



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sender:

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is

I am

I reside at

I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input.,
2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers.,
3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well.,
4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges).,

Testifier's Name (The preceding Comment Form was completed by the following individuals. However, forms containing additional comments provided by the individuals highlighted in yellow can be found below).
Travis Tavares
Charmaine Nee
Debora Sayre
Alana Haenga
Lisa Hayes
Kahokuao Papalimu
Amanda Collins
Theresa Nishida
Vanessa Gilgoff
Ritsuko Allen
Candy Dungca
Alyssa Jasso
Alexander Faumuina
Dejah Love
Pedro Maynes
Pedro Maynes, Jr
MJ McDonald
Nolan Tallett
Tom Wiedenbein
M K Ferris
Andrew Crosby
Malia Fiafaimane
Ka'imi Hernandez
Susann Quipotla
Kamanao'i'o Gomes
Divina Herrera
Georgiana Navarro
Dr Kalani Manuel
Casey Soriano
Kuuleilani Weathington
Andrea Ku'uleiawapuhi Malohi
Jonell Pahukula
Brandy-Alia Serikaku
Kalele Kekauoha-Schultz
Eddie Bikle
Lori DeLima
Marisa Wriston
Braden Simao
Orlinna Apilando

Testifier's Name

(The preceding Comment Form was completed by the following individuals. However, forms containing additional comments provided by the individuals highlighted in yellow can be found below).

Lisa Stone

Sharlene Auld

Uilani Kea

Reno Akeo

Dane Kualono o la`akea

Joshua Perez

Cara Bock

Mapihi Kahurangi Davis

Rachel Kuhn

Kerriane O'Malley

Chantelle Cabalo

Nainoa Cabalo

Pedro Sauilemau

Carla Gimpel

Milan Morales

Keau Reismoniz

Jolie Tak

Priscilla Paris

James Mattos

Toni Travis

Ariana Ghovanlou

Rachel McLain

Beau Schutte

Jamie Barut

Natalie Marquardt

Stefanie Lindner

Bette Buchele

Marshelle L. Castro

Kapua Keliikoa-Kamai

Leane Hurrell

Brian Kamalani Keao Oshiro

Byron Pulu

Lilia Young

Doreen Kaluna

Gale Perez

Lia Green

Roberta Perese

Joanna Howard

Macey Duff

Testifier's Name

(The preceding Comment Form was completed by the following individuals. However, forms containing additional comments provided by the individuals highlighted in yellow can be found below).

Kera Sherwood-O'Regan

Malia Kahananui

Nancy Yang

Rochelle Salvador

Robert Schulz

Kelis Mahu-Marsh

Charmaine Alameda

Kelly Regan

Dejahlynn Bernard

Meghan Corson

Shantel Lagman

Benjamin Gochenouer

Vi Melendy

Mari Avicolti

Miho Okamoto

Olivia Del Vecchio

Alejandra Duran

Kekai Newman

Stephanie Hicks

Joy Akamine

Karen Gehrman

Davina Ricketts

Maria Giulia Rodriguez calv

Tiffany Fullmer

Ernst Heijn

Colleen Joy

Mary Whispering Wind

Grace Osborne

Gary Kamalii

Noelani Paresa

David Tonga

Thais Rivas

Sydney Garcia

Stacey Young

Kupono Ana

Azza Vinuya

Tommy Sook

Anela Akau-LaClair

Leslie Goo



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Mari Avicoli <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 2:38 AM

My name is	Mari Avicoli
I am	other: American
I reside at	Philadelphia, PA
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Respect the sovereignty of First Nations people.



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Edie Bikle <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:44 PM

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is	Edie Bikle
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	tarogifts@aol.com
I reside at	Kapulena, Hawaii Island
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	I believe the Hawaiians and other residents have made it quite clear they want no further development on Mauna Kea.



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Bette Buchele <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 11:05 PM

My name is	Bette Buchele
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	elizabethbuchele808@gmail.com
I reside at	Honolulu Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	no TMT



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Chantelle Cabalo <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 9:34 PM

My name is	Chantelle Cabalo
I am	other: Mixed
I reside at	Waikoloa big island Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Ku'e

**LATE TESTIMONY**

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Marshelle L. Castro <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 11:12 PM

My name is	Marshelle L. Castro
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	mshelle55@gmail.com
I reside at	Kaunakakai, Molokai
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Sacred, Our Aina that connects us to Heaven



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Amanda Collins <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 7:26 PM

My name is	Amanda Collins
I reside at	Northridge, CA, United States of America
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges).,
Additional Comments:	Environmental concerns



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Mapihi Kahurangi Davis <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 9:26 PM

My name is	Mapihi Kahurangi Davis
I am	other: Tangata Māori
I am a UH	other: Supporter
My email is	12084mapihit@gmail.com
I reside at	Rotorua, Aotearoa
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Tū tiaki maunga!



