



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).

Kalai Helm
Kahiau Snyder
Jamaica Osorio
Nohea Santimer
Kanoa Manibog
Malia Palea
Samantha Rapoza
Naomi Tachera
Kahealani Acoba-Baldado
Cyr Pakele
Jamie Tom
Jennifer Schneider
Sean Downes
Kelly Ward
Erika Alvarado
Hauoli Lau
Noa Brigoli
Delma Begas
Brighton Nilsson
William Case
Joyce Wond
Penepalaau Kaonohi
Sharron Cushman
Skye Wong
Tiana Dole
Kailee Mokiao
Julie Paul
Amber Johannson
Huali McCollough
Zoë Malia Ozoa Loos
Taylor Lewis
Tianad Dole
Nichole Montgomery-Webb
Catherine Ritti
Rain Wright
Galen Hew Len
Meredith Thomas
Tina Taniguchi
James McNabb
Makanalani Guillermo
Glen Freitas

Joey Padeken
Garrett Kam
Ryan Chun
Erin Sandler
Rhonda Vincent
Bethany Bilowus
Hō'olu Cravalho
Mona Keliinoi
Deborah Wheat
Kiley Shook- Rogers
Barbara Herras
Kaila Razonable
Cheryl Hendrickson
Alisha Rego
Tierra Knight
Lorilani Keohokalole
Ty Comish
Paige Kaho'okele Napuahinano Sumberg
Anne Dunlap
Kiki Frank
Pauline Mapuana Lukela
Sheryl Dorsey
Kimberly Pecana
Laura Ramirez
Mariana Monasi
Garrick Arakaki
Mitchell Enaena
Mahina Kahalewale
Jan Makepa
Issac Tom
Kelly Keliinoi
Samantha Gomes
Kalena Lanuza
Teri Skillman
Kaily Sakai
Lee-Won Fulbright
Pele Kaio
Napua Johansen
Kahina Hewitt
Bridgit Bales
Joanna White
Pekelo Richmond
JarraeTehani Manasas
Kihalani Ezzo-Gardner
Lana-June Tennant
Kahili Ezzo
Momilani Quintana

Hope Martin
Amber Lono
Laakea Ezzo-Gardner
Vernon Wilson
Troy Gardner
Marie Alohalani Brown
Max Kalā Kim
Akira Ku'ailani
Naiya Kuwaye-Naehu
Pi'imoku Keahi
Chantelle Matagi
Tammy Wilson
Liana Rosales-Lyman
Holly Reiplinger
Pamela Williams
Monica Parker
Haaheo Kaiawe
David Shizuma
Erc Wada
Kaylin Jones
Dee Green
Kalamakū Popovich-Pung
Jonna Hoopai
Susan Vickery
Shannon Bento
Pono Nui
Joan Jensen
Shanti Devi
Deb Moy
Kamila Horswill
Annelise Houston
Charlita Mahoe
Joy McLeod
Trina Simeona
Ki'ilani Spencer
Kisha Borja-Quichocho-Calvo
Rhyan Hayashida
McKenna Conboy
Rebecca Gonzalez
C Aronoff
Debralee Kailiwai-Ra
Zenaida Sawyer
Emmaline Padeken
Tehani Malterre
Lysandra Padeken
Emma Wigren
Carol Roskam

Zan Timtim
Melia Leslie
Dana Paresa
Makana Parker
Stephen Loo
Jenesus Kahaialii
Ponokamihalana'auikekaihala'i McDowell
Jessica dos Santos
Georjanna Nau
Chyloe Leon Guerrero
David Stupplebeen
Eva Botelho
Kaleolani Poepoe-Deguzman
Maya Sanchez
Alexis Lincoln
Carl Holapa
Amanda King
Tory Kono
Brianna Pelekai
Kaleinohea Cleghorn
Trudie Hegel
Nora Cesare Blanco
Amber Manuel
Larisa Patrick
Noe Noe Wong-Wilson, PhD
Leneva Kapule
Cheyenne Manning
Karen Ara
Lahela Spencer
Megan Harrell
Lei Chock
Kiana Suganuma
Kapulei Flores
Alston Paresa
Clare Gordon
Mariel Shockley
Hilinaikamakanalilii Kane
Angel Reza
Aaron Pryer
Keauililani Bernard
Natasha Johns
Parker Webber
Kaiewa Spencer
Hawane Rios
Cynthia Franklin
Matthew M
Henry Boothe

Theresa Lindsey
Lorna Cockett
Jordyn Paa
Cristina Gomez
Landon Lopes
Melina Pelekai
Kelly Paa
Daisha Kawaa
Brigid Dodge
Jane McGunn
Kelsey Nichols
Sidney Fellows
Jonah Bobilin
Rudy Kok
Pono Paa
Mary Kok
Autumn Hesia
Selah Levine
Charles Lacaden
Kerry Lomg
Asja Hickman
Sanoë Wong
Brennan Pau
Emma Ching
Freda Ezzo
Georgette Velasco
Doreene Kealohanui
Noah Pau
Kahealani Keahi
Kaniela Pau
Kukui Haumea
Punohu Keahi
Kaydee Park
Tina Cunningham
Tara Coyote
Jessica Andres
Carolyne Whelan
Britney Styles
Ginger Shoemate
Sheadon Freitas
Jaylene Rodrigues
Zique Yutaka
Kanani Miyamoto
Justin Hussey
Jaclyn Guenther
Halia Eastburn
John Kalama

Bethan Pualani Baptista
Michelle Felipe
Avery Thorpe
Nanea Lo
Luwella Leonardi
Deborah Victorine
Stasey Butler
Dustin Agbayani
Euliana Hudson
Alexander Russell
Kiana Perreira-Keawekane
Sabrina Zapata
Leiala Cook
Ekini Lindsey
Brandee Doi
Lion Fiyah
Amy Allen
Emily Cornish
Brittney Kapaona
Sandra Cordero
Sheann Belmes
Natalie H
Aimee Sato
Sheann Belmes
Leimomi Wheeler
Antoinette Freitas
Cynthia Luafalemana
Kekai Keahi
Penster Jr Poll
Shaeralee-Tiare Manosa
Claud Sutcliffe
Asha Haridoss
Kimberly Papa
Nalani Downing
Tianalee Okuma
Alyssa Thibodeau
Lilinoe Ahia
Kameanani Blackman
Luana Rivera Palacio
Tara Rojas
Noelani Ahia
Nicole Naone
Nicole Anakalea
Joanna Pokipala
Jodie Payao
Natalie Arneson
Shaylyn Kimura

