Scheduling of upcoming meetings (please go to AWG website for updated meeting schedule)

- AWG Tuesday, August 19th from 1 to 4 pm place Plant Quarantine, DOA
- AFT Bob Wagner is only available August 25-27. We will move him to the first part of September (after first week)
- Criteria and Qualifications of Land Tuesday, July 29, 9-12 SOT, 6th floor
- Ag Feasibility, Tuesday August 5th, 8 to 10:30 am, Plant Quarantine
- Jurisdictional Issues, Tuesday, August 19th, 11 am, Plant Quarantine
- Tools & Techniques, Tuesday, August 12th, 9am to 12pm, SOT, Room 405
- Criteria – August 29th, 9am to 12 pm, SOT 6th floor

Questions

- Who is going to be drafting the document?
- How will decisions be made?
- Who will vote? Whoever shows up to the meeting

Committee Meeting Reports

Tools Committee – Tony

- Need more people to volunteer for committee
- PDR-TDR are being discussed
- 5 case studies discussed
- Did creative thinking, broke down into counties and use PDR & TDR as tools in those counties
- What are essential elements of
  - comprehensive land use plans
  - set land use policies
  - identify tools that would be useful
World Café Feedback

It was acknowledged that the process was worthwhile.

Things that went well

• Solves Myron’s problem
• Get different version of what we had before, different layers
• Small enough groups to have dialogue/discussion
• Discussion will be transcribed
• Where we go from here?
• Broaden perspective

Things that can be better

• Hard to hear in room

Planning for AFT’s next meeting

Bob Wagner would bring some resource people who could talk about specific tools. How could tools be adapted here? What kind of process would be needed? This would be a working session on how to implement potential tools.

• Concerned that the end of August may be too early
• Could use him to help us adapt tools without experimenting
• Tools need to be adapted for Hawaii’s situation
• If have alignment on incentives, it would be good idea to bring Bob Wagner in
• Having the discussion applying the tools to Oahu in the Tools subcommittee would provide good context for Bob’s visit
• Bob knew a lot about everything we were talking about. He’s a great resource. Maybe we should use him later in September and he should keep the tools open and more general. Don’t focus on specific tools.
• What to use Wagner for more than just Oahu. Interested in him for Kona
• Post Wagner’s comments on the website
• Still open on Bob Wagner’s dates and focus of presentation. The tools and techniques subcommittee will give some direction.

How do we invite people in the counties with this process?

• Need to develop a process to involve the farmers, planners, landowners on each of the counties
• The information to the counties should be at the point were the recommendations have been drafted
  • Timeframe, September, early October after the first draft
  • Leaves time for people in counties to provide input on draft
• Post information on website and market it to the counties
• “Heat” created when people have a document to respond to
Recommendation of Events to Discuss AWG recommendations

- ACPO Conference on October 8th to 10th. Provide summary at conference and solicit comments
- Ag 2003 Conference on October 16, Pacific Beach Hotel
- County Councils, Mayors need to see draft/summary also
The group memory below is a synthesis of the three small groups Donna Ching worked with in the Café.

The first group determined that it was trying to provide framework language through legislation that would have embedded in it the provision for implementation of a design for IAL.

One of the reasons this has been difficult to do is that we are trying to use current laws and policies, which were designed to support plantation agriculture, to meet very different needs for ag and development today. Another challenge is that the process has to result in changing those existing statues and State and county planning and zoning laws and ordinances.

A process was developed that started with the State providing guidelines/criteria/standards/rationale/policy framework. At this broad policy guidelines stage, refrain from using State maps. This framework would be used by the counties as guidance in the application to their own kuleana. This allows flexibility to the process and translates into allowing those with the expertise to customize a plan for their own needs.

This customization is particularly important because ag, as it is practiced today, is very site specific. This is very different from the situation 25 years ago. This is why the county perspective is so critical today.