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Macey Duff <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 11:57 PM

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is	Macey Duff
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kailua Kona
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Mauna Kea protects the culture of this land. Hawaiian culture is sacred and the Indigenous people of this land deserve the right to keep Mauna Kea protected and sacred. A'OLE.



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Alexander Faumuina <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 7:38 PM

My name is	Alexander Faumuina
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	mahaloadventuretours@gmail.com
I reside at	Volcano, Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Stop putting boundaries on the island stop with this non native structure it is not native to the islands it's a repeativeness like the Micronesia just stop breaking the islands this goes for the quarry people also we want the island to stay clean and pure. Na'u Ali'i ai Moku



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Karen Gehrman <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 4:36 AM

My name is	Karen Gehrman
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	karen.gehrman@gmail.com
I reside at	San Francisco CA
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	I urge you to halt UH's participation in this project.



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Carla Gimpel <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 9:43 PM

My name is	Carla Gimpel
I am	other: Haole Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	cgimpel@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Honolulu, O'ahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	<p>AloHA deAr board, please let's be transparent & serious. We know that the management of the science at the most sacred mountain on EArth is far from the standards required by the unique place you have been responsible to take care for until now. Start by clearing all operations & then, let's built alliances with the telescopes in Chile, Spain, Antarctica.... wherever you want we will support the science. Not in our Mauna, not now, not ever. The world is watching. This is not a local issue of UH, is of global importance. Please be pono, honor aloha & knowledge. Please clean up. Is somehow embarrassing that my university lacks vision & respect. Th se are primordial values of education. Please, stop defending something that takes your calm away. Aloha.</p>



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Kamano'i'o Gomes <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:16 PM

My name is Kamano'i'o Gomes
I am Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH Student
My email is gomeskamanaoio@yahoo.com
I reside at Honolulu, Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):
1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community...
Additional Comments: Ku Ki'a'i Mauna



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Alana Haenga <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 7:19 PM

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is	Alana Haenga
I am	other: New Zeaand Māori
I reside at	Porirua New Zealand
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	No decisions about us without us! Indigenous consultation is important. It must be meaningful and not just a tick box method.



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Malia Kahananui <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 12:16 AM

My name is	Malia Kahananui
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kahuku, O'ahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	A hiki ke aloha 'āina hope loa



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Kalele Kekauoha-Schultz <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:39 PM

My name is	Kalele Kekauoha-Schultz
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Wailuku, Maui
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Be Pono!



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Kapua Keliikoa-Kamai <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 11:14 PM

My name is	Kapua Keliikoa-Kamai
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	dkapua@gmail.com
I reside at	85-1330 Koolina St
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Aloha, moving forward without full community participation is so wrong, inappropriate for a "so-called educational institution and contradictory to education itself.



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Rachel Kuhn <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 9:26 PM

My name is	Rachel Kuhn
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Former student, leader of an RIO at UH Manoa
My email is	rach.kuhn@gmail.com
I reside at	Seattle, WA
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Please model good leadership for the students and faculty of the UH System, for Hawai'i, and for the world. You claim to be an indigenous-serving institution. Please show us what that looks like.



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

James Mattos <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 10:24 PM

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is	James Mattos
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	mattosjk@gmail.com
I reside at	Makawao, Maui
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Maunakea is not property to exploit and destroy "in the name of science". As a university that serves Hawai'i, i would hope the interests of our people, the people of Hawai'i, would be acknowledged and respected first and foremost over everything, especially when it involves decisions related to the foundation of our culture and these connections we have with our 'āina. Voting on anything while the community is respecting the "safer at home" policy is hewa. No amount of scientific discovery can justify the amount of disrespect, distruction, and mismanagement upon Maunakea.



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Pedro Maynes <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 7:46 PM

My name is	Pedro Maynes
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Former HCC and LCC student
My email is	pedromaynesjr@gmail.com
I reside at	Honolulu, Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Poor management practice and decisions.

**LATE TESTIMONY**

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Kekai Newman <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 3:40 AM

My name is	Kekai Newman
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Waianae, Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	To have meetings in secret during a global pandemic as well as not being able to attend meeting because they are not within the communities that are being affected is just so wrong. Communities need to be able to provide input in order to trust lawmakers and state officials ensuring that they are being heard and respected and we are not. Every time we offer a solution to the problem that we as native people face you don't even give our solutions a thought and just move on by proceeding the same way. You all need to wake up and realize that your job is to serve the people of the Hawaiian nation and not foreign businesses, investors, or any other entity. The university system is a very white colonial national institution that is racist to its Native Hawaiian people but are welcoming of the tourist and international dollar. It shows in what you do, the board of regents, that you cannot be trusted with the protection of Maunakea simply because you lack to see it as a living part of our culture but rather you see only foreign dollar signs. It is for this reason alone that you will never be in control of this 'āina because Native Hawaiians will always be here to oppose your wrong doings. Do the right thing and give the control to the people who love and love that land and it will flourish but if you continue to press onward so will we with defending the sacred Mauna. Kū kia'i mauna!