Shannon Tam Loo
Malia Perreira
Grace Caligtan
Keeaumoku Kapu
Chandell Asuncion
Diana Tayan
Kaleiheana-a-Pohaku Stormcrow
Crystal Kealoha Goldschmitz
Ayla Keliipio
Kellyann Zuttermeister
Cinthia Lomeli
James Akiu
Ivoree Ameperosa
Leeannda Kaawaloa-Naumu
William Rodrigues
Richard Lindsey III
Momi Kawelo
Jessica Kahue
Ka'apuni Peters-Wong
Luna Porras
Piikea Purdy
Waimakalani Lona
Stacey Ka'au'a
Kaleihua Kapua'ala
Tanya Naehu
Vance Viveiros
Zane Lacaden
Rumalynn Yee Poong
Ayesha Liquorish
Jamie Maclean
Francois Arhlac
Debra Payao
Grace Rivas
Veronica Pahia
Lezlie Purdy-Rivera
Amber Lehua Lunsford
Casey Santos
Mirai Mawae
Randal Payao
Sheridan Noelani Enomoto
Terry Ann Miller
Jennifer Hanson
Atsuko Koi
Keskealani Iona-Duncan
Kailey Kane
Rena Winchester
Nedi McKnight

Lynette Kaopuiki
Heidi Pihana
Cherry Kaauamo
Kelly Kahealani Jimenez
Anuheia Montiho
Mona Pohano
Elana Jones
Bryan Moore
Hoku Vasconcellos
Ty Kaipo Torco
Lauren Kawahakui
Amy Goo
Pahnelopi Mckenzie
Jamilyn Almodova
Lehua Kaulukukui
Aulii Mahuna
Ana Ruiz
Josiah O'Sullivan
Sarah Lindsey
James Eduard Torres
Kapilialoha Kidder
Amiste Sanders
D. Pua Serrao
Kiera Campbell
Mary Drayer
Israel Silvs
Maile Cummings
Joy Madriaga
Lexi Figueroa
Jamie Siangco
Bernadette DeLeon
Cookie Akau-Gaspar
Ionatana Iese
Melissa Nakoa
Tawaimakaomanoa Marquardt
Hooheho Haumea
L. Kehaulani Puou
Dr. Chris Lipat
Jett Aganos
Malia Siangco
Theo Katsikas
Mitchel Viernes
Travis Gylstrand
Aloha Makamae Karratti
Shauri West
Keala Piimanu
Heather Mack

Matt Hatakeyama
Dilyuns Michael
Oriett Siangco
Renee Robinson
Lacy Thompson
Sasha Olivas
Chassidy Reis-Moniz
Emma Kaahaaina
Robert Payao
Alison Mailes
Ellen-Rae Cachola
Evan Uiagaleei
Corey Asano
Kamalani Benito
Dakota Smock
Jen Jenkins
Karsyn Wong
Luke Spangenburg
Philip Kealoh
Kekoa Lupenui-Corpuz
Philip Kealoha jr
Paige Kawakami
Lauren Muneoka
Chelsey Dickson
V T
Nia Piimanu
Janea Howell
Ann-Marie Andres
Vanessa Purdy
Kuulei Cababat
Mona Kea
Anne-Louise Nunnari
Ernest Cabatingan
Erin Holmberg
Jocina Alani
Hermenia Villanueva
Kalani Guerrero
Deborah Hauanio
Debra Luna
Saxon Sawai
Royce Kaneshiro
Nahakuelua Kekauoha
Paul Cullen
Mary Jane Kahalewai
Michelle Pillen
Michelle Pillen
Halloway Kekauoha

Monica Williamson
Teresa Purugganan
mtada347@gmail.com
Bianca Isaki
Natalia Werkoff
Kimberly Kekauoha
Casey Park
Katherine Achacoso
Lorrin Manoi
Laureen Hatkeyama
Alex Sosa
Kyndal Vogt
Amidee Arellano
Nadia Fale
Andrew Connors
Gracie Wild
Xian Pomare
India Cote
Malia Daraban
Margaret Nozawa
Mahina Chillingworth
Susan Rosier
Case Dakota
Forest Frizzell
Alison Hartmann
Amlan Fujimura
Makaokalani Minihan
Bryson Poloa leeis
Hokulani Garcia
Richard Stevenson
Jontei Vincent
Bronson Kobayashi
Leilani Wagner
Kaikaina Allen
Melinda Mendez
Kela Frank
Jonah Cummings
Ayanna Silva
Ann Malluwa Wadu
Likolehua Tangaro
Kaisah Ka'aihili
Sarina Ti'a
Annie Torio
Leialohaokēānuenuē Ka'ula
Hercules Huihui
Alyssa Kahalehoe

Marlene Young
Kahanui Akui
Nina Sabahi
Daniel Kahalehoe
Shayne Fuller
Andre Perez
Julia Peralto
Hui O He'e Nalu DA HUI
Demi Addison
Odetta Gonzalez
Cesili Peralto
Keoki Kamaka
Tanya Alana
Virginia Block
Lorraine Harmon
Keoniana Flavin-Sylva
Nani Kaluhiokalani
Rebecca Rustin
Tracy Peters
Ilima Ho-Lastimosa
Rosaline Todrigues
Lillie Makaila
Charlene Holani
Starr Kalahiki
Emily C
Michelle Miyahana
Sharal Au
Kaohuhuiwiliowaimea Lee
Lanakila Washington
Christopher Seals
Kristen Kirchen
Jared Vilorja
Tj Savea
Kilia Chillingworth
Celidh Barker
Michael Aki
Ma'ili Yee
Junelle Taguas-Utumoengalu
Brad Nakamura
Molli Kalua
Elizabeth Schowalter
Summer Dierking
Shannon Peck
Shirley Asuncin
Chelsi Papas
Melissa Ka'onohi-Camit
Jonah Brody-Heim