After the framework is developed, maps will have to be used to indicate currently productive ag lands. These maps should be used as tools and provide guidelines. [Some group members questioned whether the State should provide any maps in this process. They said that regulatory maps should not be the outcome of the process.] Don’t use maps as the only tool. Use other appropriate tools to be able to identify IAL, current and potential.

Once productive ag land is identified, the next step would be to identify the factors that allowed or enabled productivity or success. This goes beyond land to analyzing business practices, access to water and other factors that enhanced success.

The process needs to be flexible and dynamic to adjust for factors beyond the existing resources (i.e. different crops become available, changes occur in transportation or markets, etc.). So if success factors change, new land could be potentially identified or currently existing land could move out of agriculture. The group did not want to put permanent lines on a map that are not subject to change in the future.

Whatever the outcome of the process, the State and counties need to provide a set of incentives and supports to assure success. In other words, don’t just create a hammer, provide carrots that encourage change. In the best case, IAL with incentives could be made so attractive that landowners would want to have their land in ag rather than fighting against this move. Incentives could make ag the highest and best use of this land.
The DOA should be involved in providing technical assistance in any process that is developed. Other State and county agencies also need to be involved in the process so that there are consistent supports for ag and future developments do not hinder ag success (e.g. proposed new highway or new agency policies).

There may also be a need for a broader planning process to undertake the achievement of the constitutional mandate (i.e. self-sufficiency, creating standards and criteria). Both the counties and the LUC may need to be involved in adopting the maps.

**Discussion about the Constitutional Mandate**

IAL is a constitutional term. What did drafters mean when they used this term?

Some constitutional history: ALISH maps had just come out when this issue was discussed at the constitutional convention of 1978. Some of the maps were meant to be used to identify IAL. Those maps have not been updated for 25 years so they are less relevant today. The situation has changed dramatically in the last 25 years. We need to use more current information w/maps and overlays indicating soil types, water, etc.

Self-sufficiency and diversification and protection of agricultural land are all discussed in the constitution. Wanted to support and encourage ag endeavors. Mandate provides balancing language so that once IAL is identified, the Legislature could provide standards and criteria that would allow rezoning and reclassification. [One participant suggested that the Legislature needed to over-classify rather than under-classify ag lands. He thought the burden should be on justifying why ag lands should be taken out of ag. Others noted that this was a controversial position and that some would argue the other way.]

The work done by the first Café group was perceived as normative and may not be consistent with the constitutional mandate to protect and conserve all important ag land.

**Other Thoughts**

- Ag currently is linked to production rather than looking at it as a service. The service component may be more important in the future (e.g. providing waste water utilization, energy production, etc.) so this would need to be considered in the criteria when identifying IAL.

- We might also include in a broader definition: processing, sale of products, rural residential component (i.e. “real” ag community).

- Ideally, farmers should be living on their farms (for convenience and to reduce theft). From practical standpoint this should be considered.

- We need to clear up the definitions of “rural,” “agriculture” and “open space.”
• Increase the use of “rural land use districts.” Need to reevaluate the permitting process in RLUD. Even in rural areas we end up with many components of urban areas (e.g. road infrastructure, sewers, etc.). Ag permitted uses need to be specified. Need rural permitted uses.

• In making its recommendation to the Legislature on this issue, the AWG needs to think about what’s the minimum that can be done to do the least harm and create the greatest good? Another perspective: what is the best package the AWG could propose that would do the greatest good.
What process would you recommend for identifying important agricultural land (IAL) and/or targeted agricultural areas? What are the state and county responsibilities?