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Brian Kamalani Keao Oshiro <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 11:23 PM

My name is	Brian Kamalani Keao Oshiro
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	bko28328@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Pu'uokapolei, O'ahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	As a kanka maoli student in STEM at UH Mānoa, we are a minority that is not heard. Student occupations of the administration building is what it lead up to but what kia'i were faced with from admin was locked in building from Friday night to Monday morning with the threat of arrest. Does this university expect students to continue their studies on the same campus, seeing the same faces as the people who let hundreds desecrate and destroy sacred land?

**LATE TESTIMONY**

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Gale Perez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 11:34 PM

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is	Gale Perez
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Kupuna of the Kohala community council
My email is	perez.kuulei@yahoo.com
I reside at	Kohala ,Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	The only ones who can Malama Mauna Kea are the ohana, kahuna, kupuna and the people who connect to Papa and Wakea.



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Susann Quipotla <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:08 PM

My name is	Susann Quipotla
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	susieqmaui@gmail.com
I reside at	Wailuku Hi.
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges).,
Additional Comments:	PutA Hold On This Until We All Can Show Up. Mahalo. 🙏 📄



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Maria Giulia Rodriguez calv <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 4:47 AM

My name is	Maria Giulia Rodriguez calv
I am	other: Italian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	giugiumitika@gmail.com
I reside at	Como italy
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	It would be a discriminatory act against the religious and spiritual rights of autonomy and recognition of the native Hawaiians, they would yet have to suffer the consequences of a elitist privileged mindset that cats the "minorities" and their dignity aside perpetrating a supremacist mindset



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Rochelle Salvador <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 12:45 AM

My name is	Rochelle Salvador
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Pearl City, Hi
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Please don't continue to aggravate our ancestors who preside and protect these islands. Mahalo!



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Pedro Sauilemau <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 9:41 PM

My name is	Pedro Sauilemau
I am	other: Samoan
I am a UH	other: None
My email is	okekoa2007@gmail.com
I reside at	Ewa Beach, Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Help us



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Beau Schutte <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 10:35 PM

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is	Beau Schutte
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	btiare91@yahoo.com
I reside at	Puukapu kamuela Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Put the damn telescope elsewhere!!! It doesn't belong here. We have to much to lose from the damage that will be caused by the change in our echo system. the damage will be irreversible!!



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Brandy-Alia Serikaku <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:31 PM

My name is	Brandy-Alia Serikaku
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	brandyal@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Hilo, Hawai'i
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Kapu 'o Maunakea



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Nolan Tallett <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:00 PM

My name is	Nolan Tallett
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	okalani_6@msn.com
I reside at	Kalihi, Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Mauna Kea has been mismanaged by UH far too long. There is no justice for the native culture, the host culture. There should be no more building on our sacred mountain!



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Kupono Ana <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 6:42 AM

My name is	Kupono Ana
I am	other: Hawaiian national living under duress in the de Facto State of Hawaii
I am a UH	other: Concerned citizen
My email is	alohaaina9@yahoo.com
I reside at	Moku o Keawe
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	I truly feel that the negligence and desecration that already has been shown in all of the office of Mauna Kea management that has been show in all of the audits they had " please read audits " show that the OMKM and the university of Hawaii failed to meet the requirements of the lease and should be given their notice to vacate from the BLNR and preserve Our most sacred mountain from further destruction and pollution of our water system



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

kaya Hutcherson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 8:25 AM

My name is	kaya Hutcherson
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	hutch.krain04@gmail.com
I reside at	Colorado Springs, Colorado
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	The Native Hawaiian people deserve the right to their land and sacred Mauna! There is no reason this should be taking place.

**LATE TESTIMONY**

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Sharon Medeiros <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 7:36 AM

My name is	Sharon Medeiros
I am	other: Plain Kanaka Maoli
I am a UH	other: None of the above
I reside at	Waimea, Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Because it is just wrong

**LATE TESTIMONY**

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Jennifer Mitchell <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 11:16 AM

My name is	Jennifer Mitchell
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kailua Kona, Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	It is not right to make decisions without the community's input, suggestions or acknowledgement. I object to

**LATE TESTIMONY**

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Donna Okiya <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 7:20 AM

To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

My name is	Donna Okiya
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	donnaokta@gmail.com
I reside at	Kailua, Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Keep sour sacred lands from development, to protect our precious lands protected.



