirect) must be made part of the conditions of the CDUP. *See Morimoto*, 107 Hawai‘i at 303-04, 113 P.3d at 179-80.
214. *Morimoto* suggests that where mitigation measures have been accepted as part of a final EIS, those mitigation measures – which are required to be made conditions of the CDUP – may also satisfy HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4). But more importantly, *Morimoto* clearly holds that *all* mitigation measures may be considered.
215. As noted above, the unchallenged FEIS for the TMT Project identifies an abundance of mitigation measures, both direct and indirect, that are aimed at ameliorating potential impacts on the environment and cultural practices. Taking into account the many measures proposed to mitigate the Project’s potential impacts on the environment and cultural practices confirms that the TMT Project will not cause substantial adverse impact to these areas.
216. In addition, under *Kilakila*, the Hearing Officer may take into consideration the scientific, economic and educational benefits of the TMT Project in determining that the project meets the criteria of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4). *See Kilakila*, 138 Hawai‘i at 405-06, 382 P.3d at 217-18 (noting that consideration of relevant scientific, economic and educational benefits of project does not conflict with the BLNR’s duty to protect natural and cultural resources through "appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety and welfare").
217. As noted in the findings of fact above and herein, the scientific and educational benefits of the TMT Project are material, substantial, and highly unique.
218. Based upon the testimony of Dr. Stone and other evidence, the TMT Project is designed to be a world-class telescope that will provide a much more advanced and powerful ground-based observatory than currently exists anywhere on Earth. The TMT Project is designed to investigate and answer some of the most fundamental questions regarding our universe, including studies relating to the formation of stars and galaxies shortly after the Big Bang and how the universe evolved to its present form.

219. Further, TIO has committed to a substantial community benefits package that has provided over \$2.5 million to date for grants and scholarships for STEM education to benefit Hawai‘i students, and TIO has committed to providing \$1 million annually for this program.
220. TIO will also pay sublease rent to the University (the first telescope developer to do so on Mauna Kea), and these funds will be used for the management of Mauna Kea through the Mauna Kea Special Management Fund, administered by OMKM.
221. For these and all other reasons noted in the findings above, the TMT Project will substantially improve the interests of the surrounding area, community, region, and public welfare by advancing public higher education in the State, ensuring that the University remains a premier institution for astronomy research throughout the world, and will bring other significant educational, economic and scientific benefits to Hawai‘i and its residents.
222. The reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that, through the comprehensive management schemes and the thoughtful design elements and mitigation measures described above and in the CDUA and supporting documents and evidence, the sustainable use of those TMT Project area natural resources will be appropriately protected and ensured.
223. Accordingly, the TMT Project satisfies the fourth criterion, HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4).

v. *The TMT Project Satisfies the Fifth Criterion*

224. The fifth criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(5), states: "The proposed land use, including buildings, structures, and facilities, shall be compatible with the locality and surrounding areas, appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the specific parcel or parcels[.]"
225. The TMT Project, including buildings, structures, and facilities, is an astronomical facility that is compatible with the locality and surrounding areas, appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the specific parcel or parcels, in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(5).
226. The appropriate locality to be considered is the summit area of Mauna Kea within the MKSR, and more specifically, the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR. The Astronomy Precinct is similar to the HO site used as the appropriate locality in *Kilakila*, 138 Hawai‘i at 406-07, 382 P.3d at 218-19. Like the HO site, the Astronomy Precinct is the specific area planned for astronomical facilities, on which such facilities had historically been placed. Although the Astronomy Precinct is larger than the HO site, the existing observatories on Mauna Kea are also much larger and more spread out than those on Haleakalā.
227. The MKSR and adjacent Natural Area Reserve could also be considered as the locality. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have repeatedly emphasized the importance of the mountain as a whole. The MKSR contains the entire area leased to the UH and set aside

by Executive Order specifically for astronomical facilities and related buffers. The Natural Area Reserve contains the remaining high elevation areas on Mauna Kea.

- 228. It would not be appropriate to use a smaller unit than the Astronomy Precinct as the locality, or one that does not include the summit ridge. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor have emphasized the importance of considering the whole mountain. The summit ridge is the dominant geographical feature in the area, culturally significant, and the existing observatories are major features in the locality.
- 229. Astronomy facilities in the locality of the TMT Project are an expressly permitted use under HAR § 13-5-24.
- 230. As noted above, the TMT Project will be located on an approximately five acre site within the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR, which is a clearly defined, highly specialized area set aside specifically for astronomical facilities, and was first leased to the University in 1968 for this purpose.
- 231. The proposed location of the TMT Project is in relatively close proximity to the eleven other previously developed facilities for astronomy within the Astronomy Precinct, which is the only area now designated for astronomical facilities on Mauna Kea.
- 232. From most vantage points within the Astronomy Precinct where the TMT Project will be visible, other astronomy facilities are already visible.
- 233. The TMT Project will not be visible from the culturally sensitive areas of the summit of Kūkahau‘ula, Lake Waiau, Pu‘u Līlinoe, and Pu‘u Wēkiu.
- 234. As discussed extensively in the findings of fact, supra, the TMT site is perhaps the best site in the world for the construction of this telescope. The proposed land use, is, therefore, "appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities" of the specific parcel or parcels.
- 235. For all these reasons, and for the reasons set forth in the findings of fact above, the proposed land use, including buildings, structures, and facilities, is compatible with the locality and surrounding areas, and appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the specific parcel or parcels. Thus, the TMT Project satisfies the fifth criterion, HAR § 13-5-30(c)(5).

vi. *The TMT Project Satisfies the Sixth Criterion*

- 236. The sixth criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6), states: "The existing physical and environmental aspects of the land, such as natural beauty and open space characteristics, will be preserved or improved upon, whichever is applicable[.]"
- 237. The existing physical and environmental aspects of the land, such as natural beauty and open space characteristics, will be preserved or improved upon by the TMT Project, in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6).

238. The relevant land area to be considered in connection with this criterion can be considered to be the Astronomy Precinct or the MKSR. In addition, natural beauty and open space should be analyzed from the point of view of people who will experience them. This means, in this case, from distant populated areas or by visitors to the summit
239. It would make no sense to analyze whether a project negatively affected natural beauty or open space by considering "the land" affected as only the project area or its immediate vicinity. Construction of any significant building will reduce the "open space" aspects of its immediate vicinity. The BLNR, having reviewed and approved twelve separate CDUP's for observatories on Mauna Kea, see Ex. A-7 at p. 7, was clearly aware that astronomical facilities, as expressly allowed under the rules with a CDUP, could be very large structures, and were not normally hidden underground. The rules also expressly allow, with a CDUP, such structures as wind turbines, hydroelectric power plants, and geothermal power facilities, which are also often very large. H.A.R. §13-5-22(a). Such renewable energy facilities are allowed even in the Protective Subzone. *Id.*
240. It would be wrong to arbitrarily select a much smaller area as the unit of analysis for the sixth criterion such as the immediate vicinity of the project site, as discussed in the findings of fact, *supra*.
241. The Astronomy Precinct is analogous to the HO site chosen as the unit of analysis in *Kilakila*: the specific area planned for astronomical facilities, on which such facilities had already been built.
242. By its terms, the sixth criterion requires the consideration of the "existing" aspects. In analyzing open space and natural beauty for the TMT Project, this necessarily means including the existing observatories.
243. Criterion Six does not mean that every possible viewplane in the land area being considered must remain free of structures. Every building, unless hidden underground, will affect some viewplane.
244. The BLNR's interpretation of its own rules is generally entitled to deference unless plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the underlying legislative purpose. *Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 396, 382 P.3d at 208 (citing *Panado v. Bd. of Trs., Emps.' Ret. Sys.*, 134 Hawai'i 1, 11, 332 P.3d 144, 154 (2014)).
245. The BLNR's interpretation and approach to this issue is consistent with other jurisdictions, which, like the BLNR, recognize that the significance of a project's visual impacts must be assessed in light of the context where it occurs. *See, e.g., Bowman v. City of Berkeley*, 122 Cal. App. 4th 572, 589, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 814, 828 (2004) ("To conclude that replacement of a virgin hillside with a housing project constitutes a significant visual impact says little about the environmental significance of the appearance of a building in an area that is already highly developed."); *Geer*, 975 F. Supp. at 73-74 (project would have some visual impacts in river basin, but impacts were not significant given existing context, where "substantial" visual impacts were already present).

246. As Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have repeatedly emphasized, the visual landscape in the summit area of Mauna Kea has already been substantially altered and impacted, and it will remain so with or without the TMT Project. The TMT Project, and its visual impacts, must be assessed in that context. Adding the TMT to the existing physical context will not result in a substantial adverse impact.
247. The BLNR may approve a proposed land use despite some environmental impacts to the Conservation District, provided that the project incorporates appropriate measures and conditions to mitigate the project's adverse impacts. *See Morimoto*, 107 Hawai'i at 305-06, 113 P.3d at 181-82; *Stop H-3 Ass'n*, 68 Haw. at 157-62, 706 P.2d at 449-52.
248. Hawai'i law requires the "mitigation" of impacts; it does not require that impacts be eliminated altogether. *See Morimoto*, 107 Hawai'i at 305-06, 113 P.3d at 181-82 (finding that BLNR appropriately considered the effect of mitigation measures designed to "diminish" – not eliminate altogether – "the impact of the project upon the Palila").
249. Specifically regarding visual impacts, "mitigation" is understood to require reducing adverse impacts, not eliminating them. *See, e.g., Las Virgenes Homeowners Fed'n, Inc. v. Cnty. of Los Angeles*, 177 Cal. App. 3d 300, 308-09, 223 Cal. Rptr. 18, 25 (1986) (where Environmental Impact Report for mixed-use development project discussed numerous mitigation measures and project was conditioned on reducing project's size and using design, landscaping, and contouring to reduce adverse visual impact, mitigation measures were found to "exceed those required by law").
250. Courts have construed regulatory language similar to that contained in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6) to require "minimization of visibility and impacts," not elimination of visual impacts altogether. *See McCallister v. Calif. Coastal Comm'n*, 169 Cal. App. 4th 912, 955, 887 Cal. Rptr. 3d 365, 398 (2009) (where county land use plan required that siting of structures "shall not detract from natural beauty of the undeveloped skylines, ridgelines, and the shoreline," court found that regulations "require that visibility and visual impacts be minimized" to the extent reasonably feasible, but did not require reduction of visibility to the point of elimination). The BLNR could have imposed an "invisibility-if-feasible standard" if it had desired; the fact that it did not do so suggests that it intended to require reasonable minimization, not elimination, of visual impacts. *See Id.*
251. Through significant mitigation measures discussed above, including the location of the telescope, reduction of the dome to the smallest size physically possible, the finishing of the dome and supporting structure to reduce the visibility of the structures, and other measures, the visual impacts for the TMT Project have been reduced to the greatest extent feasible.
252. The removal of three telescopes from the summit ridge, and the restoration of the abandoned Poliahu road, will also help to mitigate visual effects of the TMT Project.
253. Moreover, the design of the TMT Project is consistent with (and in many aspects, improves upon) the design of the other existing telescopes within the Astronomy Precinct, which also includes various support buildings, roads and other facilities.

254. The size, dimensions and dome structure were conceived to minimize the structure's impacts and to enhance the natural beauty of the surrounding areas to the extent feasible.
255. Fluids such as gas, water, and wastewater will be contained in above ground and underground tanks to minimize any possible contamination of the surface and subsurface areas.
256. The structural design considered ways to minimize visual impacts and to optimize viewpoints around the facility.
257. Given this context, and the many mitigation measures incorporated into the TMT Project specifically designed to minimize its visual impacts to the extent feasible, the sixth criterion is satisfied.
258. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors, however, propose to read this criterion to literally require that the TMT Project "improve on the natural beauty or open space of the Northern Plateau." See *e.g.* Petitioners' Collective Prehearing Statement at 5.
259. Although Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors claim that this literal reading "would not meet with absurd results," Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors are incorrect. Applying Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' interpretation would lead to an absurd result – an absolute exclusion of any construction of astronomy facilities that are an explicitly permissible use in the Resource subzone.
260. If HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6) is read the way Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors suggest, no telescope could ever have been built on Mauna Kea. Indeed, following this proposed interpretation to its logical conclusion, nothing could ever be, or have been, permissibly built on any Conservation District land anywhere in the State of Hawai'i.
261. HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6) cannot be read that way. If it were, HAR § 13-5-24(c)(4), which expressly allows "Astronomy facilities" in the Resource subzone, would be rendered meaningless.
262. In addition, HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6) must be read in the context of all subzones, including the objectives of each subzone (and the permitted uses in each subzone).
263. The Conservation District is not homogenous; rather, the Conservation District is comprised of four distinct subzones: Protective, Limited, Resource and General.
264. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors incorrectly interpret the rules as though the entire Conservation District on Mauna Kea is in the Protective subzone, the most restrictive of the subzones.
265. Under rules of statutory interpretation, courts are required to avoid rendering any provision redundant or superfluous. See *Aluminum Shake Roofing, Inc. v. Hirayasu*, 110 Hawai'i 248, 253, 131 P.3d 1230, 1235 (2006); *Okada Trucking Co. v. Bd. of Water Supply*, 101 Hawai'i 68, 77, 62 P.3d 631, 640 (App. 2002) ("We will not construe a statute so that it is rendered meaningless."). Moreover, courts "may depart from a plain

reading of a statute where a literal interpretation would lead to absurd and/or unjust results." *See, e.g., Morgan v. Planning Dep't, Cnty. of Kaua'i*, 104 Hawai'i 173, 185, 86 P.3d 982, 994 (2004) (citing *Iddings v. Mee-Lee*, 82 Hawai'i 1, 15, 919 P.2d 263, 277 (1996)) (finding that the Legislature could not have intended that the Planning Commission would need to file lawsuit each time a special management area use permit needs modification, so, despite the plain language of HRS § 205A-29, the statute had to be interpreted to avoid that "absurd result").

266. Finally, *Kilakila* confirms that HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6) should be interpreted and applied in the context of Astronomy Precinct and the MKSR and in light of the mitigation measures proposed in connection with the TMT Project. *See Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 407, 382 P.3d at 219 (affirming BLNR's findings and conclusions that the solar telescope project met the sixth criterion because the project "will be consistent with and will preserve the existing physical and environmental aspects of the land (the Haleakalā High Altitude Observatory site, which housed other existing observatories), and further noting that BLNR properly considered the numerous mitigation commitments for the project with respect to this criterion).
267. Therefore, HAR § 13-5-30(c)(6) can only make sense by interpreting it as requiring that the TMT Project, and specifically its visual impacts, be assessed in the manner set forth above, in the context of its surrounding environment – including the uses and development that has already occurred.
268. For all these reasons, and for the reasons set forth in the findings of fact above, the proposed land use is consistent with existing uses and preserves or improves upon the existing physical and environmental aspects of the land, such as natural beauty and open space characteristics, and therefore satisfies the sixth criterion.

vii. The TMT Project Satisfies the Seventh Criterion

269. The seventh criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7), states: "Subdivision of land will not be utilized to increase the intensity of land uses in the conservation district[.]"
270. The TMT Project will not utilize subdivision of land to increase the intensity of land uses in the Conservation District, in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7).
271. The TMT CDUA does not ask for a subdivision. As explained more fully below, the seventh criterion refers only to the few circumstances where a landowner can apply for a CDUP to subdivide conservation land. In those cases, the seventh criterion provides that the subdivision must not be used to increase the intensity of land use.
272. Understanding the seventh criterion requires an explanation of the differences between subdivision controls in a typical land use regulatory system versus Hawai'i's conservation district, and an explanation of how subdivisions are handled under the conservation district rules.
273. In the typical land use regulatory system, the zoning allows certain development by right, for example, single-family homes in a residential zone, subject only to ministerial

approvals like building permits. See, for example, R.O.H. §21-3.70-1(a)(permitted uses in single-family district). To ensure the orderly development of land zoned for particular uses when it is then divided for sale into individual lots, with separate owners, the subdivision code specifies minimum requirements for infrastructure like water, roads, sewers, and drainage, minimum lot sizes, road frontage requirements, and the like. See, for example, R.O.H. §22-3.1 (purpose of the subdivision code). Subdivisions are also important because they create new building sites.

274. By contrast, in Hawai‘i’s conservation district, almost all development requires a site-specific permit. See HAR Chap. 13-5, Subchapter 3. The permit itself specifies the infrastructure requirements for the proposed project. For example, the TMT CDUP addresses the width of the access road, how water will be supplied, and how drainage and wastewater will be handled. The conservation district rules do not contain a subdivision code because the issues are dealt with in permits on a case-by-case basis. Thus, case law regarding subdivisions in the typical land use context is of limited relevance in the conservation district.
275. Under the conservation district rules, subdivision is allowed in only three very limited circumstances, described in HAR § 13-5-22(b)(P-10), and applied to the other subzones by HAR §§ 13-5-23(a), -24(a), and -25(a):
 - (C-1) Consolidation and resubdivision into an equal number of lots that does not result in increased density.
 - (C-2) Consolidation of property into a lesser number of legal lots of record currently existing and approved, which furthers the objectives of the subzone.
 - (D-1) Subdivision of property into two or more legal lots of record that serves a public purpose and is consistent with the objectives of the subzone.
276. The rules allow only one house per lot of record, HAR § 13-5-41(b). They do not allow houses in the Protective Subzone (except for kuleana properties). They allow houses only under certain circumstances in the Limited Subzone, HAR § 13-5-23(c)(L-3), but allow them in the Resource and General Subzones, HAR §§ 13-5-24(c)(R-7), and -25(a).
277. The seventh criterion prevents landowners from manipulating the subdivision process to increase the number of houses that can be built. For example, if a landowner has two adjacent lots, one entirely in the Protective Subzone, and the other entirely in the Resource Subzone, there is a potential for only one house. If the landowner were allowed to consolidate and resubdivide so that part of each resulting lot was in the Resource Subzone, there would be, potentially, two house sites. Because this would "increase the intensity of land use", the seventh criterion could be invoked to deny the consolidation and resubdivision, or to put restrictive conditions on it. The seventh criterion could also be invoked in reviewing a "public purpose" subdivision applied for under HAR § 13-5-22(b)(P-10)(D-1). The seventh criterion applies only in these extremely restricted circumstances.
278. The rules do not limit the number of astronomical facilities that can be built on a single

parcel, or limit the number of other facilities that potentially can be built on a single parcel, except for houses. So, for example, although the Mauna Kea Science Reserve is a single parcel, Ex. A-7, p.1, more than twelve separate CDUP's have been issued for observatories and related infrastructure. *Id.* at p. 7. Each new application must be reviewed for its potential effects. The requirement of a CDUP is the control against overbuilding. The number of potential building sites is not controlled by subdivision rules, except for houses.

279. The University of Hawai'i's subleasing individual observatories to separate operators creates none of the infrastructural problems, or problems with coordination among multiple owners, that a typical subdivision regulation is intended to prevent. The land is still owned by the State of Hawai'i, and leased by the University of Hawai'i. The state, through the BLNR, must review any proposed sublease and consent to its terms. The CDUP's dictate how the land will be developed, including infrastructure. The sublessees are bound by the terms of the CDUP's to the same extent as the UH.
280. It has been the consistent practice of the BLNR that the Mauna Kea subleases are not subdivisions and do not require separate CDUP's. Compare Ex. A-9 at p. 6-1 (subleases) with Ex. A-7 at p. 7 (list of CDUP's). The BLNR, of course, has consented to all of these subleases.
281. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors argue that because the subleases facilitate the financing and management of the various observatory sites, they "increase the intensity of land uses."
282. Given that they are trying to stop the TMT Project, it is natural that Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors interpret the seventh criterion in this way. It makes no sense, however, to interpret the seventh criterion as if it were intended to inhibit the development of projects by making them more difficult to finance or manage. The other seven criteria all deal with the physical, environmental, and cultural impacts of a project. If a project (other than an actual subdivision) complies with the other seven criteria, and other applicable legal requirements, the permit should be granted; the government has no legitimate interest in making them harder to finance or manage.
283. The CDUP allows the increase in intensity of land use, not the sublease or any subdivision. The sublease creates no additional development rights beyond the CDUP. It is immaterial whether the landowner develops the project or has a sublessee or sublessees develop it. Land use regulations focus on the use, not who carries out the use. *Gangemi v. Zoning Bd. Of Appeals of Town of Fairfield*, 54 Conn. App. 559, 736 A.2d 167 (1999). To the extent that the BLNR may be concerned about the quality of the sublessee or compensation to the state where a sublease involves public land, those issues can be dealt with in the consent to sublease.
284. Many of the uses allowed with permits in the conservation district rules, such as telecommunications antennas, are obviously ones where (1) the use will occupy only a small portion of a lot, (2) the landowner and operator of the use will be different, and (3) the operator will want some documented site control, whether by lease, sublease,

easement, or license. To construe such arrangements as a "subdivision" requiring a separate CDUP when the project has already been found to meet all other environmental requirements would be a waste of time and effort, and to say that the rules prohibit such arrangements if the operator facilitates the development of the site is absurd. In addition, if such arrangements are subdivisions, in many cases, they could not even be allowed because the only subdivisions which can create additional lots are those that serve a "public purpose", which is narrowly defined in the rules. See HAR § 13-5-22(b)(P-10).

285. For these reasons, the BLNR does not construe arrangements such as the Mauna Kea subleases, or other arrangements where a landowner having a CDUP for a specific site transfers site control (not fee ownership) to a separate operator, as subdivisions under its rules. To the extent that there is any ambiguity in the rules, they should be interpreted according to their intent. *IBEW, Local 1357 v. Hawaiian Telephone Co.*, 68 Haw. 316, 323, 713 P.2d 943, 951 (1986). It is clearly the intent of the seventh criterion and the concept of subdivisions in the rules to regulate the use of subdivisions so that they are not used to directly create further development rights, not to regulate who operates facilities already allowed by CDUP's.
286. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors raise the issue of "illegal subdivision." An "illegal subdivision" can more properly be termed an "illegal attempted subdivision" because the purported subdivision and any conveyances would simply be nullities. *Whitlow v. Jennings*, 40 Haw. 523, 532 (1940.) If an "owner" of a "lot" purportedly created by a subdivision of land in the conservation district, not approved by DLNR or BLNR, applied for a CDUP to build a house on that "lot", DLNR staff would see that the property was not a lot of record, and that the owner could not show good title, see HAR § 13-5-31(b) and refuse to process the application. HAR § 13-5-31(c). The seventh criterion would never be applied because no application could be processed. This further illustrates the basic point that the seventh criterion comes into play only when someone has actually applied for a subdivision.
287. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors contend that the TMT Project does not satisfy HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7) because, in their view, the proposed sublease of land to TIO (and, indeed, each sublease for an existing observatory facility) "further separated areas of land use within the University's Astronomy Precinct resulting in the illegal subdivision of these lands."
288. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors, however, offer no credible authority to support their position that a sublease within MKSR legally constitutes a "division of a parcel of land into more than one parcel" within the meaning of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7).
289. The Master Plan identified specific and discrete sites for future development on Mauna Kea, including an appropriate site for a Next Generation Large Telescope (Area E). Ex. A-001 at 1-6.
290. The sublease of a parcel within the Astronomy Precinct of the MKSR that was previously planned and specifically identified as an appropriate location for a Next Generation Large Telescope, such as the TMT Project, does not constitute a division of a parcel into more

than one parcel for the purpose of increasing the intensity of land use within the conservation district as contemplated by HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7).