Process for Identifying IAL
- Maps need updating to meet current agricultural needs
  - Utilize the various land map (LRB, ALISH, etc.) and look at common denominators
  - Get agreement on factors that should be considered
  - Current maps focused on primary crops i.e. Sugar-Pineapple or used Mainland criteria
  - Are those studies – 25 years – are parameters relevant today?
- Mapping of current use of lands for agricultural activities is important
  - Distinct difference between resource mapping and planning zoning
- Criteria for IAL need to consider various issues
  - Criteria need to be updated to meet current agricultural needs
  - Based on ag physical resources
    - Focus on priority ag land intending to find full component for agriculture
    - soil/water
    - where ag successful
  - Other factors important
    - Future settlement patterns
    - land owners’ intentions
    - regulatory planning /resources
    - zoning – special restrictions
- Planning for ag land
  - Need to be part of overall plan for lands between urban lands/conservation lands
  - Counties need to make plans for ag lands as a mandated activity
    - Provide county with settlement pattern, areas where growth taking place
    - Not try to battle where urban growth is taking place, but allows focus on where to promote land not conflict – county/urban
    - Buffer Zone – important “transitional area”
      - No growth beyond this line
      - make it a swath – not line
      - concentrate on border line area
      - periodical review of lines
  - State can provide expert advice
    - LUC – Update criteria
• Need to find ways to make attractive for land owners to dedicate for ag lands
  o Formalize process to update the use of the ag statewide

Target most strategic areas – Sustainable Community Plans boundaries → put benefit/not restrictive
  • city land use ordinance
    o commit where conditional use permit are allowed
    o city have ordinance that supports conditional use permit in agriculture – tourism, produce
  • Focus benefits on area where there is a useable system with balance for urban/rural/ag/conservation
    o Ensure important ag productive
    o optimally – voluntary
    o encourage – incentives to support what is already successful
  • Provide support where industry’s greatest potential for growth/success
    o Where is the basic chemistry – of the best place for agriculture?
  • Keeping “X” for potential future growth
    o dotted lines – potential other uses
    o identify what optimum balance
  • State – set up policy guidelines
  • Counties set up the “strategies”

If continue to stay as we are
  • reduce size to ag lands
  • what lands to give priority
  • IALs targeted where may allowed to utilize incentives

Required prequalifiers for tools/incentives
  Here are the benefits IAL
  • say what it is with the qualities
  • 10 – or 1,000
    o balance critical mass
    o package of incentives
    o LUC would be process orientated
      ▪ identify up front
      Community process to identify areas
  Once definition of ag lands is identified
    o burden to show – why important
    o burden to show – why it should be excluded
  Category IAL
    o Clearly identify what criteria
    o if land owner – take initiative
      • Provide attractive incentives
      • Process should not be politically influenced
• where do you
  • overclassify
  • underclassity
• Prime IAL eligible for greater package of benefits
  • refine incentive only if active
  • define object at initiation
  • keep farm belt – pay conservation easement
World Café facilitated by Richard Bowen

What process would you recommend for identifying important agricultural lands (IAL) and/or targeted agricultural areas? What are the state/county responsibilities?

I. Roles of State, Counties, AWG

Role of State/Legislature:
- Legislature should establish standards/criteria
- Use the 5 year boundaries review for reclassifying lands in state districts
- State staffing has been drastically cut; they can not longer enforce Act 205

Role of Counties:
- via ag/community planning Process: Map IAL
- Counties should take head of process (for State redistriction)
- Counties should map settlement (urban) areas first
- Counties are better able than state to enforce requirements in Act 205
- Need good information base at a county level

Role of AWG:
- at request of legislature, recommend criteria

(Moderator comment on Part I: There was considerable support, but not unanimous, for counties having a strong role in defining and mapping Important Agricultural Lands (IAL) and Targeted Agricultural Areas. Given recent cutbacks in state planning staffing, several people questioned the ability of the state to carry out it past responsibilities in administering Act 205 and that counties may be now better able to manage this role.)

