Agenda

Desired outcome for the meeting: Create a plan for the next ten months that enables us to address the issues embedded in Article XI, section 3 of the Hawaii State Constitution.

1. Determine structure for the Ag Working Group
   a. Support Structure
   b. Principles and Rules

2. Information Needs and Potential Resources
   a. Agreement on Resource Support
   b. Daniel Kim
   c. Sustainability Institute
   d. Other

3. Discussion of Game Plan
   a. Introduction to Game Plan Template and Primary Objective—Recommendation for Sustainable Ag: The first steps Toward a Comprehensive Ag Development Strategy
   b. Suggested Steps and Tasks

1. Determine structure for the Ag Working Group
   The process support group (described below) had made a suggestion on the agenda to call this group the “Ag Working Group” because the issues it would end up discussing would go beyond just ag land (e.g. water, economic, government jurisdictions, etc.). A discussion on the name ensued with some feeling the title was too broad and others thinking it might be too narrow. At the end of the discussion, the group agreed to stay with “Ag Working Group.”

   a. Support Structure – Structure recommended by the process support group
      • Convenor/Communication Hub:
        Dean/CTAHR
          ➢ Maintains e-mail list
          ➢ Maintain directory of participants
          ➢ Notices
      • Liaison w/ Legislature
        Dean/CTAHR, Director/DOA
        A discussion of this item resulted in an agreement that, while working group participants could still maintain their liaisons with the
Legislature, in matters dealing with the working group, the Dean and Director would be the liaisons.

• Process Support:
  Jane Yamashiro/Enterprise Hawaii
  ➢ Lead facilitator
  ➢ Secretariat and keeper of group memory (i.e. minutes of meetings)

Process Support Group:

b. Support Structure – Structure recommended by the process support group
• Steering Committee
  Who: TBD/delegate to Dean/CTAHR who will attempt to have different facets of the working group represented
  ➢ Oversees planning and work of the working group and potential sub-committees
  ➢ Meets prior to working group meetings

c. Principles and Rules
• Principles
  ➢ We’re working for a balanced plan and action
  ➢ We put aside the individual’s perspective in favor of the community good
    A discussion about this principle resulted in the group agreeing it could live with and support it.
  ➢ Open process-create opportunities to invite new participants as a result of the group discussion, changed to:
    Open process where we determine at each meeting who is missing and invite them to participate.

- At this point in the discussion, these entities were identified as needing representation on the working group: all county planning groups, Farm Bureau and USDA. It was determined that all the county planning groups were invited (only Maui was represented at this meeting). Farm Bureau was represented by several people and USDA was also represented.

- As side comment as a result of this discussion, resulted in this statement, “We might share information with appropriate members of the working group and bring their input back to the group if they can’t attend a meeting.”

• Rules of Operation
  ➢ Listen to understand.
  ➢ Only one person speaks at a time.
  ➢ Only the facilitator can interrupt and then only to keep time and group on track.
No one dominates or has to win the debate.
A group decision can be revisited if the group agrees.
The working group will have agendas in advance of the meetings so people can come prepared.
The working group will have agendas in advance of the meetings so people can come prepared.
Everyone needs to keep abreast of the group memory (i.e. meeting minutes) and the decisions made by the group.
When a new person joins the group, they agree to read the group memories from all previous meetings so that they are up to date with our discussions and decisions.
When making decisions, the group will strive for consensus. If consensus is not reached after making a significant attempt to accommodate everyone, then we fallback to majority rules which we have defined as 66 2/3%. If the majority is significantly greater than 66 2/3%, that should be noted in the group memory.
Sub-committees of the working group only make recommendations to the larger body. The working group will make the final decision. Sub-committees need to try and conform to the intent of the decision making rule of the working group (see above).

The group developed a tentative agreement on the Principles and Rules at this meeting, but decided to provide final agreement at the next meeting.

2. Information Needs and Potential Resources
   a. Agreement on Resource Support
      • The Office of Planning presented a conceptual proposal for American Farmland Trust (AFT) Services that they were willing to fund. The group did not want to “sponsor” AG 101 until it had some idea of what was in the curriculum. It was agreed that additional info would be e-mailed out to the working group. Also, the group discussed the potential of seeking funding to support having AG 101 taken to the neighbor islands. No decision was made on this item.
   b. Daniel Kim—small group will be meeting with Kim to determine if he is a potential resource for this group
   c. Sustainability Institute—waiting for Jane Yamashiro to share the background on this group
   d. Other—so far, nothing else has been recommended

3. Discussion of Game Plan
   The group agreed to the first stage/task and spent the rest of the meeting identifying issues where fact finding is necessary. Everyone was given cards to
identify issues we need to address and informational needs. In the end, it was
determined these were the same. Four clusters of issues resulted from this
activity and sub-committees were created for each. Working group members
then volunteered for each of the groups (see below):