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Noelani Paresa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 5:54 AM

My name is	Noelani Paresa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	NParesa76@gmail.com
I reside at	Maui
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges).,
Additional Comments:	No more development on sacred land.

**LATE TESTIMONY**

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Katherine Piho <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 8:38 AM

My name is	Katherine Piho
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Retired
My email is	kelisanoe@gmail.com
I reside at	Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Only the Kanaka Mao'li and the Kil'ai of Hawaii should decide the fate of Mauna Kea



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Carla Rogers <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 9:07 AM

My name is	Carla Rogers
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	crogers@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Kaneohe, Oahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	The University of Hawai'i Board of Regents will be convening on May 21, 2020 at 10:30 am and discussing and decision making on items dealing with Mauna Kea during the Please do not make any proposals/decisions or determinations during the Covid-19 crisis in Hawai'i when there is no opportunity to provide in person testimony. Mahalo nui.



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Elizabeth Seaton <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 8:46 AM

My name is	Elizabeth Seaton
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	emseaton@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Honolulu, O'ahu
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	Please postpone until all communities can safely gather to discuss.



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Jana Soli <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 8:54 AM

My name is	Jana Soli
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	janaksoli@gmail.com
I reside at	Hilo, Hawaii
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges).,
Additional Comments:	<p>I ask that you do not move forward with the proposed Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans. As a University of Hawaii at Hilo alumni, I hope that the college I have proudly represented over the past 11 years will uphold the values I believed to be at its core when I entrusted UH Hilo with my educational future. I have always believed UH led by example in demonstrating the importance of integrity, respect for all, and the necessity for moral decision making, even when a decision is neither easy nor straightforward. It is with a deep sense of disappointment that I now witness this same institution going against these values, by knowingly taking courses of action on Mauna Kea that blatantly benefit its own internal priorities, in direct defiance of the clearly stated desires and needs of many of the university's own students, alumni, and stakeholders. The University of Hawaii once taught me that stakeholders include all people who hold a vested interest in an entity or business. Now this same university conducts itself in a manner that plainly states its true beliefs; that the only stakeholders of importance are those who pay the highest dollar amount or share the university's own interests. If UH continues on its current path by passing these egregious management plans, I will be grieved to discover that University of Hawaii is not the place of higher learning I imagined it to be, and my choice to learn under its banner was as misguided as its current restructuring and management plan.</p>



LATE TESTIMONY

BOR Testimony <bortest2@hawaii.edu>

OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

David Tonga <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
 To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 6:08 AM

My name is	David Tonga
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Not associated
My email is	DavidTonga@comcast.net
I reside at	Independence, Missouri
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	All though, I am not Kama'aina at this time, he Hawai'i au! I'm pro TMT, and for the furthering of our education, however not at this cost. Please consider the natives and what they feel is proper for them. This is their land. Please be considerate. Mahalo!



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Robin Waiau <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 9:12 AM

My name is	Robin Waiau
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Hilo, HI
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	I object to this process at this time.



OBJECTION TO THE UH BOR ACTIONS ON MAUNA KEA

Ammon Whigham <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 9:27 AM

My name is	Ammon Whigham
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Moku o Keawe
I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) for the following reason(s):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of Mauna Kea governance within the UH structure has not been shared with the larger community, including the Hawai'i Island community where Mauna Kea exists. There has been very little opportunity for the community to hear the explanations and provide input., 2. Holding BOR meetings where decisions and discussions on Mauna Kea are taking place in the midst of the Covid-19 crisis shows a lack of good faith and transparency on the part of the UH especially since Mauna Kea is a hot topic and the laws that govern Sunshine laws have been lifted. The intent of lifting the Sunshine laws was to allow government entities to continue working during the quarantine period. The intent was not to eliminate community opportunities to provide in person testimony and engage in back and forth discussions with decision makers., 3. Of the four Mauna Kea management models being proposed, only Model 3 moves the University out of the central command and decision-making process for Mauna Kea. It is the only option which would address the serious issues brought forth in the various State Auditor reports. Going forth with restructuring the UH internally to streamline management (including enforcement) of Mauna Kea, makes it clear that UH was never seriously considering taking itself out of the picture. Furthermore Model 3 should be a discussion at the Board of Land and Natural Resources and not before the UH Board of Regents. This option needs to be discussed more fully in the community as well., 4. There is no model comparison or full evaluation of all the various options proposed in the report. It appears the BOR is being asked to consider only one option – 4a which would not only be expedient to implement (since it does not require legislation) but would allow UH to maintain land authorizations (occupancy use, rights and privileges),.
Additional Comments:	The world is waiting for the leading pioneers of the future to acknowledge truth for what it truly was, is, and will be. Those who continue to stand for righteousness will be at the right hand of providence when the earth becomes free. A