291. Moreover, as noted above, UH Hilo has not requested, and has not been granted, any subdivision of land for purposes of the TMT Project, and, in any event, the conservation district is not subject to county land use laws. HRS § 205-5; HRS Chapter 183C; HRS § 46-4(c).
292. Thus, construing every sublease within the conservation district as creating a subdivided parcel subject to the county subdivision code would be contrary to HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7) and HRS § 205-5, and subject every such sublease to county ordinances designed to regulate residential developments and lead to absurd results.
293. Accordingly, for these reasons and all reasons stated herein, the Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' arguments relating to the effect of the sublease for the TMT Project is rejected. *See, e.g., Morgan*, 104 Hawai'i at 185, 86 P.3d at 994.
294. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors further contend that the "subdivision is illegal" because the State Land Use Commission did not create the Astronomy Precinct or separate project parcels. *See, e.g.* Petitioners' Collective PHS at 6.
295. Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' argument, however, is misplaced and illogical, because the Land Use Commission's authority does not extend to establishing or approving areas such as the MKSR or the Astronomy Precinct – it is undisputed that the BLNR has the authority to manage Conservation District lands, including subdividing lands in the Conservation District into more than one parcel. *See* HRS Chapter 183C.
296. In addition, the Astronomy Precinct is an area identified and described by the MKSR Master Plan as a management and planning designation to reduce the area within the MKSR available for astronomy development.
297. Thus, the clear intent of the designation of the Astronomy Precinct was not to divide the MKSR into more than one parcel in order to intensify the use of the MKSR, but rather to identify an area within the MKSR for planning and management of astronomical facilities.
298. Moreover, Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' proposed interpretation would mean nothing could ever be built in a Conservation District, because adding anything would always increase, in some measure, the intensity of land use. That interpretation would lead to an absurd result, and is rejected. *See, e.g., Morgan*, 104 Hawai'i at 185, 86 P.3d at 994.
299. For all these reasons, and for the reasons set forth in the findings of fact above, the proposed land use will not utilize subdivision of land to increase the intensity of land uses in the Conservation District, and therefore satisfies the seventh criterion, HAR § 13-5-30(c)(7).

viii. The TMT Project Satisfies the Eighth Criterion

300. The eighth criterion, set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c)(8), states: "The proposed land use will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare."
301. The TMT Project will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, in satisfaction of HAR § 13-5-30(c)(8).
302. The construction and use of astronomy facilities alone do not create material harm to the general health, safety, or welfare of Hawai'i's citizens.
303. The construction of astronomy facilities does not require invoking traditional police power protections to protect the public from the proposed construction activities.
304. Any concern for the well-being of a segment of the general public, including native Hawaiians, can be mitigated through the scientific, educational, and economic benefits to be derived from the Project, in accordance with similar considerations in *Kilakila*.
305. As set forth above, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors contend that building the TMT Project on Mauna Kea will be harmful to the health of native Hawaiians and others. As stated above, Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' position that the TMT Project will be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare has not been supported by reliable, probative, substantial, or credible evidence, and is far too speculative to be given any significant weight.
306. Although, for example, Dr. Taualii provided opinions as to her research on a causal link between alleged "desecration" to a sacred space and the impact upon cultural identity and health of native Hawaiians, Dr. Taualii did not provide the data on her study in this hearing; she was not aware of any peer review studies that supported her claims of trauma to native Hawaiians as a result of the TMT Project; her own study was still undergoing the independent scrutiny of the peer review process; and she testified to her own bias, as she personally opposes the TMT Project. *See* Tr. 1/24/17 at 37, 48, 132-137
307. Similarly, while Prof. Kaholokua offered testimony regarding the ostensible psychological impacts upon native Hawaiians from the activities on Mauna Kea, he did not do any research directly relating to the TMT Project, did not perform any clinical examinations of opponents of the TMT Project, and he was not aware of studies regarding partitioning the cause of stress allegedly from TMT and Mauna Kea from all other stress-causing factors for native Hawaiians, including poverty, single parenthood, and systemic diseases. Tr. 2/23/17 at 121-23, 143, 164-168, and 175.
308. The public will not be detrimentally impacted, and the alleged psychological impact on certain narrow portions of the general population would be isolated and capable of being mitigated. Surveys referenced during the hearing demonstrated that a majority of residents supported the construction of the TMT Project, notwithstanding the protests of a select few who claim political or other reasons outside of the traditional concepts of public health, safety, and welfare.
309. To the extent that there may be an impact on certain individuals from the TMT Project, the evidence adduced in this hearing is that, as a general historical matter, native

Hawaiian health and welfare has also been impacted by numerous other causes of stress, including poverty, lack of educational opportunities, systemic diseases, single parenthood, family abuse, and other societal displacements. Tr. 2/23/17 at 164-68 (Joseph Keaweaimoku Kaholokula, Ph.D.).

310. Prof. Kaholokula testified that he was not aware of any study with regard to apportioning the cause of alleged stress from the TMT Project on Mauna Kea from the other historic factors affecting native Hawaiian health and welfare, and his opinions were not based on any studies or analyses of the individuals opposing the TMT Project. Tr. 2/23/17 at 175-76 (Joseph Keaweaimoku Kaholokula, Ph.D.)
311. Thus, it would be speculative to conclude, in light of the historical issues affecting native Hawaiian health and welfare in general, and the lack of evidence in this hearing apportioning the cause of the various stressors, that the TMT Project, in and of itself, is detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the public, including native Hawaiians opposing the TMT Project.
312. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have not shown that the Project will be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, much less that it will be materially detrimental.
313. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors also contend that "public welfare" does not mean job-creation educational benefits or money generation, but instead refers to "aesthetics – preserving Hawai‘i’s unique natural beauty." That position is legally unsound.
314. Under rules of statutory interpretation, where language is plain and unambiguous, it must be given its "plain and obvious meaning." *Awakuni v. Awana*, 115 Hawai‘i 126, 133, 165 P.3d 1027, 1034 (2007) (citation omitted). Courts will attempt to construe the meaning of words in a statute according to their "general or popular use or meaning." HRS § 1- 14. If the words at issue are not defined, "[l]egal and lay dictionaries are extrinsic aids which may be helpful in discerning the meaning of statutory terms." *‘Olelo: The Corp. for Cmty. Television v. Office of Info. Practices*, 116 Hawai‘i 337, 349, 173 P.3d 484, 496 (2007) (citations omitted).
315. Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary defines "welfare" as "the state of doing well especially in respect to good fortune, happiness, well-being, or prosperity." www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/welfare. And the "plain and obvious" meaning of a benefit to "public welfare" is something that is good for the public. Job growth, educational prestige, and advancement of knowledge are plainly benefits to the "public welfare."
316. Furthermore, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court has held that consideration of relevant scientific, economic, and educational benefits are proper in the context of a CDUA as such benefits impact long-term sustainability and public welfare. *See Kilakila*, 138 Hawai‘i at 405; 382 P.3d at 217.
317. HAR § 13-5-30(c)(8) does not require that a proposed land use be affirmatively beneficial to the public health, safety, and welfare – only that a project not be materially detrimental. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied with or without a finding of affirmative

benefit to public welfare.

318. The reliable, probative, substantial, and credible evidence demonstrates that the TMT Project will inject money into the local economy and will bring with it job growth, educational prestige and opportunities, and significant advancement of knowledge. The Project will benefit the "public welfare."
319. For all these reasons, and for the reasons set forth in the findings of fact above, the proposed land use will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
320. In sum, UH Hilo has borne its burden of proving that the TMT Project satisfies all of the criteria set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c).

B. THE TMT PROJECT SATISFIES THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE, AND ART. XI, SEC. 7 OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND CUSTOMARY AND TRADITIONAL NATIVE HAWAIIAN RIGHTS ARE APPROPRIATELY PROTECTED

321. In assessing the Project and determining whether the criteria of HAR § 13-5-30(c) have been satisfied, the State must protect the public trust and the customary and traditional rights and practices of native Hawaiians.

i. The Public Trust Doctrine

322. In assessing the legal aspects of the public trust doctrine, the Board has not relied upon any expert testimony.
323. The public trust doctrine has been adopted in Hawai‘i as a "fundamental principle of constitutional law." *In re Water Use Permit Applications*, 94 Haw. 97, 132, 9 P.3d 409, 444 (2000) ("*Waiahole*").
324. Separately, Article XI, section 1 of the Hawai‘i Constitution provides that public natural resources are held in trust by the state:

"For the benefit of present and future generations, the State and its political subdivisions shall conserve and protect Hawai‘i’s natural beauty and all natural resources, including land, water, air, minerals and energy sources, and shall promote the development and utilization of these resources in a manner consistent with their conservation and in furtherance of the self-sufficiency of the State."

"All public natural resources are held in trust by the State for the benefit of the people."

325. The public trust doctrine arises from the common law. *Id.*, 9 P.3d at 439, n.25. It was first applied in Hawai‘i case law to navigable waters. *King vs. Oahu RR & Land Co.*, 11 Haw. 717 (1899), then to the shoreline. *County of Hawai‘i v. Sotomura*, 55 Haw. 176,

183-184, 517 P.2d 57, 63 (1973). *In re Waiahole* applied it to all water resources, relying on both art. XI, sec. 1, and art. XI, sec. 7 of the state constitution. *Id.* at 133, P. 3d at 445.

- 326. The TMT Project obviously does not affect navigable waters or the shoreline. The reliable, credible and substantial evidence establishes that it will not restrict, pollute, or otherwise impair any water resource, including Lake Waiau.
- 327. Therefore, the TMT Project does not violate the public trust doctrine as currently established in Hawai'i case law.
- 328. Art. XI, sec. 1 of the Hawai'i state constitution has a much broader scope than the public trust doctrine as applied to date in Hawai'i. It expressly includes **all** natural resources, and provides that "public natural resources are held in trust".

Unquestionably, the public lands on Mauna Kea are part of the public land trust under art. XII, sec. 4 of the state constitution. Unquestionably, art. XI, sec. 1 also imposes mandatory duties on the BLNR to act as a trustee in dealing with those lands and the other publicly-owned natural resources on them.

This does not mean, however, that these lands and natural resources are covered by the "public trust doctrine" as established by *Waiahole* and related cases.

- 329. The public trust doctrine arose from the concept that "certain resources bestowed by nature are so inviolable that their benefits should accrue to the collective, rather than certain members of society", *Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. BLNR*, 136 Hawai'i 376, 363 P.2d 224, 351 (2015) (Pollack, J., concurring) and was applied traditionally to "the air, running water, the sea, and consequently the shores of the sea", *Waiahole*, 9 P.3d at 445. For these resources, the trust's basic purpose is "reserving the resource for use and access by the general public without preference or restriction." *Waiahole*, 9 P. 3d 450.

Because of the inherently public character of these resources—water, tidelands, and the shore – the public trust doctrine contains a set of preferred "public trust purposes" which give an "inherent presumption in favor of public use, access, and enjoyment", *Waiahole*, 9 P.3d at 472, rather than a more general notion of public benefit. While uses may be made of the resource that are not public trust purposes, they are given a lower priority. *Waiahole*, 9 P.3d 450.

Differences exist between at least some of the resources covered by art. XI, sec. 1, and those referred to so far as "public trust resources" in Hawai'i case law. For example, land and fertile soil are surely natural resources. If the state owned a particularly fertile tract of soil, no legal precedent would suggest that its public trust responsibilities create a preference for the land to be opened for general public use to be farmed in common rather than leased to qualified individual farmers.

The text and history of Art. XI, sec. 1 show that the trustee's duty under this clause is to ensure public **benefit** from the management of the resources, rather than necessarily public **use**. It explicitly says that "All public natural resources are held in trust by the

State for the **benefit** of the people." (emphasis added). The history of this article, quoted more fully below, was that these resources be developed to "assure their highest economic or social **benefits**." See Stand. Comm. Rep. No. 77, in 1978 Proceedings, at 685-86 (emphasis added).

The *Waiahole* court recognized that different resources would need different rules under the public trust doctrine. *Id.*, 9 P.3d at 441.

The Board will apply art. XI, sec. 1 to this decision, under the terms of that constitutional mandate. It will then discuss the public trust doctrine as described in *Waiahole* and other cases, as if it applied to this decision. There is, of course, considerable overlap in the two concepts.

- 330. By its express terms, art. XI, sec. 1 encourages the "development and utilization of natural resources."
- 331. The dark sky and clear stable air at the summit of Mauna Kea constitute a natural resource for the science of astronomy. It is a unique resource, one of the finest sites in the world for astronomy.
- 332. The development and utilization of this natural resource by the various observatories has furthered human knowledge, promoted interest in science, enhanced the University of Hawai'i, and provided broadly-shared economic benefits.
- 333. The use of Mauna Kea by observatories does not degrade the clear stable air and dark skies at the summit, and therefore, follows art. XI, sec. 1's mandate that the development and utilization of natural resources "be consistent with their conservation." It is also consistent with the resource protection mandate under the public trust doctrine.
- 334. The *Waiahole* court explained the meaning of "conservation" in art. XI, sec. 1:

The framers deemed it necessary to define "conservation" and agreed on the following: "the protection, improvement and use of natural resources according to principles that will assure their highest economic or social benefits." See Stand. Comm. Rep. No. 77, in 1978 Proceedings, at 685-86 (emphases added). The second clause of article XI, section 1 thus resembles laws in other states mandating the maximum beneficial or highest and best use of [trust] resources. See, e.g., Cal. Const. art. X, § 2; N.D. Cent. Code § 61- 04-01.1.1 (Supp. 1999) . . . [A]rticle XI, section 1's mandate of "conservation"-minded use recognizes "protection" as a valid purpose consonant with assuring the "highest economic and social benefits" of the resource. . . In short, the object is not maximum consumptive use, but rather the most equitable, reasonable, and beneficial allocation of [trust] resources, with full recognition that resource protection also constitutes "use." 94 Hawai'i at 139-40, 9 P.3d at 451-52.

335. Because "conservation" of natural resources, as defined in the state constitution, includes their use and development for the highest economic and social benefits, it follows that if the construction of a large building such as the TMT Observatory is necessary for the use and development of a resource, that such construction is compatible with "conservation" in the constitutional sense. This does not mean that every project that uses and develops natural resources must be approved, regardless of consequences, but only that the large structures may be consistent with conservation as defined in our constitution.
336. Art. XI, sec. 1 also requires the protection of natural beauty, which is itself a natural resource. Stand. Comm. Rep. No. 77, in 1978 Proceedings, at 686.
337. To the extent that the "development and utilization" of the TMT site for astronomy may affect Mauna Kea's natural beauty, art. XI, sec. 1 and the public trust doctrine require a balancing of the competing interests. See *Waiahole* at 94 Hawai'i at 142 n.43, 9 P.3d at 454 n.43; *Center for Biological Diversity, Inc. v. Fpl Group, Inc.*, 166 Cal. App.4th 1349, 1371, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588 (Cal. App., 2008)(where wind turbines harm wild birds, a public trust resource, agencies must balance competing interests); *Payne v. Kassab*, 468 Pa.226, 361 A.2d 263, 273(1976)(state properly balanced duty as trustee between park and highway uses).
338. Given the development that has already taken place on Mauna Kea, this balance strongly favors the TMT Project. The major public benefits from the TMT Project have been fully described elsewhere in these findings of fact and conclusions of law. While Mauna Kea remains a magnificent and beautiful mountain, the visual experience has for many decades included large observatories, six of them 100 feet high or taller. The TMT Project will not significantly change that experience.

The conditions of approval require that funds be set aside for the eventual decommissioning and removal of the TMT. Its effect on the natural beauty of Mauna Kea need not be permanent.

The conditions of approval require that sublease rent be used for the maintenance of the Mauna Kea area. This means that the TMT Project will contribute to the preservation of the resource, a valid purpose under both the public trust doctrine and art. XI, sec. 1.

339. Turning to the public trust doctrine as explained in *Waiahole*, the State acting through its agencies has a duty to "'protect' natural resources and to promote their 'use and development.'" 94 Hawai'i at 138-39, 9 P.3d at 450-51. This duty prevents public trust resources from being irrevocably transferred to private parties. *Id.* at 139, 9 P.3d at 451. The public trust doctrine also requires the "reasonable and beneficial use" of public trust resources "to maximize their social and economic benefit." *Id.*
340. Thus, the public trust doctrine does not require absolute preservation of natural resources, but rather requires a balancing between "1) protection and 2) maximum reasonable and beneficial use." *Id.* The State must apply a rule of reasonableness in which environmental costs and benefits are balanced against economic, social, and other factors. See *Id.* at 140-43, 9 P.3d at 453-55.

341. The Hawai‘i Supreme Court has made it clear that the public trust doctrine’s mandate with respect to "conservation" does not prohibit development; rather, the doctrine requires that protection of a resource must also be consonant with assuring the "highest economic and social benefits" of the resource. See *Waiahole, supra*, at 94 Hawai‘i at 139-40, 9 P.3d at 451-52.
342. The use of the summit area of Mauna Kea for the TMT Project promotes the "maximum reasonable and beneficial use", *Waiahole, supra*, of the combination of natural resources that is unique to that location. It is the best site in the world to locate a premier scientific instrument intended to help answer such questions as "what is the nature and composition of the universe", and "is there life elsewhere in the universe". Ex. A-3/R-3 at p. 2-4.
343. The use of the combination of natural resources that is unique to the summit area of Mauna Kea for the scientific study and investigation and the advancement of knowledge that will result from the TMT Project is consistent with the public trust doctrine.
344. UH Hilo is not a private commercial user, and its proposed use of the land in question is not a private commercial use. On the contrary, the TMT Project will advance knowledge, foster educational opportunities in Hawai‘i’s public institutions of higher learning, and maintain Hawai‘i’s place as a world leader in scientific research. These are public or quasi-public land uses, and valid public trust uses.
345. The purposes of the TMT Project are valid public trust uses as confirmed by Section 5(f) of the Admission Act of 1959, which specifies public educational institutions as beneficiaries of public trust lands and their proceeds, and Article X, section 5 of the Hawai‘i Constitution, which creates the University and gives it title to all real property conveyed to it, "which shall be held in public trust for its purposes, to be administered and disposed of as provided by law."
346. UH Hilo’s public trust uses are "superior to" the private interests discussed in *Waiahole*. 94 Hawai‘i at 138, 140, 9 P.3d at 450, 452; see *In re Contested Case Hearing on Water Use ("Waiola")*, 103 Hawai‘i 401, 429, 83 P.3d 664, 692 (2004).
347. In addition, the fact that the TMT Project will be constructed and operated under a sublease from UH Hilo to a non-profit consortium of educational and research institutions for research and educational use (and not by a for-profit entity for private use), further supports the conclusion that the proposed use of the land for the TMT Project is a public, or at a very minimum, a quasi-public, use of the land. The results of the research done by the TMT Project and other observatories are shared with the public. (Haslinger, Tr. 10/27/16 at 14-15.)
348. Even assuming the TMT Project is construed as a private use, however, the University remains the lessor of the land on which the TMT Project will be built, and at the end of the TMT Project’s useful life or of a lease permitting its continued occupancy of its site (whichever comes first), the TMT Project is required to be decommissioned.
349. The TMT Project does not involve the irrevocable transfer of public trust land and resources to others, and the "protection" element of the public trust doctrine is therefore

satisfied.

350. Accordingly, for all of the reasons herein, although the privately-operated TMT Project involves the use of government land, the proposed use is consistent with the public trust doctrine regardless of whether the TMT Project is construed as a public, quasi-public, or a private use of land.
351. Different valid public trust uses for the same land must be balanced; native Hawaiian uses have been recognized as valid public trust uses. *Waiahole*, 94 Hawai‘i at 137, 9 P.3d at 449. The evidence in this proceeding demonstrated a dearth of native Hawaiian uses of the specific location of the TMT Project, and further demonstrated that, as to the summit region of Mauna Kea in general, astronomy and native Hawaiian uses have (for many years) – and in fact, do – co-exist, and that the TMT Project will not curtail or restrict native Hawaiian uses.
352. "[T]he public trust assigns no priorities or presumptions in the balancing of public trust purposes." *Waiahole*, 94 Hawai‘i at 142 n.43, 9 P.3d at 454 n.43. The BLNR "must ensure that all public trust purposes are protected to the extent feasible," requiring a balancing of competing public trust uses on a case-by-case basis. *Id.*
353. The evidence supports the conclusion that in proposing the TMT Project, UH Hilo has balanced the public trust obligations for this public purpose, and has protected native Hawaiian interests to the extent feasible.

The TMT Project will limit public access and use of Mauna Kea only on the project site itself, a tiny fraction of the summit area. The TMT access road will facilitate public use of the Northern Plateau. All of the observatories taken together limit public use of the mountain on only a small fraction of the mountain. The road to the summit, built to promote and serve astronomical use, greatly facilitates the use of the mountain by sight-seers, recreational users, and native Hawaiians for cultural practices. (William H. Brown, WDT at 1.)

354. The public trust doctrine must be viewed in the context of the relevant statute or rules at issue in a proceeding. Public trust principles, and an agency's public trust obligations, may already be incorporated into the statute or rules at issue. *See Waiahole*, 94 Hawai‘i at 130-33, 9 P.3d at 442-45 (agency's public trust obligations were incorporated into Water Code).
355. Here, the public trust principles have been incorporated into the Conservation District statute. That law's stated purpose is "to conserve, protect, and preserve the important natural resources of the State through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety and welfare." HRS § 183C-1.
356. The Conservation District rules likewise provide:

"The purpose of this chapter is to regulate land-use in the conservation district for the purpose of conserving, protecting, and preserving the important natural and cultural resources of the State

through appropriate management and use to promote their long-term sustainability and the public health, safety, and welfare."

HAR § 13-5-1.

357. The criteria set out in HAR § 13-5-30(c) expressly promote these public trust objectives. For example: (1) HAR § 13-5-30(c)(1) requires that any proposed land use in the Conservation District be consistent with the purpose of HRS Chapter 183C and its implementing regulations; (2) HAR § 13-5-30(c)(4) requires that the proposed land use not cause substantial adverse impacts to the existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region; and (3) HAR § 13-5-30(c)(8) requires that the proposed land use not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
358. A thorough and diligent assessment of those criteria necessarily addresses the concerns that doctrine protects since the criteria set out in HAR § 13-5-30(c) embody and implement the public trust doctrine, *See Morimoto*, 107 Hawai'i at 308, 113 P.3d at 184 (where the BLNR properly concluded that project would not cause substantial adverse impact on natural resources of project area, claim that the BLNR's decision violated Article XI, section 1 and the public trust doctrine "present[s] no new arguments" and "does not implicate any error on the part of BLNR"). *See also, Kilakila*, 138 Hawai'i at 410-11, 382 P.3d at 222-23 (McKenna, J., concurring) (noting that the BLNR's findings and conclusions regarding the criteria of HAR § 13-5-30(c) as outlined in the majority opinion "illustrate that the BLNR carefully considered and applied the applicable constitutional considerations.")
359. Thus, the Conservation District rules do not supplant the protections of the public trust doctrine, but they do embody and implement them.
360. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have not identified any public trust obligation that is not already reflected in the eight criteria of HAR § 13-5-30(c). Therefore, the conclusion that those criteria are satisfied – for the reasons set forth in detail above – is a compelling indication that the public trust obligations of both UH Hilo and the BLNR are satisfied as well.
361. Natural beauty is also fully considered in, and protected by, the eight criteria. The findings and conclusions above demonstrate how the TMT Project satisfies the eight criteria. Because the project satisfies the criteria with respect to natural beauty, it must, as discussed above, satisfy art. XI, sec. 1 and the public trust doctrine with respect to natural beauty.
362. Whether the public trust obligations are viewed as being encompassed within the eight criteria of HAR § 13-5-30(c) or as independent of those criteria, the approval of the CDUA here is consistent with and satisfies the public trust obligations of both UH Hilo and the BLNR to protect Hawai'i's natural resources and to promote their development and utilization in a manner consistent with their conservation and in furtherance of the State's self-sufficiency.
363. Viewed in light of the public trust obligations described above, and the implementation of

those obligations through HAR § 13-5-30(c), the TMT Project satisfies all public trust legal obligations as it is "the most equitable, reasonable, and beneficial allocation of state [trust] resources." *Waiahole*, 94 Hawai‘i at 140, 9 P.3d at 452.

364. The TMT Project provides for the development and utilization of natural resources for scientific and educational purposes for the benefit of the people of the State. It satisfies the obligations of protection and maximizing reasonable and beneficial use, and it is consistent with the constitutional, statutory, and regulatory mandates of "conservation."

ii. The Protection of Customary and Traditional Native Hawaiian Rights

a. Article XII, Section 7 of the Hawai‘i Constitution and the *Ka Pa‘akai* Analysis

365. The Hawai‘i Constitution also mandates that the State recognize and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights. Article XII, section 7 provides:

"The State reaffirms and shall protect all rights, customarily and traditionally exercised for subsistence, cultural and religious purposes and possessed by ahupua‘a tenants who are descendants of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778, subject to the right of the State to regulate such rights."