II. Defining and mapping Important Ag Lands and/or Targeted Agricultural Areas

IAL
- State – criteria
- County – plans – mapping
- Establish realistic projections of ag demand
  - self-sufficiency
  - export crops
- IAL – can use scientific approach (including infrastructure-water systems) like ALISH, but county plans and targeted areas need to consider other factors

Targeted Areas:
- smaller than IAL – provide incentives to maintain agriculture
- Don’t predefine size of IAL
- Targeted Ag Areas with Act 205: focus incentives here
- up requirements in Act 205 – State staff cannot do it
Various criteria proposed:
  - can use county sustainable plans
  - base on water availability and access
  - Consider historical use of land for agriculture plus potential
    - Why use history of land use for criteria? except for Native Hawaiian land uses
  - Where is ag successful today? then compare to existing maps
    - Some ag lands not successful today but could be in future
    - presence or lack of infrastructure is important
  - Land owner intentions for specific parcels need to be considered

Mapping:
  - Integrate existing maps, rather than do any new mapping
  - Use ALISH for defining IAL at State level
  - Start with existing maps
  - use ALISH
  - proximity to market
  - need to update criteria

III. Objectives:

For what purpose are we protecting ag land?
  - food?
  - jobs?
  - there is too much land compared to demand for land for actual farming

Support for farming:
  - Challenge is to encourage people to farm
  - How does community help landowners/farmers be successful?
  - Community hasn’t stepped up to help landowners/farmers
  - consideration given to landowner where land is put in an IAL

BIG problem: Landowner & farmer aren’t same here
World Café facilitated by Ruby Edwards

What process would you recommend for identifying important Agricultural lands (IAL) and/or targeted agricultural areas? What are the state and county roles/responsibilities?

Moderator note: Comments are listed as they pertain to objectives, process, and roles. They may be appearing in more than one section. A summary follows the comments in each section.

Objectives: what are we trying to accomplish?

- Is the intent to identify lands that would be kept in ag for perpetuity?
  - IAL is not necessarily in perpetuity. Constitution provides process for reclassifying or rezoning lands identified as IAL
- The identification of IAL per the Constitution raises the bar for the conversion of IAL to non-ag uses
- As long as ag is viable, many landowners would like to keep in ag
- See a problem that this might just turn into a land use document, need to avoid this
- Should all lands in ag priority area be IAL? Not necessarily
- Which is more important to protect – ag land or ag activity? BOTH
- Certain lands should get highest level of protection and incentives to keep ag viable on land – more ag protections for ag best ag land and long-term ag activity
- We need to do what it takes to make ag highest and best use of the land
- The process will need to deal with how do you reconcile protecting the best ag land with promoting current ag use on any kind of land
- Need clear recognition of the different perspectives in looking at this as an open space issue versus ag land versus rural land
- What happens to whatever is NOT IAL? People are afraid of this – people are more focused on ag as open space, need a mechanism for how to handle this. This needs to be answered
- Can’t do just IAL, need regional planning for “other” land

Comments pointed to a need to be clear about what it is the process is supposed to accomplish, since various parties have different expectations and concerns about the potential outcomes or impacts of such a process. Are we trying to protect and promote agriculture, protect ag land, open space, or all of these? And how should such a process be structured and what else would be needed to address any or all of these objectives?