Millie Ho
Steven Thomas
Olivia Irwin
Heidi Kerr
Ronnie Hoglen Jr.
Rachel Weckhorst Espejo
Mackenzie Jenkins
Anestasia Vendiola
Marcy Brown
Loranzo Molina
Moani Tiare Atay
Roselee Kepo'o
Linda Davis-Tafaoimalo
Devynn Wulstein
Tyra Wallrabenstein
Melissa Tomlinson
Jamie Kawauchi
Radcliffe Kaina
Leilani Antone
Keoni Wills
Kāhealani Wilcox
Karen Johnstone
Brandon Payne
Jadeleen Silva
Robin Kleiv
Marina Aina
Noa Silva
Shayna Noelani Dabis-Tom
Barbara Cuttance
Noeleen Silva
Kalia Naweli-Silva
Carolyn Cabais
Ericka Badua
Raquel Lemus
Kamaka Dias
Virginia Small
Bridget Tripp
Michelle Morin
Renee Salmo
Ramsey Calimlim
Tony Cabais
Lurline Kahele Manalo
Elia Aguirre
Christopher Kahunahana
Guessandra Cornwell
Monique DeSimone
Dea Rackley

Tehani Maielua
Lani Felicitas
Letty Sindelar
Maile Lavea-Malloe
Juz Fernandez
Jasmyn Lave
Nicolita Garces
Leianaikarose Sing Kahalehau
Elijah McShane
Phillip Nakoa
Amy Sommer
Xannelle Aveiro
Tui Asau
Sonny Sing-Kahalehau
Waiala Ahn
Tessie Souza
Kamalani Keliikuli
Yngrid Feeney
Mercedes Gacayan
Llewellyn Wodward
Mari Kanoho
Amber Kanehailua
Pomaikai Richardson
Lauralee Baoy
Pua'ena Ahn
Lindsey Drayer
Michael Willis
Eveleen Tasaki
Kalawai'a Moore
Leslie Leslie
Lea Makanani
'Eleu Novikoff
Janice Santos
Barbara Altemus
Kawaipuna Kalipi
Marissa Bartleson
Grace Tsubaki-Noguchi
Kristina Mekdeci
Serenity Lee-Carter
Kanoelani Keola-igarta
Mitchell Estores
Christopher Nakahashi
Mitchell Estores
Chaydeen Crivello
Mitch Kinnster
Melissa Garcia
Jasmine Umeno

Beatriz Cantelmo
Piliialoha Teves
Rebekah Luke
Jessie Mathieson
Jarom Laimana
Lahiki Manoa
Cherrie Blanch
Ashlin Matsuyama
Wai Needham
Meliza Brillantes
Jonathan Demayo
Mumina Ali
Kapulani Antonio
Mona Ubedei
Olivia Sears
Troy Familiar
Aidan Moore
Angela Carvalho
Shantel Wells
Vernon Kalani Kaahanui Jr
Randy Kahahane
Wren S
Cord Browning
Lopaka Lonoaea
Al Hubbard
Maelani Lee
Andre De Almeida
Anna Kamaka
Sue Canda
Kacie Raney
Michelle Rose
Kari Seiler
Sonnie Muaina
Nicholas Childs
Danielle Ah Sam-Palencia
Sonya Zabaa
Tasha Lindsey
Marie Eriel Hobro
Maura Sullivan
Haunani Martin
Keana Nihipali
Palekana Aki
Bonnie McAfee-Torco
Keolaanaole Kalaka
Gaby Schmidt
Lehua Sparrow
Jordan Ragasa

Briana Blotzke
Shae Kanakaole
Moses Kaheananui Pi'ipali
Lanell Molina
Laura Awong
Brennan Ahia-Phelan
Kauilani Trainer
Lori Halemano
Lukanicole Zavas
Leihua Naeole
Makana Melchor
Kaaiohelo McAfee-Torco
Jamie Perry
Kathleen Popa
Teresa Robertson
Roxane Keli'ikipikāneokolohaka
Malia Kaio
Derek Awong
Thomas Robertson
Duke Kamaka
Davianna McGregor
Amanda Canda
Heather Stimple
Charles Kuahine, III
Estelle Kaltenrieder
Juergen Canda
Kupalekanaka Chang
Kaila Tamala
LeShay Keli'iholoka
Audrey Alvarez
Ciary Christi Kehaulani Ono
Cameron Hee
Rebecca Maria Goldschmidt
Reiko Ah Quin
April Garrett
Jazmin Diaz
Samantha Scott
Hanohano Aken
Crescen Nobriga
Donna Ahina
Anuheia Smith
Katherine Kleving
Noelani Goodyear-Kaopua
Kairie Aiona-Peppers
Cameron Ahia
Hanaila Starks
Janell Tuttle

Anela DeSoto
Ipo Kawaa
Chris Barrett
KiJhana Barnes
Brooke Yee
Logan Yee
Michlynn Kahahane
Mahealani Cavaco
Demetria Buck
Aaron Nako
Kiele Lehel
Kanoelehua Robinson
Kylie Coito
Aislen Bacalso
Storm Wilson-Hillman
Vicky Robbins
Malia Hulleman
Star Pai
Joseph Souza
Freida Harris
Julie Warech
Kea Peters
Starleth Flores
Shawna Alapa'i
Ashley Quibol
Bob Douglas
Lilian Brupbacher
Malachi Daw
Micah Kaimana Pacatang
Katie Shim
Reid Calimpong
Davis Price
Vida Cavaco
Lydia Pontin
Hulali Pai
Naomi Forbuss
Donald Gahit
Kalialani Cruz
Kayla Goodale
Andrea Hepuapo'okela Hermosura
Kailani Naauao
Jensen Hanakahi
Michael Waters
Wallyn Christian
Jennifer Jones
Olivia Taylor
Hikurangi Mangu

Noa Spencer
Anna Funk
Katherine-Marie Matthes
Keala Fung
Kaulana Poe
Ryan Asuncion
Uilani Agbayani
Chelline Kamaka-Keliiliki
Judith Carroll
Kira Lee
Nancy Strada
Ryann Coules
Timothy Yee
Tahti Red
Jamie Boyd
Joy Yukumoto
Desiree Lee
Ashley Galacgac
Dara Suzuki
Sarah Tai
Summer Yadao
Dorinna Cortez
Kapono Lopes
Elizabeth Takamori
Isaiah Kauahi
Shaundielynn Kailikini-Louis
Jackie Englert
Kuulei Kanahale
Ahiena Kanahale
Michael Ferreira
Eric Luke
Ember Behrendt
Erika Kuhr
Keli'i Abordo
Ke'alahilani Grace
Jayden Kage
Rowena Afoa
Christopher Langan
Caleb Spencer
Sara Kahanamoku
Shayna Kahakai
Kamali'i Haumea-Thronas
Sheila Okin
Yuki Lyons
Sean Crowne
Jesse Cordero
Duane Waiolama