366. To fulfill its duty to preserve and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights to the extent feasible under *Ka Pa‘akai*, an agency must examine and make specific findings and conclusions as to:

(1) the identity and scope of "valued cultural, historical, or natural resources in the [application] area, including the extent to which traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights are exercised in the [application] area; (2) the extent to which those resources – including traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights – will be affected or impaired by the proposed action; and (3) the feasible action, if any, to be taken by the [agency] to reasonably protect native Hawaiian rights if they are found to exist. *Ka Pa‘akai*, 94 Hawai‘i at 47, 7 P.3d at 1084 (footnotes omitted).

367. This analytical framework ensures that a state agency properly effectuates its "obligation to protect native Hawaiian customary and traditional practices while reasonably accommodating competing private interests," and fulfills its duty "to preserve and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights to the extent feasible[.]" *Ka Pa‘akai*, 94 Hawai‘i at 46-47, 7 P.3d at 1083-84.
368. The utmost respect is afforded the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors regarding their beliefs and practices; to the extent that they claim such practices constitute traditional and customary rights under *PASH* and its progeny, those rights are subject to regulation by the laws of the State of Hawai‘i. Haw. Const. art. XII, § 7; *State v. Pratt*, 127 Hawai‘i at 217, 277 P.2d at 311.

369. The Hawai‘i Supreme Court has confirmed that the practices that are protected by Article XII, section 7 are those "associated with the ancient way of life" that have been continued, without harm to anyone. *Kalipi*, 66 Haw. at 10, 656 P.2d at 751. In other words, to be constitutionally protected, such practices must have been "customarily and traditionally held by ancient Hawaiians." *Pele Defense Fund v. Paty*, 73 Haw. at 619, 837 P.2d at 1271.
370. Some "customary and traditional" native Hawaiian rights are codified either in Article XII, section 7 of the Hawai‘i Constitution or in HRS §§ 1-1 and 7-1. *Id.* at 618-19, 837 P.2d at 1271. Practices that are not codified in Article XII, section 7 or HRS §§ 1-1 and 7-1 will still be entitled to constitutional protection as "customary and traditional" if it is proven that those practices were established by Hawaiian usage by November 25, 1892. *PASH*, 79 Hawai‘i at 447, 903 P.3d at 1268 (citing *State v. Zimring*, 58 Haw. 106, 115 n.11, 566 P.2d 725, 732 n.11 (1977)).
371. Under Hawai‘i law, "it is the obligation of the person claiming the exercise of a native Hawaiian right to demonstrate that the right is protected." *Hanapi*, 89 Hawai‘i at 185-186, 970 P.2d at 493-494.
372. As a threshold matter, an individual claiming that his or her conduct is constitutionally protected as a native Hawaiian right has the burden of proving that he or she is a descendant of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian islands prior to 1778. *Hanapi*, 89 Hawai‘i at 186, 970 P.2d at 494.
373. Although not all of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors presented specific evidence with respect to this requirement, there was no dispute that certain Petitioners (including Petitioners Ching, Neves, Pisciotta and representatives of the Flores-Case ‘Ohana), and the Opposing Intervenors, are native Hawaiian, and the Hearing Officer concludes there is sufficient evidence to find that the applicable Petitioners and the Opposing Intervenors satisfy this threshold requirement.
374. Each of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors are required to "establish that [his or her] claimed right is constitutionally protected as a *customary or traditional* native Hawaiian practice." *Hanapi*, 89 Hawai‘i at 185-186, 970 P.2d at 493-494 (emphasis added).
375. Under *Hanapi*, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors had the burden to establish "an adequate foundation in the record connecting a claimed right to a *firmly rooted* traditional or customary native Hawaiian practice." *Hanapi*, 89 Hawai‘i at 187, 970 P.2d at 495 (emphasis added).
376. Thus, distinguishing between traditional and customary practices and contemporary practices is important, because while the Hawai‘i Constitution affords special protection to traditional and customary practices by native Hawaiians, Article XII, section 7 does not protect contemporary cultural practices. *Hanapi*, 89 Hawai‘i at 187, 970 P.2d at 495.
377. The BLNR, through consideration of the CDUA and through the testimony and evidence in this proceeding, conducted a thorough review and analysis of the identity and scope of

"valued cultural, historical or natural resources" in the TMT Project application area, including the extent to which traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights are exercised in the application area. *Ka Pa 'akai*, 94 Hawai'i at 47, 7 P.3d at 1084.

378. As reflected in the TMT Project CDUA and in the testimony and documents admitted into evidence in the contested case proceeding, a detailed inventory of known and valued cultural, historical, and natural resources was taken in the application area, including the extent to which traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights may be exercised in the TMT Project area and the Astronomy Precinct. This is reflected in detail in the findings above.
379. In addition, as noted in the findings above, although Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors identified various areas in the summit region of Mauna Kea in which they engage in contemporary native Hawaiian cultural practices, they did not offer reliable, probative, substantial and credible evidence or testimony sufficient to establish that any of their cultural or religious practices – whether characterized as contemporary, or customary and traditional – were conducted at the five-acre site on which the TMT Project is proposed to be located until after the TMT Project was proposed, and in many instances, not until after the first contested case hearing in this matter.
380. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors also did not offer reliable, probative, substantial and credible evidence or testimony sufficient to establish that any of their cultural or religious practices – whether characterized as contemporary, or customary and traditional – were conducted in the immediate vicinity of the TMT site, such as on Area E.
381. Thorough review of the evidence fails to disclose any reliable, probative, substantial evidence or testimony sufficient to establish that any native Hawaiians other than the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors conducted any traditional or customary religious practices on or in the immediate vicinity of the TMT site, except for the construction of shrines in prehistoric times.
382. Native Hawaiians did make simple rock shrines in the general vicinity of the TMT Observatory. The closest, consisting of a single upright stone and several support stones, is 225 feet away. See FOF #607. Another one is 1300 feet away, another is 1600 feet away. *Id.* Construction of the project will not affect these shrines. No evidence indicates that the TMT site is particularly important for building shrines, and the TMT Project will affect only a tiny fraction of the potential shrine-building area on the mountain.
383. Two 'ahu were built on the TMT access road in 2015. See FOF #791, *supra*. These are not shrines. They were built as a protest against the TMT project. *Id.* The building of rock piles in the right-of-way of another person is obviously not an accepted native Hawaiian tradition and custom. Nor does it conform to the *PASH* requirement that practices be reasonable. 79 Hawai'i at 447, 903 P.2d at 1268.
384. Even assuming the Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' met their burden to prove that their claimed practices in areas within or outside of the five-acre TMT Project site are

"firmly rooted" traditional or customary native Hawaiian practices under *Hanapi* (and are thus entitled to constitutional protection), the Hearing Officer, through consideration of the CDUA and through the testimony and evidence in this proceeding, conducted a thorough review and analysis of the extent to which traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights will be affected or impaired by the TMT Project. *Ka Pa 'akai*, 94 Hawai'i at 47, 7 P.3d at 1084.

385. As reflected in the CDUA and in the testimony and documents admitted into evidence in the contested case proceeding, UH Hilo has evaluated in great detail the extent to which valued cultural, historical, and natural resources in the application area, including traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights, will be affected or impaired by the Project.
386. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors have not established by reliable, probative, substantial and credible evidence that their practices – whether characterized as contemporary, customary or traditional – will be adversely affected by the TMT Project, or that such practices cannot continue at the summit, Lake Waiau, or Pu'u Lili'noe, or elsewhere.
387. While Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors did introduce evidence regarding viewplanes from various sites at Mauna Kea, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors did not make the factual showing necessary to demonstrate that any ostensible practices involving viewplanes from Mauna Kea are native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices entitled to constitutional protection, nor that the presence of the TMT Project will substantially and adversely impact those practices given the long history and presence of the other telescopes in the Astronomy Precinct and continuation of their practices in the presence of those telescopes.
388. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors also had the burden to establish that any practices for which they seek protection have occurred on undeveloped or less than fully developed land on Mauna Kea. *Hanapi*, 89 Hawai'i at 186-87, 970 P.2d at 494-95.
389. According to Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' testimony, rather than being "undeveloped" or "less than fully developed," the landscape of the summit area of Mauna Kea is developed as it is "dominated by industrial land uses, including many telescope facilities and ancillary structures [including] . . . modern structures . . . heavy machinery, construction material, the clatter of telescope operations, and trafficked roads." WDT Townsend at 2; *see also* Tr. 01/12/17 at 137:1-12, 137:13-138:12. Petitioners further describe the summit as a place where "[t]he noise of observatory air conditioning, blowers, generators, associated vehicles and industrial activity is present and disturbing to recreational users who hope for the pristine silence of wilderness." WDT Ward at 2-3.
390. Evidence also supports the conclusion that at least some native Hawaiian practices are facilitated, rather than hindered, by the existence of the observatories and infrastructure on Mauna Kea. *See, e.g.*, WDT Naea Stevens at 3 (noting access to Mauna Kea facilitated through "roads maintained by the astronomy community.")

391. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor have not met their burden to show that any of their practices – whether contemporary, or traditional and customary – occurred at the location of the TMT Project site prior to the proposal of the TMT Project and the designation of the site.
392. Since Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor have not met their burden to show that they conduct any protected traditional and customary practices at the location of the TMT Project site prior to the proposal of the TMT Project and the designation of the site, they necessarily cannot meet their burden under the third *Hanapi* factor, as they cannot establish that any of their traditional and customary practices take place at the TMT Project Site – regardless of whether the site is considered "undeveloped," "less than fully developed," or "developed."
393. Even assuming every Petitioner and Opposing Intervenor established that he or she engages in practices that are customary and traditional, and so are entitled to constitutional protection under the *Hanapi* test, the BLNR, through consideration of the CDUA and through the testimony and evidence in this proceeding, conducted a thorough review and analysis of the "feasible action, if any," to be taken by the BLNR to reasonably protect native Hawaiian rights if they are found to exist. *Ka Pa‘akai*, 94 Hawai‘i at 47, 7 P.3d at 1084.
394. Article XII, section 7 confirms that ancient traditional and customary native Hawaiian rights are to be protected "subject to the right of the State to regulate such rights."
395. Under *PASH*, the State is obligated "to protect the reasonable exercise of customary and traditionally exercised rights of Hawaiians to the extent feasible." 79 Haw. at 450 n.43, 903 P.2d at 1271 n.43. Likewise, in *Ka Pa‘akai*, the Court held that the State (and its agencies) must "preserve and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights to the extent feasible." 94 Hawai‘i at 47, 7 P.3d at 1084.
396. Therefore, under *Pratt*, even if a person meets all three elements of the *Hanapi* test, the rights articulated in Article XII, section 7 (protecting native Hawaiian practices) are *not* absolute and are explicitly "subject to the rights of the State to regulate such rights." *Pratt*, 127 Hawai‘i 206, 277 P.3d 300. The Court observed that a common thread in Article XII, section 7 jurisprudence is a balance between "protections afforded to Native Hawaiians in the State, while also considering countervailing interests." *Id.* at 215, 277 P.3d at 309. Thus, under *Pratt*, the balancing of interests must consider the *totality* of the circumstances, including *all* of the parties' respective interests. *Id.* at 216-17, 277 P.3d at 310-11.
397. As reflected in the TMT Project CDUA and in the testimony and documents admitted into evidence in the contested case proceeding, numerous measures are designed to reasonably protect native Hawaiian rights in connection with the TMT Project, including measures relating to the design, construction and operation of the telescope to minimize the impact upon, and protect, native Hawaiian rights.
398. Approval of the CDUP for the TMT Project is consistent with and satisfies the BLNR's

and UH Hilo's obligations under Article XII, section 7 to recognize and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights to the extent feasible. *Ka Pa 'akai*, 94 Hawai'i at 47, 7 P.3d at 1084; *Hanapi*, 89 Hawai'i at 187, 970 P.2d at 495.

399. Even if every Petitioner and Intervenor had satisfied his or her burden of establishing a customary and traditional practice, and even if any of their practices relating to Mauna Kea are deemed to be traditional and customary practices entitled to constitutional protection, considering the totality of the facts and circumstances relating to Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenor's asserted practices, and then balancing the interests of *all* parties as described in detail in the Criterion Four section of the Findings of Fact above, the TMT Project preserves and protects the reasonable exercise of Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenor's practices to the extent feasible in compliance with Article XII, section 7 of the Hawai'i Constitution. *See supra* at FOF Section III.D.

b. Religious Freedom / Religious Establishment

400. The word "sacred" has been used to describe Mauna Kea.
401. For all the reasons given in these findings of fact and conclusions of law, Mauna Kea is worthy of extraordinary respect, care, and attention. The word "sacred" can be used to describe Mauna Kea in this sense. This does not raise any legal questions about the constitutional treatment of religion.
402. The common meaning of the word "sacred" is essentially spiritual and religious. Clearly, many of the parties and witnesses have used "sacred" in this sense – as a place where deities reside, where the landscape is considered as a church, and as a place where one can feel a deep bond or connection to the land, to ancestors, and to the universe.
403. While the government must respect the absolute right of people to hold these beliefs, a government body issuing a formal document like these findings of fact, conclusions of law, and decision and order cannot declare that a site is or is not sacred in the spiritual sense. Sacred in this sense is a matter of belief; it cannot be objectively judged. The government can acknowledge and respect that many people *believe* a site to be sacred.
404. Belief in an area's religious sacredness does not make development of that area an unconstitutional infringement of religion, and does not give the believer a legal right to stop the development. *See Dedman v. BLNR*, 69 Haw. 255, 261-62, 740 P.2d 28, 32-33 (1987); *Lyng v. Northwest Cemetery Protective Ass'n*, 485 U.S. 439 (1988); *see also PASH*, 79 Hawai'i at 447 n.38, 903 P.2d at 1268 n.38 (citing *Lyng* for this proposition).
405. Constitutional protection means protection against *unreasonable interference* with religious practices; such protection does *not* prevent the government from taking actions that offend religious *beliefs*. *See Dedman*, 69 Haw. at 260-61, 740 P.2d at 31-32 (noting that analysis focuses on unconstitutional infringement of religious *practices* even where the legitimacy and sincerity of religious *beliefs* is undisputed).
406. To determine if there is an unconstitutional infringement of religious rights, the inquiry focuses on *practices* rather than *beliefs*:

[I]t is necessary to examine whether or not the *activity* interfered with by the state was motivated by and rooted in a legitimate and sincerely held religious belief, whether or not the parties' free exercise of religion had been burdened by the regulation, the extent or impact of the regulation on the parties' religious practices, and whether or not the state had a compelling interest in the regulation which justified such a burden.

Dedman, 69 Haw. at 260, 740 P.2d at 32 (citations omitted; emphasis added). "[T]he United States Supreme Court has 'long recognized a distinction between the freedom of individual belief, which is absolute, and the freedom of individual conduct, which is not absolute.'" *Id.* (citations omitted).

407. Thus, a person claiming a violation of the constitutional right to free exercise of religion must "show the coercive effect of the [law] as it operates against him in the *practice* of his religion." *Id.* (brackets in original, emphasis added, citations omitted). To demonstrate that a project will result in an unconstitutional infringement of rights, a petitioner must show a "substantial burden" on his or her religious practices. *Id.* at 261, 740 P.2d at 33.
408. Moreover, even if proposed governmental action would adversely affect claimants' religious practices, the right of free exercise of religion is not violated unless the affected individuals would "be coerced by the Government's action into violating their religious beliefs" or the governmental action would "penalize religious activity by denying any person an equal share of the rights, benefits, and privileges enjoyed by other citizens." *Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 449.
409. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors claim broadly that their beliefs should give them veto power over any proposed land use on Mauna Kea. *See* Tr. 1/11/17 at 232, 239-240 (B. Pualani Case); Tr. 1/23/17 at 15-25 (Michael Lee); Tr. 1/23/17 at 213- 16, 230-31 (Harry Fergerstrom); (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 173-74 (E. Kalani Flores); Tr. 2/13/17 at 37 (Kealoha Pisciotta); Tr. 1/9/17 at 95, 100-101 (Dr. Kahakalau); Tr. 2/27/17 at 42-43 (Tajon). The law does not support that view.
410. The constitutional right to free exercise of religion "must apply to all citizens alike, and it can give to none of them a veto over public programs that do not prohibit the free exercise of religion." *Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 452. "[G]overnment simply could not operate if it were required to satisfy every citizen's religious needs and desires." *Id.* Giving any objector the power to stop a project based upon his or her personal beliefs would violate the establishment clauses of both the federal and state Constitutions. *See* U.S. Const. amend. 1; Haw. Const. art. I, § 4.
411. As the United States Supreme Court has held, native religious practitioners may well feel that they require "an unobstructed view" and that they "must be surrounded by *undisturbed* naturalness" – but "such beliefs could easily require *de facto* beneficial ownership of some rather spacious tracts of public property." *Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 453 (emphasis in original). "Whatever rights [native practitioners] may have to the use of the

area, however, those rights do not divest the Government of its right to use what is, after all, *its land*." *Id.* (emphasis in original, citation omitted).

412. According to the evidence adduced in this proceeding, the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor have not demonstrated a need to conduct or participate in religious ceremonies on or near the proposed TMT Project site; they have not identified practices that will be substantially interfered with; and the BLNR's approval of the TMT Project will not threaten practitioners with sanctions if they engage in religiously motivated conduct. Moreover, except for actual construction areas while the Project is being built (and, once it is completed, the TMT Observatory site), Petitioners, Opposing Intervenor, and everyone else will have continued access to the summit area of Mauna Kea, for religious practices and for any other permitted activity.
413. In addition, the evidence demonstrates that for all of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor, telescopes and related infrastructure have existed on Mauna Kea for the entirety of their adult lives – if not the entirety of their lives – and the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor have continued to exercise their religious practices in the presence of these facilities. The evidence presented also supports the conclusion that at least some of these religious and cultural practices would not be practiced but for the observatories being built and the construction and maintenance of the Mauna Kea Observatory Access Road. *See, e.g.*, (Nees) Tr. 12/05/16 at 63:5-15 (K. Ching testifying that kūpuna his age would rather have the road continue as it is so that they can drive up to the top of Pu'u Poli'ahu because they cannot walk up there)(WDT, William Brown, testifying that the road facilitates use of the summit by cultural practitioners).
414. Therefore, while the Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenor's believe in the sacredness and religious aspects of Mauna Kea, there is no proof of "the kind of objective danger to the free exercise of religion that the First Amendment was designed to prevent." *Dedman*, 69 Haw. at 261-62, 740 P.2d at 33 (citation omitted).
415. To withhold approval of the TMT Project "based on the mere assertion of harm to religious practices would contravene the fundamental purpose of preventing the state from fostering support of one religion over another." *Id.* at 262, 740 P.2d at 33.
416. Under these circumstances, as a matter of law, BLNR's approval of the Project does not and will not unreasonably interfere with Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenor's exercise of religious freedoms.
417. Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenor's religious practices also implicate the establishment clauses of the United States and Hawai'i constitutions.
418. The Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an *establishment of religion*, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." (Emphasis added.)
419. The Establishment Clause of Article 1, Section 4 of the Hawai'i Constitution provides that "[n]o law shall be enacted respecting an *establishment of religion*, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the

people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

420. Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' arguments that their religious beliefs and practices require that the CDUA for the TMT Project be denied, and that nothing be built on Mauna Kea to "protect" and further the Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' religious practices essentially requires the State to recognize an exclusive religious servitude over public land in violation of the establishment clauses of the state and federal constitutions.
421. Here, the Free Exercise Clause is limited by the Establishment Clause: Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors cannot use the Free Exercise Clause to create a **religious servitude** over state land where the University seeks to build the TMT Project; creating that religious servitude would violate the Establishment Clause. *See Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 476 ("Should respondents or any other group seek to force the Government to protect their religious practices from the interference of private parties, **such a demand would implicate** not only **the concerns** of the Free Exercise Clause, but also those **of the Establishment Clause** as well.") (Brennan, dissenting) (emphasis added).
422. As the Hawai'i Supreme Court observed in *Dedman*, "[t]o invalidate the Board's actions based on the mere assertion of harm to religious practices would contravene the fundamental purpose of preventing the state from fostering support of one religion over another. . . 'The First amendment . . . gives no one the right to insist that in pursuit of their own interests others must conform their conduct to his own religious necessities. . . We must accommodate our idiosyncrasies, religious as well as secular, to the compromises necessary in communal life.'" *Dedman*, 69 Haw. at 262, 740 P.2d at 33 (quoting *Otten v. Baltimore & Ohio R. Co.*, 205 F.2d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 1953)).
423. Similarly, in *Korean Buddhist Dae Won Sa Temple of Hawai'i v. Sullivan*, the Hawai'i Supreme Court noted that "[t]he Temple cannot force the City to zone according to its religious conclusion that a particular plot of land is 'holy ground.'" 87 Hawai'i 217, 248, 953 P.2d 1315, 1346 (1998).
424. Hawai'i jurisprudence on the Establishment Clause is consistent with the findings and rationale in other jurisdictions that preferential government treatment for "sacred sites" is a violation of the Establishment Clause. *See Badoni v. Higginson*, 638 F.2d 172, 179 (10th Cir. 1980) ("The First Amendment . . . gives no one the right to insist that in pursuit of their own interests others must conform their conduct to his own religious necessities... We must accommodate our idiosyncrasies, religious as well as secular, to the compromise necessary in communal life."); *Inupiat Cmty. v. United States*, 548 F. Supp. 182, 189 (D. Alaska 1982) (observing "that the relief sought by the Inupiat creates serious Establishment Clause problems" and explaining that "a free-exercise claim cannot be pushed to the point of awarding exclusive rights to a public area"); *Crow v. Gullet*, 541 F. Supp. 785, 794 (D. S.D. 1982) (noting that "the government risks being hauled into court by others who claim that the same rights of the general public are being unduly burdened, or that state government has become 'excessively entangled' with religion").
425. As set forth above, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors assert that the TMT Project should not be placed in any part of the summit area of Mauna Kea or the Astronomy

Precinct because it is a sacred site according to their beliefs. *See, e.g.*, (Prof. Fujikane) Tr. 1/11/17 at 81:1-83:2; Tr. 1/23/17 at 24:25-25:8 (Michael Lee); Tr. 1/23/17 at 213:5-216:15, 230:5-231:10 (Harry Fergerstrom); (Flores) Tr. 1/30/17 at 173:4-180:21 (E. Kalani Flores); WDT Pisciotta at 9, 16; Tr. 2/15/17 at 97:5-98:6 (Aloua); Tr. 2/27/17 at 208:8- 210:21 (Kakalia).

426. For example, Case goes to the summit of Mauna Kea to pray. She likens it to a church, a temple, or a sacred place. The TMT Project would have an impact on her cultural practices no matter where the TMT Project was located in the Astronomy Precinct or the Mauna Kea Science Reserve. Tr. 1/11/17 at 231:17 – 232:23; *see also Id.* at 239:4-240:22.
427. When asked whether the telescopes are clean enough for the summit of Mauna Kea, Kanaele responded "No, because the summit of Mauna Kea... should be wao akua, a place where only the akua and the elements are..." [B]uildings and activity of men should stay down at Wao Kanaka." (Kanaele) Tr. 1/24/17 at 158:16 – 159:1.
428. Dr. Kahakalau, another Hawaiian elder called by Petitioners also affirmed the religious beliefs of certain native Hawaiians. "[B]uilding a TMT on Mauna Kea does not follow our value system.... [A] Hawaiian Mauna Kea is clearly sacred. It is clearly the realm of akua. It is clearly a place that is reserved for the akua." "[W]e leave the wao akua to our deities." Tr. 1/9/17 at 34:6-35:7. Dr. Kahakalau goes on to say that "The Mauna is sacred." "[T]he wao akua, the places where the Gods reside, are considered sacred areas." "It is as sacred as any cathedral, as any temple, as any other sacred place in the world... So it is a place that needs to be undisturbed, that needs to remain in the state that it was created." Tr. 1/09/17 at 38:20-39:18; *see also Id.* at 125:8-22, 173:14-174:5, 195:8-17.
429. Prof. Osorio, called as a witness by Petitioners, also opposed the TMT Project because of the religious beliefs of native Hawaiians. "[B]ecause our people look at this place as sacred, and they have based practices and rituals on that place and are appealing to the state to exercise forbearance in the building of this..." The religious servitude that Prof. Osorio argues for is the whole mountain of Mauna Kea, not just the summit. Tr. 1/12/17 at 138:20 – 139:12.
430. Petitioners' legal filings also emphasize the religious nature of their claims. "Beloved Mauna a Wakea is a temple. It is a holy site...protected by Poli'ahu and other deities and ancestors." Kahea's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order at 4. "Mauna Kea is revered in the same way that other religions revere their churches, temples, synagogues, and mosques...It is considered the Temple of the Supreme Being..." Petitioners K. Pisciotta, Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, D. Ward, P. Neves, K. Kanaele, L. Sleightholm, B. Kealoha, C. Freitas, Mehana Kihoi Exceptions/Responses to Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order, Executive Summary at 1.
431. In fact, certain Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors assert that they should be able to control who accesses the summit, according to their beliefs. Tr. 1/23/17 at 233:7 - 234:9

(Harry Fergerstrom); Tr. 1/9/17 at 95:8-16, 100:19-101:7, 104:12-19, 177:17-178:5, 197:5-10 (Dr. Kahakalau). The law does not support that view.