Process

- Process should focus on targeting priority ag areas – identify based on those elements that make ag work in that area
  - Look at what is happening today and what is working in particular areas
  - Investments/incentives would then follow to these priority ag areas
  - Not simply based physical criteria
  - Who does it? Ultimately takes both State and County buy-in
• Who takes lead?
  o Preferably, landowners in terms of who wants in priority ag areas
• Isn’t there an issue of quantifying how much land you need?
  o Who knows how much land is needed?
• Is this process voluntary or not?
  o Preferably voluntary
• In order to define a priority ag area, then may need to identify a larger area or region—more than individual landowners or parcels, so this may require a process that’s larger than individual landowners coming forward with their parcel
• What criteria would need to be satisfied to be considered ag priority or IAL?
  o Don’t want to use LESA/ALISH
    ▪ These systems don’t address Hawaii crop conditions
  o There is misconception that LESA or ALISH don’t address local crop conditions
• In identifying process, criteria should include:
  o Ag business factors, like access to reasonably-priced infrastructure (e.g., water, roads, etc.) and ag support facilities
  o Some valuation of other benefits to community that ag provides, needs to be dialogue in community as to what expectations of agriculture are – (ag as providing benefits to area, more than just providing a crop (e.g., discharge of wastewater, aquifer recharge, open space, etc.)
• Need to look at the potential of ag land for future use: need to also look at the historical ag activity and historical use of ag land to identify future potential of land, then apply the prior speaker’s criteria of ag business factors and ag values to community
• Wouldn’t be opposed to using ALISH process, but update criteria or use of criteria
• Start with using maps that have been done (ratings systems) and current maps and update the maps—we already know where these lands are, then add additional criteria (from prior speaker) to identify broader area
• Anything in that area would be considered for IAL
• Need subgroups in “IAL”
• Worried that this process shouldn’t be “community” driven – need to pay attention to what is driving ag in an area, what’s going on that makes ag successful or unsuccessful
• Like the idea of a committee or some entity that understands agriculture and ag-business and is not political that looks into this – use a more technical process
• If we assume these is land identifies, what is the next step?
• What happens to whatever is NOT IAL? People are afraid of this – people are more focused on ag as open space, need a mechanism for how to handle this. This needs to be answered
• On Hawaii, have too much land to manage, e.g. vast open landscapes
• IAL needs to be taken in regional context that embraces the other regional concerns
• Can’t do just IAL, need regional planning for “other” land
• Not just resource mapping, but integrated overall plan that takes in resources and needs
• Keep the country country in general terms, using rural classification to do this
• Need to have a timeframe for this, need a timeframe for revisiting criteria to adapt to changing conditions
• In perpetuity is a stretch, maybe 50 years should be the timeframe we look at
• See a problem that this might just turn into a land use document, need to avoid this
• Need flexibility that needs to be built into overall concept
• Should be part of county-led planning process and integrated into county planning systems
• Proposal for identifying IAL and priority areas:
  o Identify IAL, State-driven, resource orientation, with regulatory implications and highest level of incentives targeted for IAL
  o Identify ag priority areas, county-driven process (like development of county ag plan) resulting in defining regional ag areas for “ag enterprise zone” designation; AG EZ is non-regulatory, would include IAL and non-IAL lands; within area, business incentives & ag supports, like infrastructure, available
• Think legislature would be open to something like special areas that protect ag activity and rural landscape and character

Comments would seem to indicate that participants thought there was value in exploring the concept of targeted agricultural areas, but there was no clear agreement that the lands within these area would then be considered IAL. Some were comfortable with starting with existing rating systems for IAL; others felt that physical criteria alone were inadequate for identifying what constituted successful ag areas. There was strong support for a regional or county-based planning process that would address both targeted ag areas and lands that would then be excluded from these ag areas.

Roles

• Process should focus on targeting priority ag areas – identify based on those elements that make ag work in that area
  o Look at what is happening today and what is working in particular areas
  o investments/incentives would then follow to these priority ag areas
  o not simply based physical criteria
  o Who does it? Ultimately takes both State and County buy-in
• Who takes lead?
  o Preferably, landowners in terms of who wants in priority ag areas
• Worried that this process shouldn’t be “community” driven – need to pay attention to what is driving ag in an area, what’s going on that makes ag successful or unsuccessful
• Like the idea of a committee or some entity that understands agriculture and ag-business and is not political that looks into this – use a more technical process
• One input needs to be county group/players
• State interest is to protect IAL as resource for future ag economy, protecting the resource base for future ag
• State involvement needs to be broad
• Counties don’t always recognize values of agriculture
• Need to recognize the role of landowners in maintaining & managing those rural/open landscapes, how much they do
• Think legislature would be open to something like special areas that protect ag activity and rural landscape and character
• Need flexibility that needs to be built into overall concept
• Should be part of county-led planning process and integrated into county planning systems
• Proposal for identifying IAL and priority areas:
  o Identify IAL, State-driven, resource orientation, with regulatory implications and highest level of incentives targeted for IAL
  o Identify ag priority areas, county-driven process (like development of county ag plan) resulting in defining regional ag areas for “ag enterprise zone” designation; AG EZ is non-regulatory, would include IAL and non-IAL lands; within area, business incentives & ag supports, like infrastructure, available

Comments underscored that the State, counties, landowners, and community all played a role in any such process of planning for and managing ag and rural lands. All favored a larger county role in planning for ag areas and other rural lands, but there was no clear consensus that the counties, rather than the State, should take the lead in identifying IAL.
World Café facilitated by Sandra Kunimoto

What process would you recommend for identifying important agricultural land (IAL) and/or targeted agricultural areas? What are state and county responsibilities?