Jill Garcia
Keaton Perkins
Jennifer Soma
Gail Noeau
Aaron Uyehara
Kayla Sepulveda
Matthew Kahaloa
Amanda Iaukea
Kim Pierce
Naomi Gomes
Sarah Ing
Robert Mills
Karen Roberts
Francis Ching
Michelle Espero
Bonnie Whittinghill
Nancy Iokepa
Crystal Mattson
Darren Duquette
Irys Felidae
Inez Larson
Jon Mabuni
Rochelle Domingo
Damien Kealoha
Christina Santos
Paul Francis
Aria Grace
Jaelyn Domingo
Kainoa Miyamoto
Kealoha Ching
Donnamarie Pabre
Samuel Romano
Jonah Domingo
Alani Bagcal
Mana'o Dela Cruz
Julie Lachappa
Sharde Freitas
Sherri Patrick
Kawai Winchester
Chazley Baitlon
Ramona Hussey
Katie Caldwell
Danny Akau
T Jenkins
Noe Tupou
Jacob Noa
Sayaka Ueno

Grace Bezilla
Palani Hassett
Lani Almanza
Winona Ramolete
Kayla Andres
Adriane Adams
Kira DeGaetano
Micah Miyaki
Justin Slutsky
Ezion Cui-Yockeman
Ashley Mocerro Powell
Renea Ruark
Patricia McCarver
Kalei Bingo
Danica Kamakana
Kyle Kajihiro
Jennifer Mae
Bronson Azama
Jonah Yee
Allison Pullman
Kathleen Lacerdo
Olivia Tuisavalalo
Joseph jr. Koanui
Jaedyn Keawe-Caspillo
Nadya Tannous
Malia Adams
Alex Miller
Shantel Ho'opai
Jerry Bess
Maria Torres
Nakamakanikolonahe Obrero
Emma Tanigawa
Tim Pajimola
Alika Kahala- Delos Santos
Mori Oco
Brandy Dobson
Kaian Torres
Kahaiolelo Morales
Amber Low
Kara Kelai
Katie Psotka
Kyle Engel
A K Nuuhiwa
Leipunahale Cleaver
Laulani Tuzon
Clifton Dobson
Michelle Tomas

Bianca Aweau
Ashlie McGuire
Rasha Anayah
Mercedes Hudman
Jamie lyn Kamaka
Tara Duke
Jaymi Pascal
Sheldon Abril
Lorraine Waianuhe
Ryan Santana
Bryan Revell
Cait Hog
Valerie Amby-Kamakeeaina
Evette Ichishita
Christina Damore
Larry Kamai
Danielle Martinez
Paris DeCambra
Marcia Timboy
Zoli Wall
Megan Kaleipumehana Cabral
Noah Ah Mook Sang
Haulani Fuller
Kaela Izak
TerrillJames Kaneali'i Williams
Maile Kuanoni LaFave
Hope Matsumoto
Caprice-Shawna Sambrana
Kehaulani Quinata
Sasha Mizuguchi
Kahelelani Keawekāne
Trinette Furtado
Enrico Martinez
Jowell Guerreiro
Jeanette Kukahiko
Kehaulani Kukahiko
Jennifer Eng
Jadine Callejo
Kristine Comer
Kalani Quinata
Zeena Aljawad
Sharade Carba
Nalea Kukahiko
Richard Garcia
Vernadette Gonzalez
Rhanda Vickery
Chozen Morimoto

Ku'ualoha Ho'manawanui
Michelle Castro
Debra Javar
Kalani Makekau-Whittaker
Callie Fahey
Florence Fola
Elston Kamaka
Lynda Romoff
Kaioluhia Hamakua
Destiny Brown
Tanya Faumuina
Hanalei Rosa
Leinani Makekau-Whittaker
Nani I
Gayla Spencer
Gwendalyn Bretz
William Freitas
Brad Romoff
Kimberly Fanene
Leialii MakekauWhittaker
Pua Heimuli
Cara Allison
Kiron Costa
Alfreda Mactagone
Leslie Lockhart
Chanelle Subee
Jodeci Manning
Melanie Park
Lauren Ebenal
Alana Fisher
Elizabeth Kahn
Ka'eoikahaku Quinata
Lauren Stovall
Aaron Pooloa
Malia Heimuli
Tiffany Hart
Kalau Herrod-Isomura
Kandice Daniels
Ashley Kuahuia-kaupu
Maria Cortes
Hylie Santos
Kikilia Lani
Lianne Uchima
Sarah Almeida
Kiara Kaleilehua Cuyo
Sharon Moraes
Jocelyne Fragoso

Jennifer Young
Ryse Akiu
Astrid Sneekes
Sunny Unga
'Alohilani Kamaunu
Paige B
Kananiola Phillip
'Ilikea Arakaki
Beth Comstock
Shannon Rudolph
Ka'ohu Cazinha
Mikiala Akau
Jessika Orris
Kahoalii Keahi
Adriana Faimealelei
Alexa Libre
Tracie Brewer



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Garrick Arakaki <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:58 PM

My name is	Garrick Arakaki
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Non Alumni
My email is	arakakigarrick@gmail.com
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:	KŪ KIA'I MAUNA



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bridgit Bales <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:04 PM

My name is	Bridgit Bales
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	Balesb001@hawaii.rr.com
I reside at	Hilo
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 conspicuous absence of community involvement and feedback/input sets the stage for failure.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sharron Cushman <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:39 PM

My name is	Sharron Cushman
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	reikimasteraichichih@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:	I strongly oppose for all the reasons mentioned above.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Tianad Dole <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:42 PM