432. Under the foregoing, to withhold approval of the TMT Project based on the Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenor's arguments that their religious beliefs and practices should hold veto power over all uses of the lands of Mauna Kea, would violate the Establishment Clause of the federal and state constitutions and is hereby rejected.
433. This does not mean that the government cannot protect a natural feature deemed sacred by native Hawaiians. The BLNR, in reviewing a CDUA, must consider the protection of cultural resources. It could be valid, on cultural grounds, to preserve the appearance of a landscape connected to important myths, legends, and traditions of native Hawaiians. The fact that some insist that the same landscape be protected for explicitly religious reasons does not disqualify it from legal protection.
434. The discussion in COL #400-433 explains the constitutional reasons why the essentially religious reasons asserted by many of the TMT opponents, which are so compelling to them, cannot be the basis for the final decision.

c. Contemporary Practices

435. As set forth above, *Ka Pa'akai* is concerned with the preservation and protection of customary and traditional native Hawaiian rights, not with contemporary cultural practices. Nonetheless, UH Hilo's extensive efforts to identify cultural practices, potential impacts on or impairment of those practices, and feasible actions to be taken to reasonably protect the native Hawaiian rights that exist, set forth above, encompass not only customary and traditional practices, but contemporary practices as well.
436. As described above, Petitioner Flores claims that the CDUA is incomplete and should be denied because it fails to identify certain "find spots." For the reasons articulated in the above findings of fact, Petitioner Flores' claims are factually unfounded and therefore do not provide a basis for the BLNR to deny the CDUA.
437. In any event, HRS § 343-2 relates to the Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Statement phase of a project. As described above and below, the time for any challenge to the FEIS for the TMT Project expired long ago and no challenges were made. Consequently, any argument under HRS § 343-2 would be untimely and cannot be raised now.

C. PETITIONERS' AND OPPOSING INTERVENORS' OTHER ARGUMENTS

i. Insufficient Consultation

438. A number of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor's claimed that consultation for the TMT Project was insufficient or non-existent. The substantial evidence of the history of the TMT Project, consideration of historical, traditional and cultural resources and practices, as well as contemporary and religious practices and impacts to those practices and resources by the TMT Project supports the finding that sufficient and significant

consultation with the Petitioners, Opposing Intervenor, and the public at large occurred at several stages of the planning process and were specifically included in the FEIS and the CIA for the FEIS, as well as the CDUA. Ex. A-3/R-3 at 3-9 to 3-21; Ex. A-5/R-5, App. D; Ex. A-1/R-1 at § 4; (White) Tr. 10/24/16 at 223:17-224:20; Tr. 11/15/16 at 23:11-23.

ii. Waiver of Challenges to the FEIS

439. As noted in the findings of fact above, a number of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor actively participated in the HRS Chapter 343 EIS process for the TMT Project, including submitting comments on the DEIS, and consulting for the cultural impact assessment. *See supra* at FOF Section II.D.
440. The time limit for making challenges to an FEIS is set out in Haw. Rev. Stat § 343-7.
441. It is undisputed that the time for challenges to the Governor's acceptance of the FEIS for the TMT Project ended on August 7, 2010, and that neither Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor nor anyone else made a timely challenge – or, indeed, any challenge at all – to the TMT Project's FEIS.
442. The TMT Project has complied with the EIS process required under HRS Chapter 343 and HAR, Title 11, Chapter 200.
443. Absent intervening changed environmental circumstances, no one is allowed a "second chance at administrative and judicial review when they failed to timely appeal the original" EIS. *See Oregon Natural Res. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 834 F.2d 842, 847 (9th Cir. 1987).
444. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor have not credibly shown any intervening changed environmental circumstances here, and there are no facts in the record suggesting any such materially changed circumstances exist.
445. Having failed to timely challenge the FEIS for the TMT Project, Petitioners and Opposing Intervenor may not use this contested case proceeding to assert any such challenge, and all arguments seeking to challenge the adequacy, sufficiency, findings and/or conclusions of the FEIS are hereby rejected.

iii. Alleged Desecration

446. Opposing Intervenor Temple, and other Opposing Intervenor and Petitioners, claim that development of the TMT Project – within the Astronomy Precinct and within an established Resource subzone in the Conservation District – would constitute a violation of HRS § 711-1107. The statute provides:
- (1) A person commits the offense of desecration if the person intentionally desecrates:
- (a) Any public monument or structure; or

- (b) A place of worship or burial; or
 - (c) In a public place the national flag or any other object of veneration by a substantial segment of the public.
 - (2) "Desecrate" means defacing, damaging, polluting, or otherwise physically mistreating in a way that the defendant knows will outrage the sensibilities of a person likely to observe or discover the defendant's action.
 - (3) Any person convicted of committing the offense of desecration shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not more than one year, a fine of not more than \$10,000, or both.
447. The Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' claims that development of the TMT Project constitutes "desecration" under HRS § 711-1107 is meritless.
448. The BLNR does not have jurisdiction to adjudicate violations of the Hawai'i Penal Code. Hawai'i law is very clear that administrative agencies have only those powers expressly granted by statute. *Morgan v. Planning Dep't*, 104 Hawai'i 173, 184, 86 P.3d 982, 993 (2004). Nothing in the Hawai'i Penal Code or the BLNR's enabling statutes provides the BLNR with jurisdiction over criminal offenses. Instead, HRS § 603-21.5 confers upon the circuit courts of the State of Hawai'i jurisdiction over all "criminal offenses cognizable under the laws of the State," except for those offenses "otherwise expressly provided." On the basis of the foregoing, the alleged desecration claims fail.
449. Even if the desecration claim could be considered on its merits, there is simply no evidence whatsoever of a violation, and the claim fails as a matter of law.
450. HRS § 711-1107 lists the types of activities that constitute desecration as "defacing, damaging, polluting, or otherwise physically mistreating" a site. *Id.* (emphasis added).
451. Under the established principle of statutory construction, *ejusdem generis*, "where general words follow specific words in a statute, the general words are construed to embrace only objects similar in nature to those objects enumerated in the preceding specific words." *Singleton v. Liquor Comm'n, Cty. of Hawai'i*, 111 Haw. 234, 243 n.14, 140 P.3d 1014, 1023 n.14 (2006) (quoting *Peterson v. Hawai'i Elec. Light Co.*, 85 Hawai'i 322, 328, 944 P.2d 1265, 1271 (1997) (citing *Richardson v. City & County of Honolulu*, 76 Hawai'i 46, 74, 868 P.2d 1193, 1201 (1994)).
452. Stated another way, "Under this established rule of statutory construction [*ejusdem generis*], where words of general description follow the enumeration of certain things, those words are restricted in their meaning to objects of like kind and character with those specified." *Richardson v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 76 Haw. 46, 74, 868 P.2d 1193, 1221 (1994) (Klein, J., dissenting) (quoting *Jones v. Hawaiian Elec. Co., Inc.*, 64 Haw. 289, 294, 639 P.2d 1103, 1108 (1982)).
453. Thus, the general clause in HRS § 711-1107(2) that desecration requires conduct of "otherwise physically mistreating" a site makes it clear that the more specific listed conduct of "defacing, damaging, [and] polluting" must be motivated by the ill-intent of

"mistreatment" and/or be unauthorized.

454. This ill-intent of mistreatment requires "conscious object to engage in certain conduct or cause a certain result." Commentary to HRS § 702-206(1).
455. Accordingly, the *mens rea* for the crime of desecration necessarily requires a specific intent to mistreat a protected site. HRS § 711-1107(2).
456. Thus, this situation is clearly distinguishable from the intent and types of conduct that desecration statutes are designed to address. See *e.g.*, *Pistorino & Co., Inc. v. U.S.*, 82 Cust. Ct. 168 (1979) (discussing desecration in the context of statues as objects of veneration); *American Atheists, Inc. v. Port Authority of New York and New Jersey*, 760 F.3d 227, 240 (2d Cir. 2014) (discussing desecration within the context of whether or not the display of a cross at Ground Zero is simply as an artifact that tells the story of 9/11 or as an "object of veneration"); *R. B. Tyler Company v. Kinser*, 346 S.W.2d 306 (Ky. Ct. App. 1961) (discussing alleged desecration of a grave).
457. There is no evidence in this matter that an entity or "person" involved in this proceeding has the specific ill-intent to mistreat Mauna Kea through defacing, damaging or polluting the mountain through the development of the TMT Project, and the Hearing Officer specifically finds that the University and TIO have no such intent.
458. It is illogical that the University and TIO can be found to have the requisite specific intent to "mistreat" Mauna Kea by the development of the TMT Project, where it is undisputed that the project has been proposed for the Astronomy Precinct within the Resource subzone of the Conservation District, in which by law, "astronomy facilities" are expressly permitted – and in fact currently exist.
459. Moreover, this entire process relating to the CDUA for the development of the TMT Project, which has involved numerous and extensive studies, the preparation of the application, numerous consultations, review and analysis by the DLNR staff, and this contested case hearing itself, completely negates any argument that the University and TIO could have the requisite specific ill-intent to "mistreat" Mauna Kea. To the contrary, the participation by the University and TIO in the preparation and consideration of the CDUA and their participation in this proceeding demonstrates the complete opposite: an intent and commitment to participate in a legal process designed to carefully consider the merits of the development of the TMT Project consistent with the eight criteria set forth in HAR § 13-5-30(c) as they apply to the Astronomy Precinct within the Resource subzone of the Conservation District on Mauna Kea.
460. To hold that HRS § 711-1107 applies to a land use expressly contemplated by law, and to a legal proceeding to consider the merits of that land use, would effectively eviscerate all land use controls and regulations, including HAR § 13-5-30(c).
461. The foregoing sufficiently addresses Petitioners' and Opposing Intervenors' claims of alleged desecration, without the need to make any findings or conclusions regarding any other element of the statute, including whether the summit of Mauna Kea meets any of the definitions under HRS § 711-1107(1)(a), (b) or (c). Petitioners' and Opposing

Intervenors' alleged claims are not within BLNR's jurisdiction, are unsupported by any evidence, and are therefore rejected.

iv. Vacatur of Consent to Sublease

462. The Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors sought the dismissal of TIO as a party in this proceeding due to the Third Circuit Court's decision in a separate matter to vacate the consent to the sublease for the TMT Project. *See* Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Appellees State of Hawai'i, Board of Land and Natural Resources, Department of Land and Natural Resources, and Chairperson Suzanne D. Case's Motion for Stay of Proceedings, or in the Alternative for the Court to Issue its Decision on Appeal, Filed October 25, 2016; Vacating Consent to Sublease and Non-Exclusive Easement Agreement Between TMT International Observatory LLC and The University of Hawai'i Under General Lease No. S-4191; and Remanding Matter to the Board of Land and Natural Resources, Filed January 6, 2017 in *E. Kalani Flores v. Board of Land and Natural Resources, et al.*, Civil No. 14-1-00324, In the Circuit Court of the Third Circuit, State of Hawai'i ("**Flores Appeal**").
463. The Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors argued that TIO lacked standing because TIO no longer had a property interest due to the vacatur of the consent to the Sublease. *See* Temple of Lono's Motion to Dismiss TIO as Intervenor or, Alternatively, Stay this Proceeding [DOC-427] and Mr. Harry Fergerstrom's Motion to Remove TMT/TIO as a Party, for Lack of Standing, Including Any and All Submissions into the Evidentiary Library [DOC-429].
464. The circuit court considered a legal issue – whether a contested case hearing was necessary prior to the BLNR's consent to the Sublease – which is not an issue to be decided in the current contested case hearing on the CDUA. As explained below, the vacatur of the consent to Sublease does not affect the propriety of TIO's participation in this contested case because it would have standing even without being a sublessee. To the extent that a decision to consent to the Sublease depends upon a full evaluation of the environmental, cultural, economic, social and other effects of the TMT Project, those issues are fully considered in the current contested case hearing. A diverse set of parties, including the party opposing the consent to Sublease, have had a full opportunity to present evidence on these issues.
465. The motions to dismiss were properly denied and TIO is a proper party in this proceeding based on TIO's initial motion to intervene.
466. TIO was admitted as a party to this proceeding pursuant to HAR § 13-1-31(c):
- "Other persons who can show a substantial interest in the matter. . . The board may approve such requests if it finds that the requestor's participation will substantially assist the board in its decision making. . . "

HAR § 13-1-31(c).

467. "After full consideration of the record, arguments, representations, motions, [and] applications," TIO's motion to intervene as a party was granted "due to TIO's substantial interest in the subject matter and because TIO's participation will substantially assist the Hearing Officer in her decision making." Minute Order No. 13 (July 21, 2016) at 4 [Doc. 115]. The order granting TIO's intervention did not reference, much less rely upon, the existence or validity of the Sublease, as it was not material to the Hearing Officer's decision to admit TIO as a party under HAR § 13-1-31(c).
468. Given the foregoing, the Circuit Court's Order in the Flores Appeal did not change the basis for the admission of TIO as a party to this proceeding. TIO, as the developer of the TMT Project, continued to have a "substantial interest" in the subject matter of this contested case hearing even after the entry of the Circuit Court's Order: the consideration of the CDUA for the TMT Project on Mauna Kea.
469. There was also no reasonable dispute that TIO's participation assisted the Hearing Officer in the decision on the CDUA. TIO was in a unique position to provide detailed evidence to the Hearing Officer regarding plans for the TMT Project, including the telescope's physical characteristics, the substantial public and scientific benefits of the project, TIO's mitigation plans and other facts that are relevant and material to the criteria that the Hearing Officer must consider pursuant to HAR § 13-5- 30(c) for issuance of the CDUP.
470. Accordingly, the motions to dismiss TIO were properly denied notwithstanding the vacatur of the consent to the Sublease in the Flores Appeal.

v. UH Hilo Authority to Execute CDUA

471. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors sought to strike the CDUA under the premise that since HAR § 13-5-31(b) provides that applications for CDUPs require the signature of the "landowner" (and in the case of state and public lands, "the State of Hawai'i or government entity with management control over the parcel shall sign as landowner") and the University is the lessee of the MKSR, UH Hilo could not have day-to-day management over the land, and thus only the President of the University had the authority to sign the CDUA. *See* Petitioners' Motion to Strike Conservation District Use Application, HA-3568, dated September 2, 2010, and/or Motion for Summary Judgment, filed July 18, 2016 [Doc. 94] ("**Motion to Strike CDUA**").
472. Under HRS § 304A-101, the University is an organization consisting of multiple campuses, including UH Hilo.
473. Under University policy and practice, the University may delegate day-to-day management to specific campuses, and in 2000, the University formally delegated management control of MKSR to UH Hilo. *See generally*, WDT Nagata at 2-3; Tr. 12/8/18 at 27:6-39:19; Ex. A-48.
474. Accordingly, as a matter of law, UH Hilo is the proper signatory to the CDUA pursuant to HAR § 13-5-31(b), so Petitioners' motion to strike the CDUA was properly denied.

vi. CDUA Reference to TMT Corporation and TIO

475. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors argued that the CDUA should be voided because it references the TMT Corporation rather than TIO.
476. Mr. Ching offered his opinions regarding, *inter alia*, TMT Corporation and TIO, and the alleged affect that the different entities had on the CDUA. Ex. B. 19a (Ching WDT) and B. 19d (Ching Supplemental WDT). The effect of the change in these entities is a question of law and Mr. Ching's opinions, as opposed to any factual elements in his testimony, are given no weight.
477. As Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors acknowledged, UH Hilo, not TIO, is the CDUA Applicant.
478. It is undisputed that under any sublease for the MKSR, UH Hilo and any sublessee must comply with all terms of the CDUP.
479. Accordingly, although it is undisputed that TMT Corporation and TIO are different legal entities, that fact does not affect the validity of the CDUA.
480. TMT Corporation and TIO are different entities for the purposes of corporation law, but it was always contemplated that TMT's interests, assets and personnel would be transferred to TIO once a CDUP had been obtained and construction was to commence. That transfer took effect after the conclusion of the prior contested case hearing.
481. Therefore, UH Hilo, as the applicant of the CDUA, was not required to resubmit the CDUA, reapply, or otherwise amend the CDUA to reflect the creation of TIO or the change from TMT Corporation to TIO.

vii. NHPA Section 106 Review / National Environmental Policy Act

482. A number of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors claimed that TIO and UH Hilo had an obligation under NHPA Section 106 to independently determine whether the TMT Project or the National Science Foundation's activities and funding related to the TMT Project constituted an undertaking under NHPA Section 106, and that a Section 106 review of the TMT Project was required.
483. Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors are incorrect that NHPA Section 106 applies to this matter.
484. NHPA Section 106 is codified in the United States Code ("U.S.C."), Title 54, Section 306108.
485. The implementing regulations for NHPA Section 106 are found in the Code of Federal Regulations ("CFR"), Title 36, Part 800, entitled "Protection of Historic Properties."
486. NHPA Section 106, 54 U.S.C. § 306108, titled "Effect of undertaking on historic property[,]" provides:

The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, shall take into account the effect of the undertaking on any historic property. The head of the Federal agency shall afford the Council a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to the undertaking.

487. NHPA Section 106 "requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and afford the Council a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings." 36 CFR § 800.1.

488. The term "undertaking" as used in NHPA Section 106 means:

...a project, activity, or program funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a Federal agency, including –

- (1) those carried out by or on behalf of the Federal agency;
- (2) those carried out with Federal assistance;
- (3) those requiring a Federal permit, license, or approval; and
- (4) those subject to State or local regulation administered pursuant to a delegation or approval by a Federal agency.

54 U.S.C. § 300320; 36 CFR § 800.16(y).

489. The term "Council" as used in NHPA Section 106 means the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation ("**ACHP**"). *See* 54 U.S.C. § 300303.

490. Review under NHPA Section 106 is required when there is an "undertaking" by a Federal agency that may affect historic properties. "The agency official shall determine whether the proposed Federal action is an undertaking." 36 CFR § 800.3(a). "It is the statutory obligation of the Federal agency to fulfill the requirements of section 106." *Id.* at § 800.2(a).

491. The NSF is a Federal agency under NHPA Section 106. *See* 54 U.S.C. § 300301; 5 U.S.C. § 551. NSF concluded that its activities and funding related to the TMT Project did not constitute an "undertaking" requiring review under NHPA Section 106. *See* Exhibits A-124; A-125; and A-126.

492. In reviewing NSF's conclusions relating to NHPA Section 106, the ACHP "[saw] no basis for objecting to NSF's conclusions." Ex. A-125; *see also* Ex. A-126 (relating to NSF's conclusion that "there is no basis for NSF to engage in consultations with the project proponent with regard to Section 106 implications").

493. Review of the TMT Project under NHPA Section 106 was not required.
494. Neither TIO nor UH Hilo had an obligation or authority under NHPA Section 106 to independently determine whether the TMT Project or NSF's activities and funding related to the TMT Project constituted an undertaking under NHPA Section 106.
495. Neither TIO nor UH Hilo had an obligation or authority to engage in a Section 106 review of the TMT Project.
496. NHPA Section 106 is irrelevant and immaterial to the issue before the BLNR of whether or not to grant the CDUA.
497. NEPA governs the preparation of environmental impact statements and other procedures by federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of proposed federal action. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 4331.
498. Although none of the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors claimed in this proceeding that the TMT Project is subject to NEPA (and the Hearing Officer affirmatively concludes that the TMT Project is not subject to NEPA), the Petitioners and Opposing Intervenors claimed that the evaluation of the cumulative impacts and proposed mitigation measures of the TMT Project should be guided by the approach applied by federal agencies pursuant to NEPA. *See* Ex. B.01s.
499. Inasmuch as NEPA does not apply to the TMT Project and the preparation of the EIS and other documents related to the project, and does not apply to the analysis of the cumulative impacts and proposed mitigation measures at issue in this proceeding, NEPA (and the approach employed by federal agencies under NEPA) is irrelevant and immaterial to the issue before the BLNR of whether or not to grant the CDUA.

XI. SUMMARY

500. The BLNR approved the CMP, CRMP, NRMP, PAP, and Decommissioning Plan on April 9, 2009 and March 25, 2010. These documents are the State of Hawai'i's management documents for the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea.
501. The activities that would be carried out if the TMT Project is approved and implemented are consistent with the management actions described in the CMP and sub-plans. This provides consistency and viability of management objectives, which include ensuring the sustained use of natural resources in the Resource subzone under HAR § 13-5-13.
502. A project-specific management plan has been developed for the TMT Project that adopts the approach, goals, objectives and management strategies and actions of the CMP and sub-plans in their entirety. The TMT Management Plan implements all relevant action items and plans of the CMP and sub-plans on a site-specific basis, ensuring that the management actions called for in the CMP and sub-plans which are applicable to the TMT Project are effectively and responsibly implemented.
503. Protection of native Hawaiian practitioners' exercise of customary and traditional

practices on the summit area of Mauna Kea and within the area covered by the CDUA can be accomplished through:

- Implementation of a Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program that will require all construction managers, contractors, supervisors, construction workers, and TMT staff to be trained annually regarding the potential impact to cultural and archaeological resources and measures to prevent such impact;
- Development and implementation of an Archaeological Monitoring Plan that will be submitted to SHPD for review and approval. Such plan shall provide for the employment of an archaeologist during the construction of the TMT Project who shall be on site during construction to insure minimal disturbance to any native Hawaiian cultural sites, practices and access to historical and cultural resources;
- Development and implementation of an Archaeological Mitigation Plan pursuant to HAR § 13-284-8(a)(2). Such plan will be developed in consultation with native Hawaiian organizations, including the Office of Hawaiian Affairs;
- Employment of a cultural resource specialist to work in conjunction with the archaeological monitor at all times and in all places or situations where on-site archaeological monitoring is required;
- Regular consultation with Kahu Kū Mauna and other community groups regarding cultural resources;
- Development of exhibits regarding cultural, natural, and historic resources in coordination with OMKM and 'Imiloa that could be used at the Mauna Kea VIS, 'Imiloa, TMT facilities, and other appropriate locations; and
- Reduced TMT Observatory operations to minimize daytime activities on up to four days per year in observance of native Hawaiian cultural practices.

504. The protection of the natural resources of the Mauna Kea summit and the area covered by the application for the CDUP can be accomplished through:

- Implementation of a Cultural and Natural Resources Training Program that will require all construction managers, contractors, supervisors, construction workers, and TMT staff to be trained annually regarding the potential impact to cultural and archaeological resources and the measures to prevent such impact;
- Development and implementation of an Invasive Species Prevention and Control Program which will ensure: (1) all material shipments will be repacked off of the proposed TMT Project site so that only essential

packing material is used for final transportation to the TMT Project site; (2) the washing and cleaning of all materials, clothing, construction vehicles, and heavy equipment off of the TMT Project site; (3) inspection of construction materials, equipment, crates, and containers and packing materials by a full-time trained biologist selected by OMKM and approved by the DLNR to assure no invasive plants or animals are introduced to the Mauna Kea summit areas; (4) weekly monitoring of the TMT Project sites by a trained biologist for the presence of invasive species; and (5) implementation of control measures by a trained biologist selected by OMKM and approved by the DLNR;

- Monitoring of arthropods in the area of the TMT Access Way prior to, during, and for two years after construction of the Access Way;
- Implementation of a Ride-Sharing Program that will limit vehicle trips to the summit, thus reducing the amount of dust generated along the unpaved sections of the Mauna Kea Access Road and TMT Access Way;
- Development of exhibits regarding cultural, natural, and historic resources in coordination with OMKM and ‘Imiloa that could be used at the Mauna Kea VIS, ‘Imiloa, TMT facilities, and other appropriate locations;
- Procurement of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit prior to the start of construction of the TMT Project from the State of Hawai‘i Department of Health;
- Implementation and coordination of the applicable provisions of the CRMP as related to the TMT construction and operation; and
- Implementation and coordination of the applicable provisions of the PAP as related to the TMT construction and operation.