Cluster 1: Jurisdictional Issues (Mary Lou Kobayashi, John Summers, Alan Takemoto,
Tracy Stice, conveyor, meeting March 28th at noon, location TBA.)
• What entity should administer the TDR review/approval process?
• Art. XI, Sec. 3 focuses on the “State.” What about actions that county gov’t
  or non-profits can do better than the State Gov’t. Shouldn’t we include
them?
• Re: Specific Title XI mandates:
  - What/how do the county LUO address the issues? Sustainability,
    preservation of open space, etc.
• State/County/Private concerns
• Binder of all applicable State and County Ag Zoning and Planning laws
• Need to align State/County efforts to protect ag land
• State vs. county role and function
• Homerule individual county needs

Cluster 2: Ag Economic/Feasibility (someone from the committee took the sign up sheet)
Committee and Convenor ??
• Major challenges to profitable ag in Hawaii
• Where is ag working in the State today and WHY?
• What are viable, profitable crops that are presently grown in Hawaii?
• With the cost of water, land, labor and insurance in HI, what crops can be
  profitably grown?
• What crops/products can be produced profitably and how many acres are
  needed to supply local needs/export?
• What is needed to promote/stimulate investment in agricultural industry?
• How can there be successful ag w/out long term financeable tenure?
• Integration of ag within a community’s economy
• No future for ag if no long term (50 years) tenure
• Incentives for ag
• Identification of incentives
• Potential structure of ag industry tax credit program
• How can we promote ag (incentives not regulations)?
• How do all the laws passed by gov’t impact ag, which is a business?
• What has worked, not worked in HI ag?

Cluster 3: Criteria and Quantification of Ag Land (Meredith Ching, Ruby Edwards,
Karen Iwamoto, Bev Kaku, Jeff Melrose, Myron Murakami, Kapu Smith, Jane
Stubenberg, Warren Suzuki, David Wong, Donna Wong) Tentative meeting date is at HARC on 3/14/03 at 1:00. Convenor Myron Murakami will confirm room.

- How many acres are really ag usable?
- How many acres of ag land available (existing) with water?
- Criteria for prime and unique ag lands
- How do we rate land today for diversified ag?
- How much land is really needed to sustain ag (as it is done today)?
- Criteria to determine important ag lands
- Existing measures of ag land suitability are inappropriate (25 years old)
- ID criteria of best ag lands in State
- How much prime ag land on each island?
- Location of existing ag lands of State
- Identify important ag lands
- How many acres of ag land are currently needed to meet Art. XI, Sec. 3?
- LESA is al plantation numbers—how to make relevant today?
- How many acres have water?
- What is “diversified ag?”
- Where are the ag lands that need to be saved?

Two other smaller sub-clusters were subsumed under Cluster 3: Environment and Culture:

- How do we address environmental concerns and get them (group) involved?
- Protection of cultural and environmental values of ag lands

Water

- Water: Land without sufficient, economical water cannot be important ag land
- Balancing agricultural use of water with instream
- Remove sewage from Lake Wilson


Sub-Cluster: Land Use Issues

- Preservation of ag lands
- How do we separate real ag land from protect open space?
- Best ag land is best urban land, how to resolve
- Ag – urban conflicts
- How to prevent sprawl on rural lands
- Balancing competing uses for land
- Tendency to include open space preservation as part of ag constitution does not say this
• Balancing landowners wish for highest and best use with Article XI objectives
Sub-Cluster: Tools and Models from Other States
• What states have mandated the preservation of ag lands and how is it working (or not)
• Ag land systems in other states – pros and cons, impacts on all sectors
• Success or experience relating to TDR in other states
• Models of successful ag strategies
• Ag land preservation experiences outside Hawaii
• Ag land protection tools
• Info on successful mainland DR programs
• What were bottlenecks?
• What has worked?
• How much demand is there for ag – TDR?
• Model legislation/Ord that can/will enable ag lands protection/preservation
• Tools for ag land preservation
• Models of ag land preservation
• Info on counties with successful plans integrating ag and development
• Federal/state tax credits for donating development rights
• Will TDRs and conservation easements work with Hawaii’s land use/ag land structures
• What farm land protection tools are being use elsewhere?
• Which ones do we already use?
• Of these we don’t use, which ones might be appropriate?
• What is a fair way to compensate landowners for “dedicated” ag land?

Next Meeting: Friday, March 28, 2003
Dept of Agriculture Plant Quarantine Conference Room
1849 Auiki Street
Suggested agenda items:
• Get final agreement on Principles and Rules
• Report back from sub-committees