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

My name is	Tianad Dole
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	tianad79@gmail.com
I reside at	Hnolulu, 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:	UH Board of Regents have heard countless testimonies over the years and have been implored to stop the TMT project but have failed to listen to the people, to Kanaka Maoli, to experts of Mauna Kea and still they have their own agenda and have proven to mismanage the best interest of Mauna Kea.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sean Downes <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:34 PM

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

My name is	Sean Downes
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kailua, 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:	The consistent inability to make a dedicated effort to include everyone in the conversation is a matter of concern. The large, vocal community reaction, often in the form of protest, should not be taken as a personal affront, rather as a demonstration of community participation and interest. Please do right by them, by us all. Please consider doing right thing, even if it conflicts with your stated goals. You are an institution of and for the people, not insulated from it.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:58 PM

My name is	Mitchell Enaena
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	mokuenaena@gmail.com
I reside at	1736 Moala pl 96786 Wahiawa 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:	UH has been doing a poor job of being transparent with there doings & I do not support the UH admin..at all



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Glen Freitas <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:46 PM

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

My name is

Glen Freitas

I am

Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian

I reside at

Kāne'ohe, 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):

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:

This is NOT Aloha Aina, of which your administration now contends to be and value as written in your new branding of this University and place of learning. Your own staff members most recently embarked on racial slurs to Hawaiians, Hawaiian schools, a Hawaiian values and Hawaiian culture. Furthermore there was no pursuit of punishment for the wrongdoing and continued inappropriate behavior that followed by the same administrators and staff members. I find this to be unethical unprofessional and unbecoming of an institution that has now taken additional steps to humiliate its native tenants by now pretending to defile the good name of those Kupuna, kanaka and advocates that have steadfastly and with aloha worked tirelessly to show the world and America what truly Aloha Aina means. UH Manoa's insensitive and deliberate acts to undermine our people, our home and our way of life is and will cause unnecessary harm and create a divide between Hawaiians and Haole that will never be mendable. This is NOT Aloha Aina. This is NOT pono. This is NOT forgivable. I oppose to any and all proposed management of Mauna Kea and your illegitimate claims of Aloha Aina community.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Barbara Herras <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:51 PM

My name is	Barbara Herras
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	jbherras@aol.com
I reside at	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:	I believe there is a need to stop whats been going on unchecked for too long. IMMEDIATELY!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Mahina Kahalewale <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:58 PM

My name is	Mahina Kahalewale
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Kaneohe, 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.,
Additional Comments:	The only way to move forward is to be completely transparent.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kelly Keliinoi <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:00 PM

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

My name is	Kelly Keliinoi
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waianae, 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



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lorilani Keohokalole <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:55 PM

My name is	Lorilani Keohokalole
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	Lorilani.kanu@gmail.com
I reside at	Kauai
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:	Consider this testimony or it will be my kūleana to once again, remain on the Mauna in Protection.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kalena Lanuza <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:01 PM

My name is	Kalena Lanuza
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	kklanuza@gmail.com
I reside at	Ventura, California
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:	Additionally, current state budget downfalls related to Covid-19 require the board to strongly consider funding non-essential projects at this time. As a California taxpayer I strongly oppose the limited funding available to be used for the TMT project. Lastly, the TMT project is causing an astronomical amount of historical trauma for Native Hawaiians. Please know that your decision to continue this project further traumatizes indigenous peoples. I urge you to divest immediately.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Taylor Lewis <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:42 PM

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

My name is	Taylor Lewis
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Maryland
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:	You speak for greed and genocide, and you have long known this. You will always carry these sins with you, no matter how much you fill your pockets. You scoff at the cries of a community because you do not know yourself. How can you bear to carry such shame with all this sickness running through you?



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kailee Mokiao <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:39 PM

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

My name is	Kailee Mokiao
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waimea, Big 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:	there are other places who who want this thirty meter telescope but not on Mauna Kea.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Mariana Monasi <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:57 PM

My name is	Mariana Monasi
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	Monasi@hawaii.edu
I reside at	San Diego, 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:	There is no price for doing what is right. A lease paid by oreigners is not worth selling ur souls, our history and the very well and alive culture and people of Hawaii. A'ole TMT!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Cyr Pakele <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:31 PM

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

My name is	Cyr Pakele
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	cpakele01@hawaii.rr.com
I reside at	Hakalau, 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:	There is an inherent conflict of interest in the UH oversight of Mauna Kea since the very first telescope. The process is flawed.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kimberly Pecana <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:57 PM

My name is	Kimberly Pecana
My email is	kimbalaya817@yahoo.com
I reside at	Maui, 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:	Aloha Aina



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Laura Ramirez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:57 PM

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

My name is	Laura Ramirez
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	lauraramirez87@hotmail.com
I reside at	Kapa'a, Kaua'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:	Kū Kia'i Mauna!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Pekelo Richmond <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:05 PM

My name is	Pekelo Richmond
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	prichmond@ehunui.k12.hi.us
I reside at	Holualoa, 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 will seriously reconsider my tuition payment this year if this is approved.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Nohea Santimer <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:29 PM

My name is	Nohea Santimer
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Tax payer
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:	Enough



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:32 PM

My name is	Jennifer Schneider
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	chongaboolie@hotmail.com
I reside at	Pepeekeo, 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:	For the Board of Regents to vote on this while the community's ability to engage with them in person is especially unprincipled and underhanded. Kū kia'i Mauna!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Teri Skillman <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:01 PM

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

My name is	Teri Skillman
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	teriskillman77@gmail.com
I reside at	Honolulu, 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'm truly disappointed with the lack of ethics that UH is demonstrating.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Tina Taniguchi <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:45 PM

My name is	Tina Taniguchi
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Kauai
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 feel like the current BLNR officials are overdeveloping and destroying all "State" lands the very land that they are supposed to be conserving and protecting. Whats happening on Maunakea is due to their neglect to protect conservation lands. The UH board of regents are as the BLNR pushing agendas ahead and neglecting the true conservation and protection of these lands.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Issac Tom <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:59 PM

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

My name is	Issac Tom
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka 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:	I object to this BOR meeting on Thursday May 21. 2020, Agenda Item V11a



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Jamie Tom <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:32 PM

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

My name is	Jamie Tom
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Honolulu, 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:	You will not silence us



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Deborah Wheat <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:49 PM