505. The TMT Management Plan, Archaeological Monitoring Plan, Construction Plan, Historical and Archaeological Site Plan, Arthropod Access Way Monitoring Plan, and all other existing plans and agreements designed to protect the natural and cultural resources of Mauna Kea shall be complied with by the permittee.
506. Based upon the evidence and testimony presented in this contested case hearing, and the files and records herein, UH Hilo has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it meets the requirements for the granting of the CDUA for the TMT Project. HAR § 13-5-30(c).
507. The proposed land use meets the criteria for issuance of a CDUP.
508. The proposed land use reasonably protects identified native Hawaiian rights and practices.
509. Provided that the special conditions discussed above and as set forth below, and the

standard conditions set forth in HAR § 13-5-42, as modified below, are imposed:

- The proposed land use will be consistent with the purpose of the Conservation District;
 - The proposed land use will be consistent with the objectives of the Resource subzone;
 - The proposed land use will comply with provisions and guidelines contained in Chapter 205A, where applicable;
 - The proposed land use will not cause substantial adverse impact to existing natural resources within the surrounding area, community, or region;
 - The proposed land use, including buildings, structures, and facilities, will be compatible with the locality and surrounding areas, appropriate to the physical conditions and capabilities of the specific parcel or parcels;
 - The existing physical and environmental aspects of the land will be reasonably preserved or improved upon, whichever is applicable;
 - Subdivision of land will not be utilized to increase the intensity of land uses in the conservation district; and
 - The proposed land use will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
510. The proposed land use meets the criteria for issuance of a Conservation District Use Permit. The proposed land use also reasonably protects identified native Hawaiian rights.
511. Any proposed conclusion of law that is not specifically included above is hereby rejected.
512. If any of the above conclusions of law shall be determined to be findings of fact, it is intended that every such conclusion of law shall be construed as a finding of fact. Conversely, if any of the above findings of fact shall be determined to be conclusions of law, it is intended that every such finding of fact shall be construed as a conclusion of law.

DECISION AND ORDER

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, the CDUA and the TMT Management Plan are approved. A CDUP shall be issued, subject to the following conditions:

General Conditions:

1. UH Hilo shall comply with all applicable statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations, and conditions of the Federal, State, and County governments, and applicable parts of the HAR § 13-5 et seq.;
2. UH Hilo shall obtain appropriate authorization from the Department for the occupancy of state lands, if applicable;
3. UH Hilo shall comply with all applicable Department of Health administrative rules;
4. Any work done or construction to be done on the land shall be initiated within two (2) years of the approval of such use, in accordance with construction plans that have been signed by the Chairperson, and, unless otherwise authorized, shall be completed within twelve (12) years of the approval. The UH Hilo shall notify the Department in writing when construction activity is initiated and when it is completed;
5. Before proceeding with any work authorized by the Board, UH Hilo shall submit four copies of the construction and grading plans and specifications to the Chairperson or his authorized representative for approval for consistency with the conditions of the permit and the declarations set forth in the permit application. Three of the copies will be returned to UH Hilo. Plan approval by the Chairperson does not constitute approval required from other agencies;
6. All representations relative to mitigation set forth in the Environmental Impact Statement and Conservation District Use Application are incorporated and adopted as conditions of the permit;
7. All mitigation measures and management actions contained in the Historic Preservation Mitigation Plan, Construction Plan, Historical & Archaeological Site Plan, Maintenance Plan, and Arthropod Monitoring Plan, are incorporated as conditions of this permit;
8. The TMT Project will comply with any terms and conditions outlined in the Comprehensive Management Plan and associated sub-plans; and
9. The TMT Management Plan is approved, including all specific management actions articulated in the TMT Management Plan including, Cultural Resources Management, Natural Resources Management, Education & Outreach, Astronomical Resources, Permitting and Enforcement, Infrastructure and Maintenance, Construction Guidelines, Site Recycling, Decommissioning, Demolition & Restoration, Future Land Uses, and Monitoring, Evaluation & Updates. These management actions and their associated mitigation measures are incorporated as conditions of this permit.

The following special conditions shall be implemented by UHH, OMKM and TIO, as applicable:

1. Ensuring that employees attend mandatory cultural and natural resources training with a minimum of one days' training;
2. Working with the 'Imiloa Astronomy Center, OMKM, and Kahu Kū Mauna to develop informational exhibits for visitors regarding the natural, cultural and archaeological resources of Mauna Kea that could be used at the Mauna Kea VIS, 'Imiloa, TMT facilities, and other appropriate locations;
3. Funding the re-naturalization of the closed access road on Pu'u Poli'ahu, partial re-naturalization of the batch plant staging area after construction has been completed, and camouflaging of the utility pull boxes in certain locations to reduce the visual impact from the summit area;
4. Implementing an invasive species control program;
5. Working with OMKM to develop and implement a wēkiu bug habitat restoration study;
6. Implementing the "Zero Waste Management" policy;
7. Filling employment opportunities locally to the greatest extent possible;
8. Mandating that employees traveling beyond Hale Pōhaku take part in a ride-sharing program using project vehicles;
9. Using energy savings devices such as solar hot water systems, photovoltaic power systems, energy efficient light fixtures, and Energy Star rated appliances;
10. The University will decommission three telescopes permanently, as soon as reasonably possible, and no new observatories will be constructed on those sites. This commitment will be legally binding on the University and shall be included in any lease renewal or extension proposed by the University for Mauna Kea;
11. Notwithstanding any lease renewal or extension, consistent with the Decommissioning Plan, at least two additional facilities will be permanently decommissioned by December 31, 2033, including the Very Long Baseline Array antenna and at least one additional observatory.
12. Providing \$1 million annually, adjusted for inflation, for "Community Benefits Package" which will commence with construction and continue through the term of the sublease. The package will be administered via The Hawai'i Island New Knowledge (THINK) Fund Board of Advisors. In addition to the types of programs described in the "Community Benefits Package" in the Findings of Fact, at least \$5,000 annually of the \$1 million shall support a program or programs to assist at risk youth, specifically focusing on the children of incarcerated parents;
13. The Board of advisors shall ensure that a reasonable amount of funding is directed at programs for the most vulnerable and underserved members of Hawai'i Island

communities so that they can participate in our technological future.

14. The funding shall be distributed with reasonable promptness and not be used to build a permanent endowment;
15. Partnering with other institutions to implement a Workforce Pipeline Program, headed by at least one full-time position through the Community Outreach office, to prepare local residents for jobs in science, engineering, and technical fields;
16. UHH will ensure that the survey of the power line corridor easement complies with DLNR standards and is in accordance with the conditions contained in the grant of easement (including the Mauna Kea Ice Age Natural Area Reserve) that was approved by the BLNR in August 1985. The University will provide copies of the survey to DOFAW;
17. OMKM will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and experts who are advising OMKM, including representatives from the DLNR regarding surveys of the wēkiu bug and invertebrates along the utility corridor, including Pu‘u Hau Kea and the pu‘u west of the Parking Area 1;
18. The construction contractor will be required to minimize the visual changes to land within the utility line right-of-way during utility upgrades. Any disturbance outside of the easement area of the construction corridor will be restored to the extent possible;
19. UH Hilo will present a plan for handling recreational parking during construction to the OCCL for review and approval, at least one month prior to beginning construction;
20. Following construction, TMT shall keep their area clean and free of trash or unattended tools and equipment, unless authorized in writing by OMKM and OCCL;
21. The Archaeological Monitoring Plan will be submitted to the State Historic Preservation Division for review and approval prior to the onset of construction;
22. Sublease rent will be deposited into the Manna Kea Lands Management Special Fund, and only used for management of Mauna Kea and related purposes as provided by law;
23. UH Hilo/OMKM will notify OCCL of the date of the twice-annual inspections of the project site and allow Department staff to attend if available;
24. UH Hilo/OMKM will provide OCCL and BLNR a copy of TIO's annual report to OMKM, as required by Section 5.3 of the TMT Management Plan;
25. UH Hilo will allow BLNR to name a DLNR representative to participate in the CMP five-year management review process;

26. When provided or required, potable water supply and sanitation facilities shall have the approval of the Department of Health and the county Board of Water Supply;
27. UH Hilo understands and agrees that this permit does not convey any vested rights or exclusive privilege;
28. In issuing this permit, the Department and Board have relied on the information and data that UH Hilo has provided in connection with this permit application. If, subsequent to the issuance of this permit, such information and data prove to be false, incomplete or inaccurate, this permit may be modified, suspended or revoked, in whole or in part, and/or the Department may, in addition, institute appropriate legal proceedings;
29. Where any interference, nuisance, or harm may be caused, or hazard established by the use, UH Hilo shall be required to take the measures to minimize or eliminate the interference, nuisance, harm, or hazard;
30. Should historic remains such as artifacts, burials or concentration of charcoal be encountered during construction activities, work shall cease immediately in the vicinity of the find, and the find shall be protected from further damage. The contractor shall immediately contact the State Historic Preservation Division (692-8015), which will assess the significance of the find and recommend an appropriate mitigation measure, if necessary; the Applicant will also notify the Office of Hawaiian Affairs at the same time;
31. During construction, appropriate mitigation measures shall be implemented to minimize impacts to off-site roadways, utilities, and public facilities;
32. No construction work shall be initiated until the Applicant demonstrates compliance with all preconstruction conditions and mitigation measures specifically required in this decision. Once this condition has been satisfied, the Department will issue notice to proceed with construction;
33. TIO shall set aside funds annually in a sufficient amount to allow for site observatory and access way site restoration;
34. Daytime activities at TMT will be minimized on up to four days per year, as identified by Kahu Kū Mauna;
35. UHH shall consult with the Kahu Kū Mauna Council and cultural practitioners to the extent feasible to plan for, and establish, an appropriate area on Mauna Kea, within the MKSR, to be used by native Hawaiians for religious and cultural purposes; provided that this condition shall not affect the timing of TMT construction or operation;
36. UHH shall allow reasonable access to the area established under Condition 35 for the exercise of any native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices to the

extent feasible, reasonable, and safe. The allocation of this area shall be in addition to all other cultural and access rights of native Hawaiians to other areas of Mauna Kea as provided by law or by other conditions set forth herein;

37. In order to enhance the Hawaiian cultural presence on Mauna Kea, UHH shall include products and handicrafts with a native Hawaiian cultural theme among those sold at the Mauna Kea VIS, and explore whether an expanded area for specifically native Hawaiian crafts can be accommodated at or near the VIS;
38. UHH shall implement a cooperative internship and mentorship program between personnel working at the astronomy facilities on Mauna Kea and Hawaiian communities;
39. UHH and TIO shall develop a plan to implement and extend early entry programs for at-risk children of Hawaiian ancestry and other at-risk youth in the community of UH Hilo. The early entry program shall provide educational opportunities in STEM-related and other curriculum such as the following:
 - (a) Astronomy, math, science, engineering, environmental science and technical support careers at astronomy facilities;
 - (b) Hawaiian language and culture;
 - (c) Navigation;
 - (d) Geology;
 - (e) Biology and agriculture;
 - (f) Law Enforcement/criminal justice;
 - (g) New disciplines of learning dependent on career fields needed; and
 - (h) On-the-job training as necessary.

UHH/TIO shall report to BLNR on the progress of this condition prior to the completion of TMT construction; provided that progress on this condition or lack thereof shall not affect the construction or operation of the TMT Project and provided further that it requires no commitment for funding other than staff time for plan development;

40. UHH shall make reasonable accommodations for the use of facilities at Hale Pōhaku for the Hawaiian Language and Hawaiian Studies programs at UHH and HCC, along with their continued use by others;
41. Kahu Kū Mauna shall review policies concerning the construction and retention of personal or group shrines such as ‘ahu, and recommend policies to OMKM and/or BLNR as appropriate, within 18 months;

42. UHH and OMKM are allowed to take reasonable measures consistent with law, including limitations on the use of the TMT Access Way, if necessary for the security of the TMT Observatory; and

43. Other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Chairperson.

The conditions above shall be deemed severable, so that if any are deemed invalid, that shall not affect the part which remains or the validity of the permit.

In case of noncompliance with these conditions, the chairperson shall first attempt to secure compliance from the responsible party, and if unsuccessful, shall bring the matter to the board, with notice to the permittee, to request an order revoking the permit.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 27, 2017.

Suzanne D. Case

SUZANNE D. CASE, Chairperson
Board of Land and Natural Resources
and Presiding Officer

STANLEY H. ROEHRIG, Member

KEITH "KEONE" DOWNING, Member

JAMES A. GOMES, Member

Thomas H Oi

THOMAS OI, Member

Samuel Gon III

SAMUEL "OHU" GON III, Member

CHRISTOPHER YUEN, Member


42. UHH and OMKM are allowed to take reasonable measures consistent with law, including limitations on the use of the TMT Access Way, if necessary for the security of the TMT Observatory; and
43. Other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Chairperson.

The conditions above shall be deemed severable, so that if any are deemed invalid, that shall not affect the part which remains or the validity of the permit.

In case of noncompliance with these conditions, the chairperson shall first attempt to secure compliance from the responsible party, and if unsuccessful, shall bring the matter to the board, with notice to the permittee, to request an order revoking the permit.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 27, 2017.

SUZANNE D. CASE, Chairperson
Board of Land and Natural Resources
and Presiding Officer

 I do not
concur.

STANLEY H. ROEHRIG, Member

KEITH "KEONE" DOWNING, Member

JAMES A. GOMES, Member

THOMAS OI, Member

SAMUEL "OHU" GON III, Member

CHRISTOPHER YUEN, Member

42. UHH and OMKM are allowed to take reasonable measures consistent with law, including limitations on the use of the TMT Access Way, if necessary for the security of the TMT Observatory; and
43. Other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Chairperson.

The conditions above shall be deemed severable, so that if any are deemed invalid, that shall not affect the part which remains or the validity of the permit.

In case of noncompliance with these conditions, the chairperson shall first attempt to secure compliance from the responsible party, and if unsuccessful, shall bring the matter to the board, with notice to the permittee, to request an order revoking the permit.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 27, 2017.

SUZANNE D. CASE, Chairperson
Board of Land and Natural Resources
and Presiding Officer

STANLEY H. ROEHRIG, Member

I DO NOT CONCUR
Keith Keone Downing 9-27-17

KEITH "KEONE" DOWNING, Member 9:49 AM

JAMES A. GOMES, Member

THOMAS OI, Member

SAMUEL "OHU" GON III, Member

CHRISTOPHER YUEN, Member

42. UHH and OMKM are allowed to take reasonable measures consistent with law, including limitations on the use of the TMT Access Way, if necessary for the security of the TMT Observatory; and
43. Other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Chairperson.

The conditions above shall be deemed severable, so that if any are deemed invalid, that shall not affect the part which remains or the validity of the permit.


In case of noncompliance with these conditions, the chairperson shall first attempt to secure compliance from the responsible party, and if unsuccessful, shall bring the matter to the board, with notice to the permittee, to request an order revoking the permit.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 27, 2017.

SUZANNE D. CASE, Chairperson
Board of Land and Natural Resources
and Presiding Officer

STANLEY H. ROEHRIG, Member

KEITH "KEONE" DOWNING, Member



JAMES A. GOMES, Member

THOMAS OI, Member

SAMUEL "OHU" GON III, Member

CHRISTOPHER YUEN, Member

42. UHH and OMKM are allowed to take reasonable measures consistent with law, including limitations on the use of the TMT Access Way, if necessary for the security of the TMT Observatory; and
43. Other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Chairperson.

The conditions above shall be deemed severable, so that if any are deemed invalid, that shall not affect the part which remains or the validity of the permit.

In case of noncompliance with these conditions, the chairperson shall first attempt to secure compliance from the responsible party, and if unsuccessful, shall bring the matter to the board, with notice to the permittee, to request an order revoking the permit.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 27, 2017.

SUZANNE D. CASE, Chairperson
Board of Land and Natural Resources
and Presiding Officer


STANLEY H. ROEHRIG, Member

KEITH "KEONE" DOWNING, Member

JAMES A. GOMES, Member

THOMAS OI, Member

SAMUEL "OHU" GON III, Member


CHRISTOPHER YUEN, Member

Index of Select Defined Terms

Defined Term	Definition
13N	13 North site
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
AIS	Archaeological inventory survey
AO	Adaptive optics
ASM	ASM Affiliates, Inc.
BLNR or Board	Board of Land and Natural Resources
BOR	University Board of Regents
Caltech	California Institute of Technology
CBP	Community Benefits Package
CDUA	Conservation District Use Application
CDUP	Conservation District Use Permit
CFHT	Canada-France-Hawai‘i Telescope
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
Chairperson	Chairperson of BLNR
CMP	Comprehensive Management Plan
COL	Conclusions of Law
CRMP	Cultural Resources Management Plan
CSO	Caltech Submillimeter Observatory
CZMA	Hawai‘i Coastal Management Area
Decommissioning Plan	Decommissioning Plan for the Mauna Kea Observatories
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DLNR or Department	Department of Land and Natural Resources
DOE	Department of Education
EISPN/EA	Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice/Environmental Assessment
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
Flores Appeal	<i>E. Kalani Flores v. Board of Land and Natural Resources, et al.</i> , Civil No. 14-1-00324, In the Circuit Court of the Third Circuit, State of Hawai‘i
FOF	Findings of Fact
FWS	United States Fish & Wildlife Service
Gemini	Gemini North Observatory
General Lease	General Lease No. S-4191
<i>Hanapi</i>	<i>State v. Hanapi</i> , 89 Hawai‘i 177, 970 P.2d 485 (1998)
HAPA	Hawai‘i Administrative Procedures Act, HRS Chapter 91
HAR	Hawai‘i Administrative Rules
HawCC	Hawai‘i Community College
Hearing Officer or Judge Amano	Judge (Ret.) Riki May Amano
HELCO	Hawai‘i Electric and Light Company
HIBC	Hawai‘i Island Burial Council
Historic District	Geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of contributing properties – sites, buildings, structures, or objects united by past events or

	aesthetically by plan or physical development
Historic Property	Any building, structure, object, district, area, or site, including heiau and underwater sites, which is over fifty years old
HRS	Hawai‘i Revised Statutes
IfA	Institute for Astronomy
‘Imiloa	UH Hilo’s ‘Imiloa Astronomy Center
IRTF	NASA Infrared Telescope Facility
JCMT	James Clark Maxwell Telescope
<i>Ka Pa‘akai</i>	<i>Ka Pa‘akai o Ka ‘Aina v. Land Use Comm’n</i> , 94 Hawai‘i 31, 7 P.3d 1068 (2000)
KAHEA	Petitioner KAHEA: The Environmental Alliance
Keck I	First Phase of W.M Keck Observatory
Keck II	Second Phase of W.M Keck Observatory
Master Plan	Mauna Kea Science Reserve Master Plan
<i>Mauna Kea Anaina Hou</i>	<i>Mauna Kea Anaina Hou v. Board of Land and Natural Resources</i> , 136 Hawai‘i 376, 363 P.3d 224 (2015)
MISMP	Maunakea Invasive Species Management Plan
MKAH	Petitioner Mauna Kea Anaina Hou
MKMB	Mauna Kea Management Board
MKSR	Mauna Kea Science Reserve
MKWC	Mauna Kea Weather Center
<i>Morimoto</i>	<i>Morimoto v. BLNR</i> , 107 Hawai‘i 296, 113 P.3d 172 (2005)
Motion to Strike CDUA	Petitioners’ Motion to Strike Conservation District Use Application, HA-3568, dated September 2, 2010, and/or Motion for Summary Judgment, filed July 18, 2016 (Doc. 94)
NAR	Mauna Kea Ice Age Natural Area Reserve
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA Section 106	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
NOI	Notice of Intent
Non-Appearing Applicants	Ana Nawahine-Kaho‘opi‘i, Edward Akiona, Wai‘ala Ahn, Holonaikaipuna Mikala-Jiro Fukutomi, Michael Kumukauoha Lee, Keahi Tajon, Eric Hansen, Rick Cassiday, Linda Namauu, Joy Keahipuakauikawekiu Mills-Ferren, and Michelle Cabalse
NRMP	Natural Resources Management Plan
OCCL	DLNR, Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands
OEQC	State of Hawai‘i Department of Health’s Office of Environmental Quality Control
OHA	Office of Hawaiian Affairs
OMKM	Office of Mauna Kea Management
Opposing Intervenors	Meha Kihoi, C.M. Kaho‘okahi Kanuha, Harry Fergerstrom, Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara, Jennifer Leina‘ala Sleightholm, Maelani Lee, Cindy Freitas, William Freitas, Temple, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Stephanie-Malia:Tabbada, Tiffnie Kakalia, Glen Kila, Dwight Vicente, and Brannon Kamahana Kealoha
PAP	Public Access Plan for the UH Management Area on Mauna Kea

<i>PASH</i>	<i>Public Access Shoreline Hawai‘i v. Hawai‘i County Planning Comm’n</i> , 79 Hawai‘i 425, 903 P.2d 1246 (1995)
PCSI	Pacific Consulting Services, Inc.
Petitioners	Petitioners MKAH, Kealoha Pisciotto, Clarence Kukauakahi Ching, the Flores-Case ‘Ohana, Paul Neves, Debora Ward, and KAHEA
PHS	Prehearing Statement
<i>Pratt</i>	<i>State v. Pratt</i> , 127 Hawai‘i 206, 277 P.3d 300 (2012)
Preliminary Draft CIA	Preliminary Draft of the Cultural Impact Assessment
Prior Contested Case	DLNR Docket No. HA-11-05
PUEO	Perpetuating Unique Educational Opportunities, Inc.
ROOK	Royal Order of Kamehameha
SDRP	Site Deconstruction and Removal Plan
SHPD	State Historic Preservation Division
SIHP	Statewide Inventory of Historic Places
SMA	Submillimeter Array
SPRP	Spill Prevention and Response Plan
SRP	Site Restoration Plan
STEM	Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics
Subaru	Subaru Observatory
Supreme Court	Hawai‘i Supreme Court
TCP	Traditional cultural property
Temple	Temple of Lono
TIO	TMT International Observatory, LLC
TIO Sublease	Executed, written sublease between the University and TIO for a portion of the UH Management Area
TMK	Tax Map Key
TMT Corporation	TMT Observatory Corporation
TMT Project	Thirty Meter Telescope at the MKSR
U.S.C.	United States Code
UH Hilo	University of Hawai‘i at Hilo
UH Management Area	MKSR, the Hale Pōhaku mid-level facilities, and the Summit Access Road (between Hale Pōhaku and the MKSR, including 400 yards on either side of the road, excluding the NAR)
UHERO	University of Hawai‘i Economic Research Organization
UKIRT	United Kingdom Infrared Telescope
University	University of Hawai‘i
UST	Underground Storage Tanks
VIS	Mauna Kea Visitor Information Station
VLBA	Very Long Baseline Array
<i>Wa‘ahila Ridge</i>	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order, In re Conservation District Use Application for Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. to Construct a 138-kV Transmission Line at Wa‘ahila Ridge, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, DLNR File No. OA-2801 (June 28, 2002)
<i>Waiahole</i>	<i>In re Water Use Permit Applications</i> , 94 Haw. 97, 9 P.3d 409

ccxvii.