Process of Identifying IAL
- Counties have responsibility for identifying and implementing; State creates framework
  - Counties have the knowledge
- Has to be a regional approach
  - look at labor and transportation too
  - creates desire to be in IAL
  - becomes integrated and enhances changes of profitability (synergy)—so it’s desirable to be in IAL
- State provides some guidance and criteria
  - may need to verify the county’s designations that they did follow the criteria and guidance
  - State could provide incentives for doing it within a timely manner
- County identifies and maps – can’t be done at State level – must be bottom up
- Holistic planning based – current use, location in relation to other ag etc. (rather than rating system)
- Land use analysis at county level through community plans, look @ county development plans
- Criteria might include:
  - Existence of viable ag enterprises
    - What is viable keeps changing over time
  - Availability of support infrastructure
    - i.e. water
    - at right cost
  - Natural assets/resources (soils, etc.)
    - multiple factors (criteria)
    - land-based and non-land-bases
- Examine past studies (such as ALISH, LESA, etc.) and select most applicable criteria
- IAL may include “unique” and non-traditional uses
  - i.e. ag uses that additionally provide other important service (i.e. waste water use)
- It’s different from 25 years ago when sugar and pineapple were dominant
- Use of rural needs to be addressed with IAL

IAL issues:
- IAL should get incentives/public investment (i.e. infrastructure (water) support, tax, etc.)
- What happens to the current ag land not designated IAL?
• What happens to IAL (e.g. tax consequences)? Definition of preserve and protect?
  Is IAL permanent? Could change in 40-50 years or sooner (3-5 years?)
    o if ag-less infrastructure required
• IAL and targeted ag areas could mean different things
• Counties may lose revenues? They must be very involved in these decisions
    o Could they gain from rural designations?
• Need definition of IAL?
• How is IAL different than current designations (system)
• Constitutional history of IAL

Other Issues:
• Should state “buy” the strategic lands?
What process would you recommend for identifying important agricultural lands (IALs) or targeted agricultural areas? What are the state and county responsibilities?

Group 1
- Move immediately to ALISH, but modify its components to: Prime, Unique and Other Important Lands
- The process should use maps: look at existing agricultural maps that identify regions, agricultural activities etc., then use overlays to illustrate, for example, agricultural activity and soils, or agricultural activity and water availability etc.
- The question needs to be refined or rephrased, because IALs and Targeted Agricultural Areas (TAA) may use different processes or may not be the best terms to describe land categories.

Group 2
- Use community-based planning processes like those in place on O‘ahu
- Identifying IALs should be a planning process that considers all lands, from conservation to urban
- The process should include incentives or voluntary designations by landowners
- The process should be 2 processes: the first would be scientific in nature, assessing land capability and other factors of agricultural production; and the second would be planning in nature, taking information from the first process and building it into the county planning processes.
- The identification process doesn’t necessarily require maps: it could be accomplished by developing standards, guidelines and criteria for the various counties
- Regardless of process, any implementation by the counties through their planning processes should include periodic review

Group 3
- Maps that identify lands by agricultural capability should be complemented by notation of other factors such as availability of human resources, proximity to markets and/or transportation services, landowner intentions/desires, and agricultural incentives
- The process should include a five-year boundary review
- The process should identify potential agricultural markets that Hawai‘i could enter, or export opportunities that could be initiated or expanded upon
➢ The process should identify imported agricultural products that can be grown here, and it should correlate those products to Hawai‘i lands suitable to produce the crops (with a goal of agricultural self-sufficiency)

➢ Ask the Dept. of Agriculture and UH College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources what the process(es) should be.