My name is	Deborah Wheat
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Tribal from US
My email is	debwheat39@gmail.com
I reside at	Shoreline, 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:	In this time of need for all, we still need to preserve and protect that which is sacred. How would you feel if we can to your church or your cemetery and said ths this needs to be torn apart to make may for a useless item. You wold not like it,nor would you allow it. Well, neither can we. This mountain is sacred to us all and needs to remainfor generations to come.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Vernon Wilson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:09 PM

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

My name is	Vernon Wilson
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	wahiawavernon@gmail.com
I reside at	Wahiawa 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:	Just stop already



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Joyce Wond <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:37 PM

My name is	Joyce Wond
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	kaopuikijoyce@gmail.com
I reside at	Honolulu,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:	I oppose the UH board of reagents moving forward with Mauna KEA restructuring management plan. A'ole.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Nora Cesare Blanco <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:11 PM

My name is	Nora Cesare Blanco
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	kilipoipoi@hotmail.com
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:	Mauna K ea belongs to Hawaiians not to UH regents who have shown disrespect for Mauna Kea. The dealings behind closed doors leave me with the idea of abuse of power. Those with connections to the Mauna have been left out of decisions concerning the management of their sacred place.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lei Chock <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:14 PM

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

My name is	Lei Chock
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	leiright@gmail.com
I reside at	Haliimaile, 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:	Ku Kiai Mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kaleinohea Cleghorn <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:10 PM

My name is	Kaleinohea Cleghorn
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	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:	Listen to us already. We are speaking for the earth and her resources. We are speaking for your progeny! Mahalo



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kaleolani Poepoe-Deguzman <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:07 PM

My name is	Kaleolani Poepoe-Deguzman
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	kkpd@hawaii.edu
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:	Do what's right for the Hawaiian community instead of choosing to cater to outsider interest and money. Astronomy atop Mauna Kea does not and will not help our community in any way.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kapulei Flores <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:15 PM

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

My name is	Kapulei Flores
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Waimea, Hawaii'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 Hawaii'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 TMT should not be built in Hawaii'i



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Cynthia Franklin <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:19 PM

My name is	Cynthia Franklin
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	cfrankli@hawaii.edu
I reside at	O'ahuCom
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 comply with your desire to be an Aloha 'Āina University and put the management of Mauna a Wākea in the hands of kia'i.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Rebecca Gonzalez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 3:57 PM

My name is	Rebecca Gonzalez
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	rgonzo611@aol.com
I reside at	Volcano, 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:	It's time for UH to respect and honor the host culture. Your institution is an embarrassment. Open your eyes the world has changed.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Dee Green <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 3:43 PM

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

My name is	Dee Green
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
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:	SUBmitting this, though we know that from past experience the UHBOR goes through motions but doesn't actually listen to anyone other than foreign govt., military and corporations.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Trudie Hegel <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:11 PM

My name is	Trudie Hegel
I am	other: Ally
I am a UH	other: Concerned citizen
I reside at	Sacramento,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 am one of thousands of concerned people who are watching the corruption and continued theft of sacred lands



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Joan Jensen <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 3:46 PM

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

My name is	Joan Jensen
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty, Student
I reside at	Hauula, 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:	Finally, leadership comes with great kuleana or responsibility. Stewardship over aina, Mauna Kea, and other natural and cultural resources that belongs to Native Hawaiians must be done with Native Hawaiian people if not given to the Hawaiian community to decide. Asserting full control and decision-making is a blatant slap in the face and a mockery of the university's espoused Hawaiian values.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Natasha Johns <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:18 PM

My name is	Natasha Johns
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
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:	Having this vote during a pandemic is not only disrespectful it's dirty and underhanded. You do not own this mountain period and to move forward without extensive input from the Native Hawaiians and Hawaii Island residents you are completely violating the tenets of ALOHA!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Hilinaikamakanalilii Kane <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:17 PM

My name is	Hilinaikamakanalilii Kane
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Neither
My email is	hilinaikane@gmail.com
I reside at	Kailua-Kona, 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:	Kū kia'i Mauna!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Daisha Kawaa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:24 PM

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

My name is	Daisha Kawaa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Wailua, Kaua'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:	I do not approve the desecration of our sacred Mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Rudy Kok <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:26 PM

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

My name is	Rudy Kok
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Keaau, 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:	I was at the meeting in Hilo where many people testified against this plan and they were completely disregarded. The government needs to start listening to the people they are supposed to serve.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Joy McLeod <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 3:54 PM

My name is	Joy McLeod
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	mcleodj003@hawaii.rr.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:	Do right by the community for once.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Pono Paa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:26 PM

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

My name is	Pono Paa
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Haiku, 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:	Nothing is more important now than the safety of the community during this COVID-19 crisis. Please, before you make moves behind the scenes without the community's input, make sure to take care of your 'ohana first at home.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Monica Parker <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 3:40 PM

My name is	Monica Parker
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	monica@teammotorhead.com
I reside at	Waimea, Hawaii'i 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 Hawaii'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 move forward with restructuring plans during a pandemic and stay at home order is extremely underhanded.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Larisa Patrick <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:11 PM

My name is	Larisa Patrick
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	lizardlarisa@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):	<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:	If things cannot be done responsibly; they should not even be considered to be set in motion. Furthermore, the focus of everyone in the Kingdom of Hawaii should be to focus on our health and safety during these stressful times. All our resources could be put to better use.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

AaRoN Pryer <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:17 PM

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

My name is	AaRoN Pryer
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	aaron.pryer@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):	<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 that the buliding of The Thirty Meter Telescope is desecration to Native Hawaiian SACRED Land. I also believe that meetings around this project wich exculde the comminity access to engage & participate is wrong. Due the COVID-19 Challenge I believe this shows that The Boards are purposely excluding the Native Hawaiian & Community input. (A huge lack of Transparency. I Believe the land belongs to The Native Hawaiians.Not only do they hold the TRUE leases of their land they should most definitely be the ones to participate in "Discussions"about this topic. I feel that it is wrong to have meetings without the input of Native Hawaiians or The concerned Community. There should be more Transparency on how things are moving forward as well as inclusion. MAHALO.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Maya Sanchez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:08 PM

My name is	Maya Sanchez
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Los Angeles
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 belongs to the indigenous people of Hawaii leave it alone