	(2000)
<i>Waiola</i>	<i>In re Contested Case Hearing on Water Use ("Waiola")</i> , 103 Hawai'i 401, 83 P.3d 664 (2004)
WDT	Written Direct Testimony
WMP	Waste Minimization Plan
WPP	Workforce Pipeline Program

APPENDIX A
Pre-Hearing Filings filed by July 18, 2016

DOC. NO.	DATE FILED	DOCUMENT NAME	RESPONSIVE FILINGS	DISPOSITION
Doc. 5	April 15, 2016	Petitioners' Objections to Selection Process and to Appointment of Hearing Officer Made Pursuant to Minute Order No. 1	UH Hilo's Response [Doc. 8, filed 4/21/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 4 [Doc. 14, filed 5/6/16]
			Petitioners' Response and Supplemental Objection [Doc. 13, filed 5/2/16]	
			Petitioners' Motion for Reconsideration and/or Motion to Strike Selection Process and to Disqualify Various Members and Hearing Officer [Doc. 31, filed 5/13/16]	Motion for Reconsideration denied by Minute Order No. 9 [Doc. 63, filed 6/3/16]
			UH Hilo's Statement of Position [Doc., 43, filed 5/25/16]	
Doc. 15	May 6, 2016	Petitioners' Objections Regarding Procurement Committee and Process and Committee Member/BLNR Board Member		Denied by BLNR Member Christopher Yuen's Response [Doc. 42, filed 5/25/16]
Doc. 78	June 21 2016	Temple of Lono Motion for Partial Summary Judgment	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 135, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 27:19-45:22]
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition. [Doc 142, filed 8/1/16]	
			PUEO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 154, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 23 [Doc. 346, filed 10/10/16]
			Temple's Reply to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 176, filed 8/3/16]	
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 315, filed 10/5/16]	
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
			Temple's Response to Proposed Order [Doc. 334, filed 10/7/16]	
Doc. 79	June 22, 2016	Temple's Kingdom of Hawaii Notice of Absence of Necessary and Indispensable Parties	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 151, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 111:23]
			Temple's Reponses to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 175, filed 8/3/16]	

Doc. 80	June 24, 2016	Vicente's Motion to Disqualify Judge Amano (Ret.); State of Hawai'i Lack of Jurisdiction to Hear this Contested Case Hearing	Temple's Response in Support [Doc. 132, filed 7/27/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 14 [Doc. 124, filed 7/22/16]
			Tabbada's Support [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	
Doc. 81	July 11, 2016	Petitioners' Request for Continuance on Submissions and Next Hearing Date	Petitioner's Supplement [Doc. 83, filed 7/12/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 25:13]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 85, filed 7/14/16]	
			The LTH Hilo's Opposition f Doc. 86, filed 7/14/16]	
			Petitioners' Reply to TIO's and the UH Hilo's Responses [Doc. 87, filed 7/14/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 27 [Doc. 350, filed 10/10/16]
			Kanaele's Joinder [Doc. 88, filed 7/15/16]	
			C. Freitas' Reply to TIO's and the LTH Hilo's Responses [Doc. 114, filed 7/20/16]	
			William Freitas' Reply to TMT International Observatory LLC's and the UH Hilo's Responses [Doc. 125, filed 7/21/16]	
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 319, filed 10/5/16]	
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
Doc. 84	July 13, 2016	Lee's Motion to Intervene	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 136, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 76:7 – 78:6]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 146, filed 8/1/16]	
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 322, filed 10/5/16]	
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 26, [Doc. 349, filed 10/10/16]

Doc. 89	July 18, 2016	C. Freitas' Request for Continuance on Witness List and Next Hearing Date	C. Freitas' Motion for Reconsideration [Doe. 205, filed 8/11/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 20:07, 25:13] Denied by Minute Order No. 97 [Doc. 769, filed 7/14/17]
			W. Freitas' Joinder to Cindy Freitas' Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 207, filed 8/11/16]	
			C. Freitas' Motion to Withdraw Motion for Reconsideration [Doc 212, filed 8/16/16]	
Doc. 90	July 18, 2016	W. Freitas' Request for Continuance on Witness List and Next Hearing Date		Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 20:07, 25:13] Denied by Minute Order No. 97 [Doc. 769, filed 7/14/17]
Doc. 91	July 18, 2016	Kila's Request for Continuance on Witness List and Next Hearing Date		Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 20:07, 25:13] Denied by Minute Order No. 97 [Doc. 769, filed 7/14/17]
Doc. 92	July 18, 2016	Sleightholm's Request for Continuance on Witness List and Next Hearing Date		Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 20:07, 25:13] Denied by Minute Order No. 97 [Doc. 769, filed 7/14/17]
Doc. 94	July 18, 2016	Petitioners' Motion to Strike Conservation District Use Permit Application, HA-3568, dated September 2, 2010, and/or Motion for Summary Judgment	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 137, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 37 [Doc. 388, filed 10/19/16]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 148, filed 8/1/16]	
			Camara's Joinder [Doc. 181, filed 8/8/16]	
			TIO's Objection to Camara's Joinder [Doc. 183, filed 8/8/16]	
			The UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Objections to Camara's Joinder [Doc. 199, filed 8/11/16]	
			Tabbada's Support [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	

Doc. 95	July 18, 2016	Petitioners' Motion to Disqualify BLNR's and Hearing Officer's Counsel	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 138, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 38 [Doc. 389, filed 10/19/16]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 147, filed 8/1/16]	
			PUEO's Joinder to the UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 153, filed 8/1/16]	
			Attorney General Douglas S. Chin, The Department of the Attorney General, and Deputy Attorneys General in their capacity as counsel for the Board of Land and Natural Resources and Hearing Officer's, Memorandum in Opposition [Doc. 157, filed 8/1/16]	
Doc. 96	July 18, 2016	Ferguson's Motion to Reconsider all Motions, Application, and/or Request for Admission or Intervention as a Party or Other Parties in this Matter; Motion to strike all motions, Applications, Decisions, etc: Essentially Making Moot the Entire Hearing; Motion to Remove Hearing Officer Riki May Amano, Attorney General Julie China, and Director of Coastal and Conservation Lands Michael Cain	Kanaele's Motion to Join [Doc. 122 filed 7/22/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 92:6 – 103:9]
			DeLeon's Motion to Join [Doc. 123, filed 7/22/16]	Denied in part by Minute Order No. 17 [Doc. 245, filed 8/26/16]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 144, filed 8/1/16]	
			TIO's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 309, filed 10/5/16]	Denied in part by Minute Order No. 22 [Doc. 345, filed 10/10/16]
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
Doc. 97	July 18, 2016	Tabbada's Motion to Vacate Entire Process for Violation of BLNR and UH Hilo of Hawaii Fiduciary Trust, Rights, Responsibilities, Breach of Contract, Etc. Mandated by the Law of the Land	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 139, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 79:6 – 81:4]
			TIO's Joinder to the UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 142, filed 8/1/16]	
			Tabbada's Response to the UH Hilo's Oppositions [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 25 [Doc. 348, filed 10/10/16]
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 316, filed 10/5/16]	
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	

Doc. 98	July 18, 2016	Kihoi's Motion to Deny the Intervention of Perpetuating Unique Educational Opportunities as a Party to the Contested Case Hearing	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 145, filed 8/1/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 81:5-88:22]
			PUEO's Opposition [Doc. 155, filed 8/1/16]	
			Sleightholm's Joinder [Doc. 192, filed 8/10/16]	
			UH Hilo's Objection to Sleightholm's Joinder [Doc. 197, filed 8/11/16]	Motion for Reconsideration denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/29/16 at 9:3 – 9:8]
			TIO's Objection to Sleightholm's Joinder [Doc. 204, filed 8/11/16]	
			Kihoi's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 209, filed 8/12/16]	
			Kealoha's Joinder to Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 228, filed 8/22/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 28 [Doc. 351, filed 10/10/16]
			Sleightholm's Joinder to Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 236, filed 8/22/16]	
			TIO's Opposition to Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 232, filed 8/22/16]	
			PUEO's Opposition to Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 234, filed 8/22/16]	Motion for Reconsideration denied by Minute Order No. 60 [Doc. 683, filed 6/2/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 226, filed 8/22/16]	
			Tabbada's Response to the UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	
			PUEO's Proposed Minute Order Denying Kihoi's Motion [Doc. 308, filed 10/5/16]	
			Kihoi's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 380, filed 10/15/16]	
			Kanaele's Joinder to Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 390, filed 10/18/16]	
			PUEO's Opposition to Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 396, filed 10/19/16]	
			Kihoi's Proposed Minute Order No. __ Objection to Proposed Minute Order No. __ Denying Mehana Kihoi's Motion to Deny the Intervention of Perpetuating Unique Educational Opportunities as a Party in the Contested Case Hearing [Doc. 327, filed 10/6/16]	

Doc. 99	July 18, 2016	PUEO's Motion to Set the Issues	Temple's Oppositions [Doc. 119, filed 7/20/16]	Granted by Minute Order No. 19 [Doc. 281, filed 9/23/16]
			UH Hilo's Substantive Joinder [Doc. 140, filed 8/1/16]	
			TIO's Substantive Joinder [Doc. 152, filed 8/1/16]	
			Petitioners' Position Statement [Doc. 164, filed 8/1/16]	
			Fergerstrom's Opposition [Doc. 186, filed 8/9/16]	
			Sleightholm's Joinder to Fergerstrom's Opposition [Doc. 210, filed 8/8/16]	
			Kihoi's Joinder to Fergerstrom's Opposition [Doc. 195, filed 8/10/16]	
			UH Hilo's Objections to Fergerstrom's Opposition and Sleightholm's and Kihoi's Joinders [Doc. 196, filed 8/11/16]	
			Vicente's Objection [Doc. 222, filed 8/19/16]	
			Tabbada's Response to the UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	
			UH Hilo's Supplemental Comments [Doc. 242, filed 8/22/16]	
			PUEO's Proposed Minute Order Granting PUEO Motion to Set Issues [Doc. 256, filed 9/9/16]	
			Temple's Proposed Issues [Doc. 265, filed 9/17/16]	
			Fergerstrom's Opposition to PUEO's Proposed Order [doc. 266, filed 9/18/16]	
			UH Hilo's Response in Support of PUEO's Proposed Order [Doc. 267, filed 9/19/16]	
			TIO's Response to PUEO's Proposed Order [Doc. 268, filed 9/19/16]	
			Camara's Response to PUEO's Proposed Order [Doc. 269, filed 9/19/16]	
			Petitioners' Response to PUEO's Proposed Order [Doc. 270, filed 9/19/16]	
			W. Freitas' Response to Issue that all Should be Considered [Doc. 271, filed 9/19/16]	
			Vicente's Objection [Doc. 272, filed 9/19/16]	
			Kakalia's Addition to PUEO's Motion [Doc. 273, filed 9/19/16]	
			Tabbada's Response to PUEO's Proposed Order [Doc. 275, filed 9/19/16]	

C. Freitas' Respond to Proposed Doc 256 All Issues Should Also be Considered [Doc. 297, filed 10/3/16]
Kanaele's Joinder to Petitioners' Response [Doc. 298, filed 10/3/16]

APPENDIX B
Pre-Hearing Filings filed after July 18, 2016

DOC. NO.	DATE FILED	DOCUMENT NAME	RESPONSIVE FILINGS	DISPOSITION
Doc. 126	July 22, 2016	Temple of Lono's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction Based on Unresolved Land Claims	TIO's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 310, filed 10/5/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/5/16 at 30:22 – 46:8] Denied by Minute Order No. 29 [Doc. 352, filed 10/10/16]
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
			Temple's Response to Proposed Order [Doc 335, filed 10/7/16]	
Doc. 127	July 22, 2016	Temple of Lono's Motion to Vacate Ruling and Supplement Response Time	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 150, filed 7/22/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 17 [Doc. 245, filed 8/28/16]
			Vicente's Motion to Support [Doc 169, filed 8/1/16]	
			Tabbada's Motion to Support [Doc. 174, filed 8/1/16]	
			Temple's Reply to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 177, filed 8/3/16]	
Doc. 130	July 26, 2016	Petitioners' Renewal of Objections to Hearing Officer Selection Process and Hearing Officer Appointment, and Supplemental Arguments on Motion to Disqualify BLNR's and Hearing Officer's Counsel		Denied by Minute Order No. 17 [Doc. 245, filed 8/26/16]
Doc. 141	August 1, 2016	UH Hilo's Objection to Immaterial, Irrelevant, and Unduly Repetitious Witness Testimony		#2 Non-Motion 6/24/17
Doc. 143	August 1, 2016	TIO's Objections to Witness List		#2 Non-Motion 6/24/17

Doc. 161	August 1, 2016	Brannon Kamahana Kealoha's Quo Warranto, Demand of Jurisdiction	Kealoha's Motion Invoking Quo Warranto [Doc. 180, filed 8/8/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 30 [Doc. 353, filed 10/10/16] Motion for Reconsideration denied by Minute Order No. 59 [Doc. 682, filed 6/2/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 184, filed 8/9/16]	
			Kealoha's Response [Doc. 189, filed 8/10/16]	
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 202, filed 8/11/16]	
			Fergerstrom's Opposition to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 206, filed 8/11/16]	
			Tabbada's Response to the UH Hilo's Joinder and Motion in Support [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	
			Kealoha's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 379, filed 10/15/16]	
			TIO's Opposition to Kealoha's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 393, filed 10/19/16]	
			TIO's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 311, filed 10/5/16]	
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
Doc. 163	August 1, 2016	MKAH, et al's Petitioners' Initial Objections to Witnesses Designated by Other Parties		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 100 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 173	July 29, 2016	Kanaele's Motion to Exclude/Remove PUEO, TMT, UH Manoa/Hilo, and all Petitioners Seeking for Permit for TMT by circumvention of Religious Protections of the Hawaii Constitution Article XII and HRS 7-11-1107 Committing Desecration	UH Hilo's Proposed Minute Order Denying Kalikolehua Kanaele's Motion to Exclude/Remove PUEO, TMT, UH Manoa/Hilo, and all Petitioner's Seeking for Permit [Doc. 321, filed 10/5/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 24 [Doc. 347, filed 10/10/16]
Doc. 178	August 7, 2016	Temple's Motion for Reconsideration of Judge Amano's Oral Ruling that the Status of the State of Hawaii will not be an Issue in this Contested Hearing	TIO's Objection [Doc. 183, filed 8/9/16]	Withdrawn by Temple's Motion to Withdraw Motion [Doc. 211, filed 8/15/16]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Objection [Doc. 199, filed 8/11/16]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 200, filed 8/11/16]	
			Tabbada's Response [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	

Doc. 179	August 8, 2016	Temple of Lono's Motion to File Out of Time	TIO's Objection [Doc. 183, filed 8/9/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/29/16 at 28:9 – 28:12]
			Sleightholm's Joinder [Doc. 193, filed 8/10/16]	
			UH Hilo's Objection [Doc. 194, filed 8/10/16]	
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Objection [Doc. 199, filed 8/11/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 33 [Doc. 356, filed 10/10/16]
			UH Hilo's Objection to Sleightholm's Joinder [Doc. 198, filed 8/11/16]	
			Kila's Memorandum in Support [Doc. 221, filed 8/19/16]	
			Sleightholm's Memorandum in Support [Doc. 235, filed 8/22/16]	
			Tabbada's Response to the UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	
			Fergerstrom's Memorandum in Support [Doc. 244, filed 8/25/16]	
			Temple's Supplement [Doc. 337, filed 10/7/16]	
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Denying Motion. [Doc. 318, filed 10/5/16]	
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
			Temple's Response to Proposed Order [Doc 336, filed 10/7/16]	

Doc. 182	August 8, 2016	BLNR's Motion for Protective Order for the Honorable David Y. Ige, Suzanne Case and Stanley Roehrig	Petitioner's Motion. to Strike [Doc 187, filed 8/10/161]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr 8/29/16 at 52:14 – 52:20 and 72:1 – 72:14]
			UH Hilo's Joinder [Doc. 201, filed 8/11/16]	
			TIO's Objection to the Untimely Motions and Joinders Doc. 203, filed 8/11/15]	
			Vicente's Objection [Doc. 208, filed 8/11/161]	Denied by Minute Order No. 31 [Doc. 354, filed 10/10/16]
			BLNR's Opposition to Petitioners' Motion. to Strike [Doc. 224, filed 8/22/16]	
			Petitioners' Opposition. [Doc. 233, filed 8/22/16]	
			Tabbada's Response to the UH Hilo's Joinder and Response to Motion [Doc. 239, filed 8/22/16]	Motion to Strike denied by Minute Order No. 32 [Doc. 355, filed 10/10/16]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Objection. [Doc. 241, filed 8/22/16]	
			TIO's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 312, filed 10/5/16]	
			TIO's Proposed Order Denying Motion to Strike [Doc. 314, filed 10/5/161]	
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
Doc. 188	August 10, 2016	Petitioners' Request for Simultaneous Hearings on Petitioner's Motions to Disqualify Hearing Officer and to Recuse BLNR and Hearing Officer's Counsel and Request to Stay Proceeding		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 100 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 190	August 10, 2016	Kealoha's Demanding Redress to the Fact that we are Being Rushed, Coerced, and Intimidated through this Process by the Hearing's Officer and through Silence and Verbal Prodding as well as through Silence and Lack of Action of the Attorney General's Office	TIO's Objection to the Untimely Motions and Joinders [Doc. 203, filed 8/11/16].	Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 100 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 225, filed 8/22/16]	
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 231, filed 8/22/16]	
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Objection [Doc. 241, filed 8/22/16]	

Doc. 191	August 10, 2016	Kealoha's Motion Demanding Inventory of the So-Called Ceded Lands Containing the Specific Land and Parcel the TIO Plans to be Sub- Leased by UH who Leases Said Lands from the BLNR, a Survey of these Lands also	TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 237, filed 8/22/16]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 8/29/16 at 56:1 – 56:3]
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 243, filed 8/22/16]	
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 317, filed 10/5/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 34 [Doc. 363, filed 10/11/16]
			C. Freitas' Objection to Proposed Order [Doc. 332, filed 10/7/16]	
			UH Hilo's Joinder [Doc. 241, filed 8/22/16]	
Doc. 227	August 22, 2016	Cindy Freitas' Motion to File Motion Out of Time		Denied by Minute Order No. 92 [Doc. 764, filed 7/13/17]
Doc. 246	August 26, 2016	TIO's Request for the Board to act upon denial of intervention pursuant to LIAR Sect. 13-1-31(G)		Denied by Minute Order No. 86 [Doc. 750, filed 6/23/17]
Doc. 248	August 29, 2016	Fergerstrom's Notice of the Appearance of Administrative Bias		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 100 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 252	September 2, 2016	Fergerstrom's Notice of Family Burial Claim Under the Proposed TMT Site		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 100 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]

Doc. 254	September 8, 2016	Petitioners' Request for Further Status Conference and/or Consideration of Proposed Scheduling	Fergerstrom's Memorandum in Support [Doc. 257, filed 9/11/16]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 45 [Doc. 590, filed 5/2/17]
			W. Freitas' Memorandum in Support [Doc. 278, filed 9/12/16]	
			C. Freitas' Memorandum in Support [Doc. 259, filed 9/12/16]	
			Kihoi's Memorandum in Support [Doc. 261, filed 9/14/16]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 294, filed 9/30/16]	
			Temple's Support [Doc. 296, filed 10/3/16]	
			Kanaele's Joinder [Doc. 299, filed 10/3/16]	
Doc. 262	September 17, 2016	Temple of Lono's Motion to Recuse Hearing Officer	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 434, filed 12/30/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 46 [Doc. 595, filed 5/2/17]
			Temple's Motion to Strike UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 436, filed 12/31/16]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion to Strike [Doc. 536, filed 3/22/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion to Strike [Doc. 544, filed 3/23/17]	
			Temple's Motion to Reconsider [Doc. 610, filed 5/4/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 638, filed 5/17/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 639, filed 5/17/17]	

Doc. 263	September 17, 2016	Temple of Lono's Motion for Summary Judgment (Disqualification)	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 433, filed 12/30/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 47 [Doc. 609, filed 5/4/17]
			Temple's Motion to Strike UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 435, filed 12/31/16]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion to Strike [Doc. 536, filed 3/22/16]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion to Strike [Doc. 544, filed 3/23/17]	
			Temple's Motion to Reconsider [Doc. 619, filed 5/5/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion to Reconsider [Doc. 641, filed 5/18/17]	
Doc. 264	September 17, 2016	Temple of Lono's Motion for Summary Judgment (Desecration)	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 473, filed 2/22/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 53 [Doc. 654, filed 5/27/17]
			Temple's Motion to Strike [Doc. 474, filed 2/22/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 484, filed 2/28/17]	
			Temple's Motion to Strike TIO's Joinder [Doc 490, filed 3/2/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion to Strike [Doc. 536, filed 3/22/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition to Motion to Strike and Opposition to Temple's Motion to Strike TIO's Opposition [Doc. 544, filed 3/23/17]	
Doc. 277	September 21, 2016	W. Freitas' Motion to Amend Doe. 274 Site Visit		Denied by Minute Order No. 94 [Doc. 766, filed 7/14/17]
Doc. 278	September 21, 2016	C. Freitas' Motion to Amend Doc. 274 Site Visit		Denied by Minute Order No. 95 [Doc. 767, filed 7/14/17]
Doc. 279	September 22, 2016	Kihoi's Memorandum re: Site Visit		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]

Doc. 280	September 22, 2016	Sleightholm's Motion of Opposition and Request to Amend Minute Order No. 18 Doc 274		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 283	September 26, 2016	W. Freitas' Motion to Amend Doc. 281 Minute Order No. 19		Denied by Minute Order No. 54 [Doc. 656, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 284	September 26, 2016	C. Freitas' Motion to Amend Doc. 281 Minute Order No. 19		Denied by Minute Order No. 54 [Doc. 656, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 285	September 26, 2016	Cindy Freitas' Motion to Object to Phone Call by Michael Cain on 9/23/16 that was Instructed by Hearing Officer Judge Riki Amano (Ret.)		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 286	September 26, 2016	Temple of Lono's Motion for Reasoned Explanations and Extensions of Time		Denied by Minute Order No. 54 [Doc. 656, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 287	September 26, 2016	Camara's Response [to Minute Order No. 18]		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 288	September 26, 2016	Petitioners' Objections to Site Visit and Minute Order No. 18		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 291	September 28, 2016	Camara's Motion to Reconsider Minute Order No. 19	W. Freitas' Joinder [Doc. 292, filed 9/28/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 54 [Doc. 656, filed 5/29/17]
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 303, filed 10/3/16]	
Doc. 293	September 29, 2016	Temple's Motion for Reconsideration [of Minute Order No. 19]	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 301, filed 10/3/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 54 [Doc. 656, filed 5/29/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 302, filed 10/3/16]	

Doc. 300	October 3, 2016	W. Freitas' Motion to Amend Second Witness List Doc 166		Denied by Minute Order No. 55 [Doc. 659, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 304	October 4, 2016	W. Freitas' Motion for Extension of Time for Filing of Motions, Witness and Exhibit Lists and Direct Testimonies and Pre-Hearing Statement		Denied by Minute Order No. 56 [Doc. 660, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 305	October 4, 2016	C. Freitas' Motion for Extension of Time for Filing of Motions, Witness and Exhibit Lists and Direct Testimonies and Pre-Hearing Statement		Denied by Minute Order No. 56 [Doc. 660, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 306	October 4, 2016	Kihoi's Motion for Extension of Time for Filing of Motions, Witness and Exhibit Lists and Direct Testimonies and Pre-Hearing Statement	Kihoi's Motion for Extension of Filing Motions, Witness and Exhibit Lists, Direct Testimonies and Pre-Hearing Statements [Doc. 323, filed 10/5/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 56 [Doc. 660, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 324	October 6, 2016	Temple's Motion to Schedule Pending Motions		Denied by Minute Order No. 57 [Doc. 674, filed 5/31/17]
Doc. 326	October 6, 2016	Sleightholm's Motion for a Motion for Extension of Filing Motions, Witness and Exhibit Lists, Direct Testimonies and Pre-Hearing Statements		Denied by Minute Order No. 56 [Doc. 660, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 328	October 6, 2016	Kealoha's Essential Extension of Time for Filing Motions and Witness and Exhibit Lists and Direct Testimonies and Pre-Hearing Statements and Request/Demand for Reconciliation on Following Items		Denied by Minute Order No. 56 [Doc. 660, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 329 -	October 7, 2016	Temple's Motion for Extension of Time for Filing of Final Witness List and Prefiled Testimony, Exhibit List and Exhibits, Pre-Hearing Statement, and Motions		Denied by Minute Order No. 56 [Doc. 660, filed 5/29/17]

Doc. 330	October 4, 2016	Slightholm's Motion to Update Contact Information		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc 709, filed 7/11/17]
Doc. 331	October 7, 2016	C. Freitas' Objection to Minute Order No. ___ that Hearing Officer Order on October 3, 2016		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 338	October 8, 2016	Kanaele's Motion for More Time of 1 Month, for Due Process in this Instant Case, and Final Order for Motion to Exclude Pro Desecration PUEO/TMT/LTH from Promoting Desecration of a Conservation District		Denied by Minute Order No. 56 [Doc. 660, filed 5/29/17]
Doc. 339	October 8, 2016	Camara's Response to Amended Notice of Contested Case Hearing		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]

Doc. 340	October 10, 2016	Petitioners' Renewed Motion to Disqualify Hearing Officer	Temples' Substantive Joinder and Supplement [Doc. 343, filed 10/10/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 39 [Doc. 406, filed 10/28/16]
			Temples' Second Supplement [Doc. 360, filed 10/11/16]	
			Temples' Third Supplement [Doc 361, filed 10/11/16]	
			Kihoi's Joinder [Doc. 3581 filed 10/11/16]	
			W. Freitas' Substantive Joinder [Doc. 359, filed 10/13/16]	
			UH Hilo's Statement of Position [Doc. 369, filed 10/13/16]	
			Petitioners' Response to UH Hilo's Statement of Position Doc 383 filed 10/17/16]	
			Temple's Response to UH Hilo's Statement of Position [Doc 386, filed 10/17/16]	
			Temple's Motion to Vacate Minute Order No. 39 or, Alternatively, to Partially Reconsider Minute Order No. 39 [Doc.,. 409, filed 11/6/16]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple's Motion to Vacate [Doc. 417, filed 11/17/16]	
Doc. 364	October 12, 2016	Temple's Motion to Strike for Failure to Serve or Extension of Time and Rescheduling of Hearing	Temple's Supplement [Doc. 367, filed 10/13/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 58 [Doc. 681, filed 6/2/17]
			Temple's Second Supplement [Doc. 368, filed 10/13/16]	
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 374, filed 10/14/16]	
			KAHEA's Joinder [Doc. 387, filed 10/17/16]	
			TIO's Opposition to KAHEA's Joinder [Doc. 395, filed 10/19/16]	
Doc. 366	October 13, 2016	Request for Electrical Hook Up, Technical Support to Hook Up Internet		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/114/17]

Doc. 370	October 13, 2016	UH Hilo's Statement of Position re Scheduling	C. Freitas' Support [Doc. 372, filed 10/14/16]	Start of Hearing Confirmed [Tr. 10/17/16 at 111:11]
			Temple's Response [Doc. 373, filed 10/14/16]	
			Petitioners' Response [Doc. 384, filed 10/17/16]	
			Kanaele's Joinder to Petitioners' Response [Doc. 397, filed 10/19/16]	
Doc. 371	October 14, 2016	Temple's Unresolved Matters		Minute Order Nos. 39, 46, 47, 53, 54, 56, 57, & 58
Doc. 377	October 14, 2016	Flores-Case Ohana's Motion for 30 Day Extension of State of Contested Case Hearing	Temple's Joinder [Doc. 378, filed 10/15/16]	Withdrawn by Flores-Case Ohana's Motion to Withdraw Motion [Doc. 385, filed 10/17/16]
Doc. 381	October 16, 2016	Sleightholm's Motion to Accept Pre-Hearing Statement, Witness Testimony; Witness and Exhibit List ,		Granted by Minute Order No. 61 [Doc. 684, filed by 6/2/17]
Doc. 382	October 16, 2016	Sleightholm's Motion to Clarify Minute Order No. 16		Denied by Minute Order No. 40 [Doc. 407, filed 10/28/16]
NA	October 16, 2016	Fergerstrom's Oppositions to All Motions/Reconsiderations/Minute Orders, Granting the Same, that Stand in Opposition to All of the Parties Who Have Stood in Opposition to the Representatives of Organizations Who Have Supported or Otherwise Advocated for the Permit to Construct the TMT, including UH Hilo, TMT, TIO, PUEO		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]

Doc. 391	October 18, 2016	C. Freitas' Motion to Dismiss Contested Case Hearing		Denied by Minute Order No. 62 [Doc. 685, filed 6/4/17]
Doc. 394	October 19, 2016	TIO's Memorandum re Standard for Admissibility of Evidence	UH Hilo's Joinder and Amended Joinder [Docs. 402, 404 filed 10/24/16]	
			TIO's Supplemental Memorandum [Doc. 405, filed 10/27/16]	
Doc. 398	October 19, 2016	Fergerstrom's Need for Published Change in Hearing Dates		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 401	October 19, 2016	Vicente's Objection to Not Receiving Witness Testimony and Exhibits by Mail		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]

APPENDIX C
Hearing Filings (Not Including Motions to Admit Evidence)

DOC. NO.	DATE FILED	DOCUMENT NAME	RESPONSIVE FILINGS	DISPOSITION
Doc. 400	October 20, 2016	Kanaele's Join In Objections of Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Hank Fergerstrom, Dwight Vicente		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 403	October 24, 2016	Kanuha's He Noi E Ho'ololi Ika'u 'Ikepili Ho'oka'a'ike		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 409	November 6, 2016	Temple's Motion to Vacate Minute Order No. 39 or Partially Reconsider Minute Order No. 39.	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 415, filed 11/16/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 88 [Doc 709, filed 6/4/17]
Doc. 410	November 7, 2016	Temple's Motion to Restore Cross-Examination Rights	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 415, filed 11/16/16] TIO's Joinder to the UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc 416, filed 11/17/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 63 [Doc. 686, filed 6/4/17]
Doc. 411	November 14, 2016	Kanaele's Motion for No Can Come		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 686, filed 6/4/17]
Doc. 412	November 13, 2016	Fergerstrom's Notice of Dates in January 2017		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]
Doc. 413	November 15, 2016	Fergerstrom's Statement of Harry Fergerstrom		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 1001 [Doc. 774, filed 7/17/17]

Doc. 419	November 17, 2016	Kanaele's Motion for No Can Come		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 686, filed 6/4/17]
Doc. 420	December 7, 2016	Stephens' Motion to be a Party	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 423, filed 12/9/16]	Denied by Minute Order No. 64 [Doc. 687, filed 6/4/17]
			TIO Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 425, filed 12/11/16]	
NA	December 7, 2016	Fergerstrom's Opposition to UH Hilo of Hawaii Confirmation of exhibits and Direct Written Testimonies of Witnesses to be Entered into Evidence; Motion to Recall Mr. Perry White	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 430, filed 12/23/16]	Withdrawn by oral motion [Tr. 1/11/17 at 13:22 – 14:2]
Doc. 421	November 16, 2016	Lee's Notice of Withdrawal from Case		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 422	December 8, 2016	Kanuha's He Koi I Ka Luna Hookolokolo e Imi I Palapala Olelo Hooholokolo Oleleo Hawaii		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 427 and 428	December 15, 2016 and December 16, 2016	Temple's Motion to Dismiss TIO as Intervenor or Alternatively, Stay this Proceeding	UH Hilo's Objection of [Doc. 440, filed 1/10/17]	Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 441, filed 1/17/17]	
Doc. 429	December 16, 2016	Fergerstrom's Motion to Remove TMT/TIO as a Party for Lack of Standing	UH Hilo's Objection [Doc. 440, filed 1/10/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 65 [Doc. 688, filed 6/5/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 441, filed 1/17/17]	
Doc. 431	December 23, 2016	KAHEA's Motion for Production of TIO Decommissioning Funding Plan	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 432, filed 12/30/16]	Withdrawn by oral motion (document provided) [Tr. 1/3/17 at 8:8 – 9:5]

Doc. 437	January 3, 2017	Kanaele's Motion for No Can Come		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 438	January 8, 2017	Temple's Request for Witness Subpoena for David Lassner, President of the UH Hilo of Hawai'i System	UH Hilo's Motion to Quash [Doc. 445, filed 1/19/17]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 1/26/17 at 12:12 – 12:24]
			UH Hilo's Proposed Minute Order Denying Request [Doc. 457, filed 2/1/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 66 [Doc. 689, filed 6/5/17]
Doc. 439	January 8, 2017	Temple's Request for DLNR Employee to Testify on Whether DLNR has a Form to Fill-Out Requesting Permission to Build an Altar on Mauna Kea	UH Hilo's Proposed Minute Order Denying Request [Doc. 458, filed 2/1/17]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr.1/26/17 at 12:12 – 12:24] Denied by Minute Order No. 67 [Doc 690, filed 6/5/17]
Doc. 447	January 25, 2017 (refiled)	Flores-Case Ohana's Request for Witness Subpoena for "John Doe" and for a Subpoena Duces Tecum to Disclose Unidentified Mauna Kea Observatories Support Services Employee Involved with the Destruction of Ahu (Shrine) on Mauna Kea in August 2015	UH Hilo's Motion to Quash [Doc. 443, filed 1/19/17]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 1/26/17 at 13:2 – 13:10]
			UH Hilo's Proposed Minute Order Denying Request [Doc. 456, filed 2/1/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 68 [Doc. 692, filed 6/5/17]
Doc. 448	January 25, 2017 (refiled)	Flores-Case Ohana's Request for Witness Subpoena for Samuel Lemmo, Administrator, Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands, DLNR, State of Hawaii	UH Hilo's Motion to Quash [Doc. 444, filed 1/19/17]	Granted by oral ruling [Tr. 1/30/17 at 27: 16 – 27:22]
			Flores-Case Ohana's Amended Request [Doc. 452, filed 1/27/17]	Granted by Minute Order No. 42 [Doc. 464, filed 2/17/17]
			KAHEA's Joinder [Doc. 455, filed 1/31/17]	
			MKAH's Joinder [Doc. 477, filed 2/24/17]	

Doc. 449	January 26, 2017	Sleightholm's Motion to Appear by Phone		Granted by Minute Order No. 69 [Doc. 693, filed 6/5/17]
Doc. 450	January 26, 2017	Kealoha's Motion Reserving Right to Participate		Granted by Minute Order No. 70 [Doc. 696, filed 6/6/17]
Doc. 453	January 28, 2017	Camara's Motion to Present Witness Testimony		Granted by Minute Order No. 71 [Doc. 697, filed 6/6/17]
Doc. 454	January 31, 2017	Fergerstrom's Demand for a Written Explanation for the Denial of Testimony of Professor Williamson Chang from Richardson School of	Fergerstrom's Second Demand [Doc. 496, filed 3/7/17]	Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 459	February 13, 2017	KAHEA's Motion to Permit Live Testimony of Rebuttal Witness Brian Cruz	UH Hilo's Objection [Doc. 469, filed 2/20/17]	Granted by oral ruling [Tr. 2/21/17 at 28:5 – 28 14]
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Objection [Doc. 471, filed 2/21/17]	
			KAHEA's Proposed Order Granting Motion [Doc. 478, filed 2/24/17]	Granted by Minute Order No. 72 [Doc. 698, filed 6/7/17]
Doc. 460	February 13, 2017	Kanaele's Motion for No Can Come		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 461	February 13, 2017	UH Hilo's Motion for Leave to Present Rebuttal Testimony	Flores-Case Ohana's Response [Doc. 465, filed 2/16/17]	Granted by oral ruling [Tr. 2/21/17 at 28:20 – 28:24]
			KAHEA's Response and Partial Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana's Response [Doc. 466, filed 2/17/17]	
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Granting Motion in Part [Doc. 479, filed 2/24/17]	Granted in part by Minute Order No. 73 [Doc. 699, filed 6/9/17]

Doc. 462	February 13, 2017	MKAH's Motion to Bring on Rebuttal Witness on Behalf of Kealoha Pisciotta and Mauna Kea Anaina Hou	KAHEA's Joinder [Doc. 467, filed 2/17/17]	Denied by oral ruling [Tr. 2/21/17 at 29:24 – 30:12]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 468, filed 2/20/17]	
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 470, filed 2/20/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 74 [Doc. 462, filed 6/10/17]
			UH Hilo's Proposed Order Denying Motion [Doc. 475, filed 2/24/17]	

APPENDIX D
Post-Hearing Filings (Including Motions to Admit Evidence)

DOC. NO.	DATE FILED	DOCUMENT NAME	RESPONSIVE FILINGS	DISPOSITION
Doc. 442	January 17, 2017	UH Hilo's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	UH Hilo's Supplement [Doc. 506, filed 3/9/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			C. Freitas' Opposition [Doc. 512, filed 3/16/17]	
			Flores-Case Ohana's Response [Doc. 513, filed 3/16/17]	
			C. Freitas' Errata to Opposition [Doc. 519, filed 3/21/17]	
Doc. 451	January 23, 2017	TIO's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	TIO's Supplement [Doc. 476, filed 2/24/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			TIO's Second Supplement [Doc. 508, filed 3/9/17]	
			Ching's Opposition to Admission of Exhibits C-41 and C-42 [Doc. 510, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 463	February 16, 2017	Temple's Exhibits Entered into Evidence	Temple's Motion to Admit Opening Statement, Pre-Filed Testimony, and Exhibits into Evidence [Doc. 491, filed 3/3/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 472	February 21, 2017	KAHEA's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	KAHEA's First Supplemental [Doc. 486, filed 2/28/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			KAHEA's Second Supplemental [Doc. 505, 3/9/17]	
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 551, filed 3/16/17]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
			KAHEA's Errata [Doc. 517, filed 3/20/17]	

Doc. 480	February 26, 2017	W. Freitas' Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	W. Freitas' First Supplemental [Doc. 493, filed 3/6/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			W. Freitas' Second Supplemental [Doc. 501, filed 3/8/17]	
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 481	February 26, 2017	C. Freitas' Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	Fergerstrom's Opposition to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 520, filed 3/21/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc 553, filed 4/20/17]
			Fergerstrom's Opposition to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 521, filed 3/21/17]	
Doc. 482	February 26, 2017	MKAH's Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony Offered into Evidence	MKAH's First Supplement [Doc. 509, filed 3/9/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc 553, filed 4/20/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 483	February 28, 2017	Ward's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony in Evidence	Ward's First Supplement [Doc. 507, filed 3/9/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc 553, filed 4/20/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc.514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 485	February 28, 2017	PUEO's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence		Granted by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
Doc. 487	February 28, 2017	Flores-Case Ohana's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	Flores-Case Ohana's First Supplement [Doc. 500, filed 3/8/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	

Doc. 488	March 1, 2017	Ching's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	Ching's Supplemental Motion [Doc. 497, filed 3/8/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 489	March 1, 2017	Kanaele's Motion for Acceptance of Exhibits M-1-2, M-A, M-4, M-E, M-7, M-I-5		Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
Doc. 494	March 6, 2017	Ferberstrom's Motion to Move All Documents in Hearing Submittals, Identified by Letter "D" into Evidence	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
			Ferberstrom's Clarification [Doc. 515, filed 3/18/17]	
			Ferberstrom's Opposition to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 520, filed 3/21/17]	
			Ferberstrom's Opposition to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 521, filed 3/21/17]	
Doc. 495	March 7, 2017	Camara's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
			Camara's Response to UH Hilo's and TIO's Oppositions [Doc. 525, filed 3/22/17]	
Doc. 496	March 7,	Ferberstrom's Second Demand for an Answer to Document 454		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 498	March 8, 2017	Vicente's Motion to Admit Exhibits into Evidence	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
			Vicente's Objection to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 533, filed 3/22/17]	
			Vicente's Objection to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 534, filed 3/22/17]	

Doc. 499	March 8, 2017	Kanaele Motion for Admittance of Exhibits and Prehearing Statement as My Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 502	March 9, 2017	Kihoi's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 503	March 9, 2017	Kakalia's Motion to Admit Exhibits and Written Direct Testimony into Evidence	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 504	March 9, 2017	Sleightholm's Motion to Enter Pre-Hearing Statement, Witness Testimony, and Exhibits into Evidence	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 511, filed 3/16/17]	Granted in part, denied in part by Minute Order No. 44 [Doc. 553, filed 4/20/17]
			UH Hilo's Objections [Doc. 514, filed 3/16/17]	
Doc. 516	March 19, 2017	Temple's Motion to BLNR to Dismiss HA-3568	Fergerstrom's Joinder [Doc. 518, filed 3/20/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 87 [Doc. 751, filed 6/23/17]
			W. Freitas Joinder [Doc. 523, filed 3/21/17]	
			C. Freitas' Joinder [Doc. 529, filed 3/22/17]	
			Kanaele's Joinder [Doc. 531, filed 3/22/17]	
			Ching's Joinder [Doc. 537, filed 3/22/17]	
			MKAH's Joinder [Doc. 542, filed 3/23/17]	
			Ward's Joinder [Doc. 543 filed 3/23/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 549, filed 4/4/17]	

Doc. 522	March 21, 2017	MKAH's Requesting Time to Respond to Exhibit Objections and Related Matters	Fergerstrom's Joinder [Doc. 524, filed 3/21/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 75 [Doc. 707, filed 6/11/17]
			Temple's Joinder [Doc. 526, filed 3/22/17]	
			Ward's Joinder [Doc. 527, filed 3/22/17]	
			Kanaele's Joinder [Doc. 528, filed 3/22/17]	
			C. Freitas' Joinder [Doc. 530, filed 3/22/17]	
			Flores-Case Ohana's Joinder [Doc. 532, filed 3/22/17]	
			W. Freitas' Joinder [Doc. 535, filed 3/22/17]	
			Ching's Joinder [Doc. 538, filed 3/22/17]	
			Kihoi's Joinder [Doc. 539, filed 3/22/17]	
			Kakalia's Joinder [Doc. 540, filed 3/22/17]	
			KAHEA's Joinder [Doc. 541, filed 3/23/17]	
			Ward's Joinder [Doc. 545, filed 3/23/17]	
Doc. 546	March 24, 2017	Temple's Motion for Protective Order	Fergerstrom's Joinder [Doc. 547, filed 3/24/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 76 [Doc. 708, filed 6/11/17]
			C. Freitas, W. Freitas, and Ching's Joinder [Doc. 548, filed 3/25/17]	
Doc. 550	April 6, 2017	Fergerstrom's Reservation of all Rights for All the Intervenors, Suspended by Lack of Action by Hearings Officer		Non-Motion, Minute Order No. 77 [Doc. 709, filed 6/11/17]
Doc. 554	April 23, 2017	Fergerstrom's Motion to Reconsider (Doc 553, Minute Order 44); Recently Found Document No Previously Uploaded to Doc Library, WDT (Copy Attached); Motion to Upload WDT into Evidentiary Submittals, and then Moved into Evidence	TIO's Statement of Position [Doc. 588, filed 4/28/17]	Granted by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Statement of Position [Doc. 589, filed 5/1/17]	

Doc. 555	April 24, 2017	TIO's Motion for Clarification or, in the alternative, Reconsideration re Minute Order No. 44	UH Hilo's Substantive Joinder [Doc. 556, filed 4/24/17]	Granted by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			TIO's Proof of Service [Doc. 625, filed 5/8/17]	
			UH Hilo's Proof of Service [Doc. 626, filed 5/8/17]	
Doc. 557	April 25, 2017	C. Freitas Motion for Reconsideration of Minute Order 43	C. Freitas' Errata [Doc. 562, filed 4/26/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 50 [Doc. 646, filed 5/23/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 593, filed 5/2/17]	
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 596, filed 5/2/17]	
Doc. 558	April 25, 2017	Flores-Case Ohana's Motion to Reconsider Minute Order 43	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 592, filed 5/2/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 50 [Doc. 646, filed 5/23/17]
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 597, filed 5/2/17]	
Doc. 559	April 25, 2017	Temple's Motion for Reconsideration of Minute Order 43	Ward's Joinder [Doc. 560, filed 4/25/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 50 [Doc. 646, filed 5/23/17]
			MKAH, Pisciotta, Neves' Joinder [Doc. 561, filed 4/25/17]	
			Kihoi's Joinder [Doc. 563, filed 4/26/17]	
			MKAH Joinder [Doc. 564, filed 4/26/17]	
			Sleighthom's Joinder [Doc. 565, filed 4/26/17]	
			Kealoha's Joinder [Doc. 567, filed 4/26/17]	
			Ching's Joinder [Doc. 572, filed 4/27/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 594, filed 5/2/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 598, filed 5/2/17]	
Doc. 566	April 26, 2017	Fergerstorm's Motion to Reconsider (Doc 553, Minute Order 44); Motion to Include WDT and Pre-Hearing Statement into Evidence; Motion to Include as a Submission of Record, the Testimony of Williamson Chang	TIO's Statement of Position and Opposition [Doc. 605, filed 5/3/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Statement of Position and Opposition [Doc. 606, filed 5/3/17]	
Doc. 568	April 26, 2017	W. Freitas' Motion to Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 43	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 604, filed 5/3/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 50 [Doc. 646, filed 5/23/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 607, filed 5/3/17]	
			W. Freitas' Response [Doc. 628, filed 5/10/17]	

Doc. 569	April 26, 2017	Temple's Motion to Reconsideration to Minute Order 44	Fergerstrom's Joinder [Doc. 570, filed 4/26/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			Sleightholm's Joinder [Doc. 576, filed 4/27/17]	
			MKAH's Joinder and Objections [Doc. 578, filed 4/27/17]	
			Kihoi's Joinder [Doc. 580, filed 4/27/17]	
			Ward's Joinder [Doc. 581, filed 4/28/17]	
			Ching's Joinder and Joinder to MKAH's Joinder [Doc. 587, filed 4/28/17]	
			Temple's Response to MKAH's Joinder and Objections [Doc. 591, filed 5/2/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 599, filed 5/3/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition to MKAH's Joinder and Objections [Doc. 601, filed 5/3/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 603, filed 5/3/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition to MKAH's Joinder and Objections [Doc. 608, filed 5/3/17]	
Doc. 571	April 26, 2017	C. Freitas' Motion to Reconsideration to Minute Order 44	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 613, filed 5/4/17]	Granted in part, Denied in part by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 617, filed 5/4/17]	
Doc. 573	April 27, 2017	Temple's Emergency Motion to Board to Stay Proceedings	Ward's Joinder [Doc. 582, filed 4/28/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 48 [Doc. 631, filed 5/12/17]
			Sleightholm's Joinder [Doc. 583, filed 4/28/17]	
			MKAH's Joinder [Doc. 584, filed 4/28/17]	
			W. Freitas' Joinder [Doc. 585, filed 4/28/17]	
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 600, filed 5/3/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 602, filed 5/3/17]	
			Flores-Case Ohana's Joinder [Doc. 624, filed 5/7/17]	

Doc. 574	April 27, 2017	Vicente's Motion to Reconsider [Minute Order No. 44]	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 612, filed 5/4/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 618, filed 5/4/17]	
Doc. 575	April 27, 2017	W. Freitas' Motion to Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 44	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 614, filed 5/4/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 616, filed 5/4/17]	
			W. Freitas' Response [Doc. 628, filed 5/10/17]	
Doc. 577	April 27, 2017	Flores-Case Ohana's Motion to Reconsider Minute Order No. 44 and Notice of Spoliation of Evidence	Ching's Joinder [Doc. 587, filed 4/28/17]	Granted in part, Denied in part by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 615, filed 5/4/17]	
			Flores-Case Ghana Response to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 623, filed 5/7/17]	
Doc. 579	April 27, 2017	UH Hilo's Motion to Reconsider Minute Order No. 44	C. Freitas' Opposition [Doc. 611, filed 5/4/17]	Granted by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
Doc. 586	April 28, 2017	KAHEA's Motion for Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 44	TIO's Statement of Position [Doc. 620, filed 5/5/17]	Granted by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Statement of Position [Doc. 621, filed 5/5/17]	
Doc. 586	April 28, 2017	KAHEA's Motion for Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 44	TIO's Statement of Position [Doc. 620, filed 5/5/17]	Granted by Minute Order No. 51 [Doc. 647, filed 5/25/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TMT's Statement of Position. [Doc. 621, filed 5/5/17]	
Doc. 610	May 4, 2017	Temple's Motion to Reconsider Minute Order No. 46	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 638, filed 5/17/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 78 [Doc. 710, filed 6/11/17]
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 639, Filed 5/17/17]	
Doc. 619	May 5, 2017	Temple Motion to Reconsider Minute Order No. 47	UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc 641, filed 5/18/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 79 [Doc. 711, filed 6/12/17]