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 3:41 PM

My name is	David Shizuma
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	kawikasmail@gmail.com
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:	As an alumni of this educational institution, I deeply sadden by the lack of transparency in this process as well as the lack of respect for the host culture, the native Hawaiian community. It is clear that the native Hawaiian community has been hurt by the management of Mauna Kea, and true changes have not been considered or executed. A sacred place for the people of Hawaii, this mountain should be treated in a way that the host culture appreciates, which seems to be by removing the telescopes on the mountain. It may be a loss for science, but it will be a big step in supporting Hawaii, the Hawaiian culture, and being an institution of Hawaiian learning.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Mariel Shockley <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:16 PM

My name is	Mariel Shockley
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Concerned human. Don't mess with their land!
My email is	mshockley005@gmail.com
I reside at	Greenwood, Indiana
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:	Leave



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kiana Suganuma <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:15 PM

My name is	Kiana Suganuma
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	kianasug@hawaii.edu
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:	I OBJECT TO THE UH BOARD OF REGENTS MOVING FORWARD ON MAUNA KEA RESTRUCTURING AND MANAGEMENT PLANS



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Parker Webber <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 4:18 PM

My name is	Parker Webber
I am	other: American Indian cherokee
My email is	parkerthadreamer@gmail.com
I reside at	Kihei, 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:	I do not consent to the sacred summit of mauna Kea to be utilized without the permission of the civilians of big island and the Hawaiian Islands in general which includes the kanaka maoli and the resident people's.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Amy Allen <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:35 PM

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

My name is	Amy Allen
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Hawaii Resident
I reside at	Milolii, 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:	I stand with my Native Hawaiian Friends and neighbors in opposing any building on Mauna Kea. Enough is enough. The university has proven unsuccessful at management of Mauna Kea, it is time to give the Hawaiians control of their own lands.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Nicole Anakalea <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:44 PM

My name is	Nicole Anakalea
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	nanakalea@yahoo.com
I reside at	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:	No TMT!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Natalie Arneson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:45 PM

My name is	Natalie Arneson
I am	other: Of Hawaiian descent living on Mainland
I am a UH	other: Not a community member
I reside at	Portland, Oregon
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:	Protect Mauna Kea



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bethan Pualani Baptista <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:28 PM

My name is	Bethan Pualani Baptista
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	gma.1994.315@gmail.com
I reside at	Lihue, Kauai
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 remove yourselves from all and any issues dealing with Kanaka Maoli lands in the Hawaiian Kingdom. Further, stop creating inappropriate contracts with false corporations founded by the occupying corporation, The United States of America. This a grave miscarriage of justice. The Department of Hawaiian Homelands and every other created corporations formed by America is not the rightful and legal representatives of the Kanaka Maoli shoes rights are in the land and the Hawaiian Subjects, whose responsibility is to obey the Hawaiian Kingdom Laws. Please Stop! Cease and Desist!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lion Fiyah <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:34 PM

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

My name is	Lion Fiyah
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Ewa Beach, 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):	<p>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.,</p> <p>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.,</p> <p>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.,</p> <p>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).,</p>
Additional Comments:	A'ole pono UH



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Antoinette Freitas <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:37 PM

My name is	Antoinette Freitas
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
I reside at	Aiea, 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:	UH Manos talks about being an aloha Aina University, but we see that talk is cheap.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kaleihua Kapua'ala <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:50 PM

My name is	Kaleihua Kapua'ala
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	maunamajoritylahui@gmail.com
I reside at	Kaneohe, 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 the restructuring and management plan for the above checked reasons. Public testimony is paramount and this decision shouldn't be made in the middle of a pandemic.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Luwella Leonardi <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:30 PM

My name is	Luwella Leonardi
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	kanakaoomaunawili@gmail.com
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:	Do the right thing for our future generations!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Cynthia Luafalemana <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:37 PM

My name is	Cynthia Luafalemana
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Waialeale, Moloka'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:	It saddens me that our nā kūpuna had fought for our lands and 5 generations after we are still fighting for our own land for our children and for the betterment of our own people. Please and think about that! Kanaka Maoli first everyone else has no decision.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Shaeralee-Tiare Manosa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:38 PM

My name is	Shaeralee-Tiare Manosa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	shaeralee@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Kaunakakai, 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:	Integrity...practice what you preach.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:46 PM

My name is	Malia Perreira
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	maliaperreira@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:	Please help not hurt.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kiana Perreira-Keawekane <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:33 PM

My name is	Kiana Perreira-Keawekane
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	kianapk@hawaii.edu
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>The Board of Regents policy, chapter 4-1 states: As the only provider of public higher education in Hawai'i, the University embraces its unique responsibilities to the indigenous people of Hawai'i and to Hawaii's indigenous language and culture. To fulfill this responsibility, the University ensures active support for the participation of Native Hawaiians at the University and supports vigorous programs of study and support for the Hawaiian language, history and culture. I bring my family, my friends, and my classmates to your meetings so that we can express our concerns; my grandmother once wept before you in a way I've never seen, and you ignore us - over and over again, as if we do not exist. The Board of Regents as a unit has openly ignored the concerns of indigenous students, faculty, staff, and principle in matters that concern the management of Mauna Kea. As a student, choosing to continue my endeavors toward higher education is difficult because in the things that matter most to my safety and well-being, I feel insignificant and ignored by the schools administration. Here, you are given yet another opportunity to abide by Chapter 4-1 of the BOR policy and seriously consider the concerns of native students and principle over that of visitors and foreign scientists. I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b).</p>



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Penster Jr Poll <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:38 PM

My name is	Penster Jr Poll
I am a UH	other: Citizen
My email is	pollpenster2469@gmail.com
I reside at	764 kaipuu 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:	I love pluto



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Luna Porras <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:49 PM

My name is	Luna Porras
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	lpurras@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Manoa, 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:	I believe Mauna Kea is sacred and should be left alone to the Kanaka Maoli



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Tara Rojas <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:43 PM

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

My name is	Tara Rojas
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty, Alumni
I reside at	'Ewa Beach, 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.,
Additional Comments:	Indigenous Knowledge - UH PPIS 4.202: NO TO TMT - RETURN THE LEASED LAND TO THE NATIVE HAWAIIANS.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Georgette Velasco <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:13 PM