Doc. 622	May 5, 2017	MKAH's Petition to the BLNR for Online Access to the Transcripts	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 627, filed 5/10/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 49 [Doc. 637, filed 5/17/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 630, filed 5/11/17]	
			MKAH's Opposition to UH Hilo's Joinder [Doc. 632, 5/12/17]	
			Flores-Case Ohana's Joinder [Doc. 635, filed 5/16/17]	
			MKAH's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 643, filed 5/20/17]	
Doc. 628	May 10, 2017	W. Freitas' Response to TIO's Opposition to Reconsideration to Minute Order 43 and Minute Order 44		Denied by Minute Order No. 80 [Doc. 712, filed 6/12/17]
Doc. 629	May 11, 2017	Protector/Parties' Petition to Board for Declaratory Judgment and Motion to Vacate Minute Order 43	Flores-Case Ohana's Joinder [Doc. 636, filed 5/16/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 52 [Doc. 650, filed 5/26/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 642, filed 5/18/17]	
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 645, filed 5/18/17]	
Doc. 633	May 13, 2017	W. Freitas' Motion to Procedural Clarification Concerning Transcript Errors	TIO's Position Statement [Doc. 644, filed 5/22/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 81 [Doc. 713, filed 6/12/17]
Doc. 634	May 15, 2017	Flores-Case Ohana's Motion for Clarification or, in the alternative, Reconsideration re Minute Orders No. 43 and 44	Fergerstrom's Joinder [Doc. 640, filed 5/17/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 98 [Doc. 772, filed 7/15/17]
			UH Hilo's Statement of APosition [Doc. 749, filed 6/23/17]	
Doc. 643	May 20, 2017	MKAH's Motion for Reconsideration [Minute Order 49]	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 652, filed 5/26/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 89 [Doc. 759, filed 7/10/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO Opposition [Doc. 653, filed 5/26/17]	
Doc. 658	May 29, 2017	Vicente's Motion to Stay Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 678, filed 6/2/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 82 [Doc. 715, filed 6/12/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 680, filed 6/2/17]	

Doc. 663	May 30, 2017	Kealoha's Motion for More Time to Submit My Findings of Fact Conclusion of Law	TIO's Opposition [Doc. 677, filed 6/2/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 83 [Doc. 739, filed 6/14/17]
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 739, filed 6/2/17]	
Doc. 675	June 1, 2017	Temple's Motion for Reconsideration of Minute Order 53		Denied by Minute Order No. 91 [Doc. 763, filed 7/13/17]
Doc. 676	June 2, 2017	Flores-Case Ohana's Motion for Full Disclosure Re: Spoliation	Ching's Joinder to Flores-Case's Motion [Doc. 695, filed 6/6/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 85 [Doc. 748, filed 6/17/17] and Minute Order No. 90 [Doc. 762, filed 7/13/17], Minute Order No. 99 Rescinded by Minute Order No. 99 [Doc. 773, filed 7/15/17]
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 700, filed 6/9/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 702, filed 6/9/17]	
			Kanaele's Joinder to Flores-Case's Motion [Doc. 706, filed 6/11/17]	
Doc. 691	June 5, 2017	W. Freitas' Motion to Amend Second Witness List		Denied by Minute Order No. 84 [Doc. 745, filed 6/15/17]
Doc. 694	June 6, 2017	Temple's Motion to Reconsider Minute Order 57		Denied by Minute Order No. 93 [Doc. 765, filed 7/14/17]
Doc. 752	June 24, 2017	Flores-Case `Ohana's Motion for Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 85	Ching's Joinder to Flores-Case's Motion [Doc. 755, filed 6/29/17]	Denied by Minute Order No 96 [Doc. 768, filed 7/14/17]
			UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc. 756, filed 6/30/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Opposition [Doc.757, filed 6/30/17]	

Doc. 760	July 10, 2017	C. Freitas Motion to Admit Exhibits	Ching's Joinder to C. Freitas Motion [Doc. 761, filed 7/11/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 101 [Doc. 781, filed 7/24/17]
			TIO's Opposition [Doc. 770, filed 7/14/17]	
			UH Hilo's Joinder to TIO's Opposition [Doc. 771, filed 7/14/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to UH Hilo's Position Statement [Doc. 780, filed 7/21/17]	
Doc. 782	July 25, 2017	Minute Order No. 102, Declaration Record Closed		
Doc. 785	July 27, 2017	C. Freitas Motion to Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 101; Memorandum in Support; Office of the Auditor Follow-up on Recommendations from Report No. 14-07, Follow-up Audit of the Management of Mauna Kea and the Mauna Kea Science Reserve	TIO's Memorandum in Opposition to Cindy Freitas' Motion for Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 101; Exhibit "1" [Doc. 847, filed 9/11/17]	
Doc. 786	August 10, 2017	Flores-Case Ohana's Motion for Extension of Time to File Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations	Ward Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana Motion for Extension of Time to File Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations [Doc. 787, filed 8/12/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 104 [Doc. 793, filed 8/14/17] and First Amended Minute Order No. 104 [Doc. 797, filed 8/14/17]
			C. Freitas Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana Motion for Extension of Time to File Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations [Doc. 789, filed 8/13/17]	
			Kahea Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana Motion for Extension of Time to File Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations [Doc. 791, filed 8/14/17]	
			Ching Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana's Motion for Extension of Time to File Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations filed August 10, 2017 [Doc. 794, filed 8/14/17]	
			Kihoi Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana's Motion for Extension of Time to File Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations filed August 10, 2017 [Doc. 795, filed 8/14/17]	

Doc. 788	August 13, 2017	Temple of Lono Motion to Board of Land and Natural Resources to Remand Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order	C. Freitas Joinder to Temple of Lono Motion to Board of Land and Natural Resources to Remand Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order [Doc. 790, filed 8/13/17]	
			Ward Joinder to Temple of Lono Motion to Remand Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact; Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order [Doc. 792, filed 8/14/17]	
			Ching Joinder to Temple of Lono's Motion to Board of Land and Natural Resources to Remand Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order [Doc. 796, filed 8/14/17]	
			The UH Hilo's Opposition to Temple of Lono's Motion to Board of Land and Natural Resources to Remand Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order [Doc. 798, filed 8/15/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to the University of Hawai'i at Hilo's Opposition to Temple of Lono's Motion to Board of Land and Natural Resources to Remand Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order filed August 15, 2017 [Doc. 801, filed 8/16/17]	
Doc. 800	August 16, 2017	Temple of Lono Motion to Board of Land and Natural Resources to Dismiss HA-3568; Memorandum in Support	UH Hilo's Opposition to the Temple of Lono's Motion to Board of Land and Natural Resources to Dismiss HA-3568 [Doc. 832, filed 8/25/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 106 [Doc 833, filed 9/1/17]
Doc. 802	August 17, 2017	Fergerstrom Notice of Temporary Incapacitation; Reservation of All Rights; Memorandum of Support		

Doc. 859	September 18, 2017	Flores-Case 'Ohana's Objection to BLNR Member; Declaration of E. Kalani Flores; Exhibit "A"	C. and W. Freitas Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana's Objection to BLNR Member [Doc. 860, filed 9/18/17]	Denied by Minute Order No. 108 [Doc. 864, filed 9/19/17]
			KAHEA's Joinder in Petitioner Flores-Case Ohana's Objection to BLNR Member filed September 18, 2017 [Doc. 861, filed 9/18/17]	
			PUEO's Response to Flores-Case 'Ohana's Objection to BLNR Member; Declaration of Shadd Keahi Warfield [Doc. 863, filed 9/19/17]	
Doc. 865	September 19, 2017	Temple of Lono Motion for Clarification		
Doc. 867	September 21, 2017	Temple of Lono Motion for Stay of Hypothetical Ruling	TMT International Observatory, LLC's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Motions to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 876, filed 9/25/17]	
			UHH's Joinder to TIO's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 877, filed 9/25/17]	
Doc. 869	September 21, 2017	Ferguson Motion to "Stay" Execution of Any Permit to Build the TMT Pending Outcome of Appeal; Memorandum of Support	TMT International Observatory, LLC's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Motions to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 876, filed 9/25/17]	
			UHH's Joinder to TIO's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 877, filed 9/25/17]	
Doc. 870	September 21, 2017	Mauna Kea Anaina Hou Motion for Stay of Execution of any CDUP Pending Appeal and Joinder to Request Made by Kahea for the Same Relief	TMT International Observatory, LLC's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Motions to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 876, filed 9/25/17]	
			UHH's Joinder to TIO's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 877, filed 9/25/17]	

Doc. 871	September 21, 2017	Cindy & William Freitas and C. Ching Motion for Stay of Execution Pending Appeal; Memorandum in Support	TMT International Observatory, LLC's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Motions to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 876, filed 9/25/17]	
			UHH's Joinder to TIO's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 877, filed 9/25/17]	
Doc. 873	September 21, 2017	Flores-Case 'Ohana's Motion for Stay of Execution Pending any CDUP Appeal; Memorandum in Support of Motion	TMT International Observatory, LLC's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Motions to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 876, filed 9/25/17]	
			UHH's Joinder to TIO's Consolidated Memorandum in Opposition to Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal [Doc. 877, filed 9/25/17]	
Doc. 875	September 25, 2017	Flores-Case 'Ohana's Motion of Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 108; Memorandum in Support of Motion; Declaration of E. Kalani Flores; Exhibits "A" and "B"	C. & W. Freitas and Ching's Joinder to Flores-Case 'Ohana's Motion to Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 108 [Doc. 878, filed 9/25/17]	
			Kihoi Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana's Motion of Reconsideration of Minute Order No. 108 filed September 25, 2017 [Doc. 880, filed 9/26/17]	
			Kahea's Substantive Joinder in Petitioner Flores-Case 'Ohana's Motion of Reconsideration of Minute Order 108 filed on September 25, 2017 [Doc. 881, filed 9/26/17]	

APPENDIX E
Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order

DOC. NO.	DATE FILED	DOCUMENT NAME	RESPONSIVE FILINGS	DISPOSITION
Doc. 799	August 16, 2017	Temple of Lono Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order	Kakalia Joinder to Maunakea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotta, Flores-Case 'Ohana, Temple of Lono and KAHEA Response to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order [Doc. 812, filed 8/21/17]	
			KAHEA's Joinder in Temple of Lono's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order filed August 16, 2017 [Doc. 827, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Temple of Lono's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, filed as Document 783 on July 26, 2017 [Doc. 799]; Appendices A-B [Doc. 855, filed 9/11/17]	

			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotta, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	
Doc. 803	August 21, 2017	B. Kamana Kealoha's Statement to Incorporate by Reference and join on to Mauna Kea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotta's Exceptions, and provide Additional Exceptions (if any)	UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to B. Kamahana Kealoha's Statement to Incorporate by Reference and Join on to Mauna Kea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotta's Exceptions, and Provide Additional Exceptions, if any [Doc. 803]; Appendix A-B [Doc. 844, filed 9/11/17]	
Doc. 805	August 21, 2017	Fergerstrom Exception to the Entire Process and Conclusions, Recommendations; Memorandum of Support	UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Opposing Intervenor Harry Fergerstrom's Exception to the Entire Process and Conclusions, Recommendations [Doc. 805]; Appendix A [Doc. 841, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 806	August 21, 2017	Flores-Case 'Ohana's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations; Exhibits "A" – "K"	Kakalia Joinder to Maunakea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotta, Flores-Case 'Ohana, Temple of Lono and KAHEA Response to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order [Doc. 812, filed 8/21/17]	
			KAHEA's Joinder in Flores-Case Ohana's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations; Exhibit "A" – "K" filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 822, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to the Petitioner the Flores-Case 'Ohana's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order filed as Document 783 on July 26, 2017 [Doc. 806]; Appendix A [Doc. 854, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotta, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 807	August 21, 2017	Sleightholm's Exceptions and Responses to Hearing Officer, Hon. Riki Mae Amano's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order (Hearing Officer's Report)	KAHEA's Joinder in J. Leina'ala Sleightholm's Exceptions and Responses to Hearing Officer, Hon. Riki Mae Amano's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order (Hearing Officer's Report) filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 826, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to J. Leina'ala Sleightholm's Exceptions and Responses to Hearing Officer's Report [Doc. 807]; Appendices A-B [Doc. 840, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 808	August 21, 2017	K. Pisciotto, Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, D. Ward, P. Neves, K. Kanaele, L. Sleightholm, B. Kealoha, C. Freitas, Mehana Kihoi, Exceptions/Responses to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order	B. Kamana Kealoha's Statement to Incorporate by Reference and join on to Mauna Kea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotto's Exceptions, and provide Additional Exceptions (if any) [Doc. 803, filed 8/21/17]	
			Kakalia Joinder to Maunakea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotto, Flores-Case 'Ohana, Temple of Lono and KAHEA Response to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order [Doc. 812, filed 8/21/17]	
			KAHEA's Joinder in Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele Brandon Kamahana Kealoha and Joseph Kualii'i Camara's Response to Hearing Officer's Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 825, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Petitioners K. Pisciotto, Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, D. Ward, P. Neves, K. Kanaele, L. Sleightholm, B. Kealoha, C. Freitas, Mehana Kihoi's Exceptions/Responses to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order, filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 808] [Doc. 852, filed 9/11/17]	

			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	
--	--	--	---	--

Doc. 809	August 21, 2017	KAHEA's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017	Kakalia Joinder to Maunakea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotta, Flores-Case 'Ohana, Temple of Lono and KAHEA Response to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order [Doc. 812, filed 8/21/17]	
			KAHEA's Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017 [Doc. 819, filed 8/21/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotta, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 810	August 21, 2017	Ward's Narrative Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order	KAHEA's Joinder in Deborah J. Ward's Narrative Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 829, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Petitioner Deborah J. Ward's Narrative Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order, filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 810]; Appendices A-B [Doc. 851, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 811	August 21, 2017	C. Freitas Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law	KAHEA's Joinder in Cindy Freitas' Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law filed August 21, 2017 [Doc 820, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Cindy Freitas' Exceptions of Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order filed as Document 783 on July 26, 2017 [Doc. 811]; Appendix A [Doc. 850, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 812	August 21, 2017	Kakalia Joinder to Maunakea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotto, Flores-Case 'Ohana, Temple of Lono and KAHEA Response to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order	KAHEA's Joinder in Tiffnie Kakalia's Response to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 823, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Tiffnie Kakalia's Joinder to Maunakea Anaina Hou and Ms. Pisciotto, Flores-Case 'Ohana, Temple of Lono and Kahea Response to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order, filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 812]; Appendices A-B [Doc. 848, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 813	August 21, 2017	TIO's Exceptions to the Proposed Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order Issued July 26, 2017	W. Freitas' Responsive Brief to TMT/TIO's Exceptions to Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Decision Order on July 26, 2017 [Doc. 836, filed 9/11/17]	
			Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul Neves, Deborah J. Ward, Clarence Ku Ching, Mehana Kihoi, Cindy Freitas, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Tiffnie Kakalia, Joseph Kualii Camara, and Kamahana Kealoha's Exceptions to UHH/TIO/TMT/PUEO's Exceptions to HO FOF, COL and DO [Doc. 837, filed 9/11/17]	
			KAHEA's Joinder in Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul Neves, Deborah J. Ward, Clarence Ku Ching, Mehana Kihoi, Cindy Freitas, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Tiffnie Kakalia, Joseph Kualii Camara, and Kamahana Kealoha's Exceptions to UHH/TIO/TMT/PUEO's Exceptions to HO FOF, COL and DO filed on September 11, 2017 [Doc. 838, filed 9/11/17]	
			Flores-Case 'Ohana's Response to Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations; Exhibits "A" – "J" [Doc. 835, filed 9/11/17]	
			C. Freitas Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana's Response to Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations [Doc. 857, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 814	August 21, 2017	PUEO's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, filed July 26, 2017	Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul Neves, Deborah J. Ward, Clarence Ku Ching, Mehana Kihoi, Cindy Freitas, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Tiffnie Kakalia, Joseph Kualii Camara, and Kamahana Kealoha's Exceptions to UHH/TIO/TMT/PUEO's Exceptions to HO FOF, COL and DO [Doc. 837, filed 9/11/17]	
			KAHEA's Joinder in Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul Neves, Deborah J. Ward, Clarence Ku Ching, Mehana Kihoi, Cindy Freitas, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Tiffnie Kakalia, Joseph Kualii Camara, and Kamahana Kealoha's Exceptions to UHH/TIO/TMT/PUEO's Exceptions to HO FOF, COL and DO filed on September 11, 2017 [Doc. 838, filed 9/11/17]	
			TIO's Response to Intervenor PUEO's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order filed July 26, 2017 [Doc. 814] [Doc. 845, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 815	August 21, 2017	W. Freitas' Exceptions to Hearing Officer Amano's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision Order	KAHEA's Joinder in William Freitas' Exceptions to Hearing Officer Amano's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision Order filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 828, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to William Freitas's Exceptions to Hearing Officer Riki Mae Amano's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order, filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 815]; Appendices A-B [Doc. 849, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 816	August 21, 2017	UH Hilo's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, filed July 26, 2017	Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul Neves, Deborah J. Ward, Clarence Ku Ching, Mehana Kihoi, Cindy Freitas, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Tiffnie Kakalia, Joseph Kualii Camara, and Kamahana Kealoha's Exceptions to UHH/TIO/TMT/PUEO's Exceptions to HO FOF, COL and DO [Doc. 837, filed 9/11/17]	
			KAHEA's Joinder in Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul Neves, Deborah J. Ward, Clarence Ku Ching, Mehana Kihoi, Cindy Freitas, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Tiffnie Kakalia, Joseph Kualii Camara, and Kamahana Kealoha's Exceptions to UHH/TIO/TMT/PUEO's Exceptions to HO FOF, COL and DO filed on September 11, 2017 [Doc. 838, filed 9/11/17]	
			TIO's Joinder to University of Hawaii at Hilo's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, filed on July 26, 2017, filed on August 21, 2017 [Doc. 846, filed 9/11/17]	
			Flores-Case 'Ohana's Response to Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations; Exhibits "A" – "J" [Doc. 835, filed 9/11/17]	
			C. Freitas Joinder to Flores-Case Ohana's Response to Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Recommendations [Doc. 857, filed 9/11/17]	
Doc. 817	August 21, 2017	Vicente Exception to Recommendation	UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Opposing Intervenor Dwight Vicente's Exception to Recommendations [Doc. 817]; Appendix A [Doc. 842, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 818	August 21, 2017	Camara's Exceptions to the Hearings Officers Proposed Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order	UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 818] [Doc. 853, filed 9/11/17]	
Doc. 830	August 21, 2017	Kihoi's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law	KAHEA's Joinder in Mehana Kihoi's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 824, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Mehana Kihoi's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law [Doc. 830]; Appendix A [Doc. 839, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

Doc. 831	August 21, 2017	Ching's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law filed as Document 783 on July 26, 2017 filed August 21, 2017	KAHEA's Joinder in Clarence Kukauakahi Ching's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law filed as Document 783 on July 26, 2017 filed August 21, 2017 [Doc. 821, filed 8/22/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to Petitioner Clarence Kukauakahi Ching's Exceptions to Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order filed as Document 783 on July 26, 2017 [Doc. 831]; Appendix A [Doc. 843, filed 9/11/17]	
			UH Hilo and TIO's Joint Brief in Response to KAHEA: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance's Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 809], Supplemental Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, dated August 21, 2017 [Doc. 819], and Joinders in the Exceptions to the Hearing Officer's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order dated July 26, 2017, filed by Cindy Freitas; Clarence Kukauakahi Ching; Flores-Case Ohana; Tiffnie Kakalia; Mehana Kihoi; Petitioners Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, Kealoha Pisciotto, Paul K. Neves, Kalikolehua Kanaele, Brandon Kamahana Kealoha, and Joseph Kualii Camara; J. Leina'ala Sleightholm; Temple of Lono; William Freitas; and Deborah J. Ward on August 22, 2017 [Docs. 820-829] [Doc. 856, filed 9/11/17]	

BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

STATE OF HAWAII

Contested Case Hearing Re Conservation
District Use Application (CDUA) HA-3568
for the Thirty Meter Telescope at the Mauna
Kea Science Reserve, Ka'ohē Mauka,
Hāmakua, Hawai'i, TMK (3) 4-4-015:009

BLNR Contested Case HA-16-02
Document title: **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of
Law, and Decision and Order**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the above referenced documents were served upon the following parties by email (when indicated) on September 28, 2017 and by regular mail on September 28, 2017:

Carlsmith Ball LLP
Ian Sandison, John P. Manaut, Lindsay N. McAneeley
1001 Bishop Street
ASB Tower, Suite 2200
Honolulu, HI 96813
isandison@carlsmith.com
jpm@carlsmith.com
lmcaneley@carlsmith.com
Counsel for the Applicant University of Hawai'i at Hilo

Law Offices of Yuklin Alulu
415-C Uluniu Street
Kailua, HI 96734
yuklin@kailualaw.com
Co-Counsel for Kahea

Dexter K. Kaiama
111 Hekili Street, #A1607
Kailua, HI 96734
cdex@hotmail.com
Co-Counsel for Kahea

Kealoha Pisciotto and Mauna Kea Anaina Hou
PO Box 5864
Hilo, HI 96720
keomaivg@gmail.com

Clarence Kukauakahi Ching
64-823 Mamalahoa Hwy
Kamuela HI 96743
kahiwal@cs.com

Flores-Case 'Ohana
E. Kalani Flores, B. Pualani Case
PO Box 6918
Kamuela, HI 96743
ekflores@hawaiiantel.net

Deborah J. Ward
PO Box 918
Kurtistown, HI 96760
cordylinecolor@gmail.com

Paul K. Neves
380 Nahale-a Avenue
Hilo, HI 96720
kealiikea@yahoo.com

Watanabe Ing LLP
J. Douglas Ing, Ross T. Shinyama, Summer H. Kiawe
First Hawaiian Center 999 Bishop Street, 23rd Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813
rshinyama@wik.com
douging@wik.com
Counsel for TMT International Observatory, LLC

Harry Fergerstrom
P.O. Box 951
Kurtistown, HI 96760

Mehana Kihoi
PO Box 393
Honaunau, HI 96726
uhiwai@live.com

C. M. Kaho'okahi Kanuha
77-6504 Maile St
Kailua Kona, HI 96740
kahookahi@gmail.com

Joseph Kualii Lindsey Camara
kuallic@hotmail.com
(email only)

Torkildson, Katz, Moore, Hetherington & Harris
Attn: Lincoln S. T. Ashida
120 Pauahi Street, Suite 312
Hilo, HI 96720-3084
lsa@torkildson.com
njc@torkildson.com
*Counsel for Perpetuating Unique Educational
Opportunities (PUEO)*

J. Leina'ala Sleightholm
P.O. Box 383035
Waikoloa, HI 96738
leinaala.mauna@gmail.com

Lanny Alan Sinkin
PO Box 833
Bismarck, North Dakota 58502-0833
lanny.sinkin@gmail.com
Representative for The Temple of Lono

Kalikolehua Kanaele
4 Spring Street
Hilo, HI 96720
akulele@yahoo.com

Stephanie-Malia:Tabbada
P O Box 194,
Naalehu, HI 96772
s.tabbada@hawaiiantel.net

Tiffnie Kakalia
549 E. Kahaopea St.
Hilo, HI 96720
tiffniekakalia@gmail.com

Glen Kila
89-530 Mokiawe Street
Waianae, HI 96792
makakila@gmail.com

Dwight J. Vicente
2608 Ainaola Drive
Hilo, Hawaiian Kingdom

Brannon Kamahana Kealoha
89-564 Mokiawe Street
Nanakuli, HI 96792
brannonk@hawaii.edu

Cindy Freitas
PO Box 4650
Kailua Kona, HI 96745
hanahanai@hawaii.rr.com

William Freitas
PO Box 4650
Kailua Kona, HI 96745
pohaku7@yahoo.com

Wilma H. Holi
P. O. Box 368
Hanapepe, HI 96716
w_holi@hotmail.com
Hearing Officer's witness

Moses Kealamakia Jr.
1059 Puku Street
Hilo, HI 96720
mkealama@yahoo.com
Hearing Officer's witness

Signature: 
Name: Lauren Yasaka
Date: September 28, 2017