My name is	Georgette Velasco
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	pauoavalley90@yahoo.com
I reside at	Pauoa Valley, 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:	I don't want any money from you, just please stop building on land you cannot return to it's originality.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sabrina Zapata <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:33 PM

My name is	Sabrina Zapata
I am	other: Human
My email is	slgarcia777@gmail.co
I reside at	Texas
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 life matters. Respect creancient.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Corey Asano <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:09 PM

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

My name is	Corey Asano
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	Enough is enough we need a change.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kuulei Cababat <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:15 PM

My name is	Kuulei Cababat
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	ktxc24@gmail.com
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:	This plan has lacked sufficient consultation. UH has proven multiple times that they are not capable of managing the Mauna properly. For the Board of Regents to vote on this while the community's ability to engage with them in person is unprofessional and unprincipled.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Maile Cummings <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:00 PM

My name is	Maile Cummings
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kailua 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:	



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bernadette DeLeon <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:01 PM

My name is	Bernadette DeLeon
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Resident of Papakolea
My email is	keikilanideleon@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:	I object



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Mary Drayer <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:00 PM

My name is	Mary Drayer
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: maui island resident and advocate for prevention of desecration and development of sacred places
My email is	mdrayerhome@msn.com
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:	it's time to put our precious culture above money 🙏📄



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Amy Goo <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:57 PM

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

My name is	Amy Goo
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	California
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:	Leave the land alone please



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Travis Gylstrand <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:04 PM

My name is	Travis Gylstrand
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Lahaina, 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 Means No! Enough With The Mismanagement Of Sacred Lands. NO TMT!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Janea Howell <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:13 PM

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

My name is Janea Howell

I am other: Samoan

I am a UH Alumni

My email is janea@hawaii.edu

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, 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 an alumnus I'm disappointed and disheartened by the lack of oversight from the UH board of regents. Protection and Preservation of Mauna Kea should be the primary focus of UH not adding buildings that hardly are used.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ionatana lese <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:01 PM

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

My name is	Ionatana lese
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	jjese33@yahoo.com
I reside at	Hawaii Kai, 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:	Return Hawaiian Land to the Kanaka Maoli.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lehua Kaulukukui <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:57 PM

My name is	Lehua Kaulukukui
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	kananilehua@gmail.com
I reside at	Waikoloa
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:	Hewa loa



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kekoa Lupenui-Corpuz <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:11 PM

My name is	Kekoa Lupenui-Corpuz
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	kekoalupenuicorpuz@gmail.com
I reside at	Ewa Beach, 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:	My Native Hawaiian Lupenu family From, Ka'u Pāhala Sign the Ku'e Petition As a kanaka maoli I say no to UH board of regean my voice matters no to any more abusing Our Mauna kea its Our sacred place for generations . Kapu Aloha Lāhui



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Aulii Mahuna <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:58 PM

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

My name is	Aulii Mahuna
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: associate
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:	The building of TMT is a violation of not only environmental laws, but of our rights as indigenous peoples. I am saddened to be in a generation where our rights as indigenous people have been disregarded.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Alison Mailes <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:09 PM

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

My name is	Alison Mailes
I am	other: Californian
My email is	alimailes@gmail.com
I reside at	Los Angeles, 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:	Honor the wishes of Hawaii's first people please



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Pahnelopi Mckenzie <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:57 PM

My name is	Pahnelopi Mckenzie
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
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:	It s so shameful to see UH holding these meeting when people cannot be part of the conversation. There are so many things wrong with this. You each on the board know that this is wrong. This does not set an example what you say UH represents. The management of Mauna Kea belongs to the people not to UH. These meetings should not be in session unless you figure out a way that all people can have equal voice to all of these matters. Do not make meetings and decisions based on greedy beneficial disenfranchisement and beneficial use of a global pandemic to do dirty dishonest work. Shame on you for even trying to move forward.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bryan Moore <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:57 PM

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

My name is	Bryan Moore
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Pearl city, 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:	im not satisfied with this restructure process



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Melissa Nakoa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:01 PM

My name is	Melissa Nakoa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Non affiliate
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:	UH does not have the interest of the Hawaiian people.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Veronica Pahia <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:52 PM

My name is	Veronica Pahia
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	vkpahia@icloud.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:	Ka Wai Ola



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Keala Piimanu <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:05 PM

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

My name is	Keala Piimanu
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	k.piimanu@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:	Maunakea is a sacred wahi that should no longer be desecrated. Have we not learned from what is going on in the world? We need to mālama 'āina and cease the further construction upon that mountain. My ancestors and lineage are connected to that mauna. It is CRIMINAL to further disrespect this sacred site.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Chassidy Reis-Moniz <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:08 PM

My name is	Chassidy Reis-Moniz
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	chas96795@yahoo.com
I reside at	Waimānalo, 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:	FOREVER STANDING IN TRUTH. KŪ KIA‘I MAUNA!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Renee Robinson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:07 PM

My name is	Renee Robinson
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Member of the community
My email is	reneeinhawaii@gmail.com
I reside at	Kailua-Kona, Hawai'i 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:	This is NOT PONO to move forward while the CoVid-19 crisis is happening and most every one needs to stay at home to protect everyone on-island, especially the kupuna.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Luke Spangenburg <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:10 PM

My name is	Luke Spangenburg
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	newsolutionsenergy@gmail.com
I reside at	Santa Fe, NM
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:	Universities should not be infringing on sacred lands. This facility is not more critical than spiritual lands .



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ty Kaipo Torco <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:57 PM

My name is	Ty Kaipo Torco
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Honolulu, 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 UH has not demonstrated any competency in managing the Maunakea Area. All the UH / BOR is interested in is control and financial compensations they receive from the existing / future telescopes they are pushing for. DO NOT use the term Aloha Aina University in any commercials or publications. Stop chasing the money and do what is right; learn your history and correct the past hewa that UH has been involved in.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

James Eduard Torres <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 5:59 PM

My name is	James Eduard Torres
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Kahului, 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:	Kū kia'i mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Demi Addison <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:32 PM

My name is	Demi Addison
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	demimihoaddison@yahoo.com
I reside at	Haiku, 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:	It is highly disrespectful and unlawful to build a telescope on the most sacred ground to Kanaka Maoli. I demand that you stop all planning and building on Mauna Kea and take the rest of the broken telescopes down. I demand that you stay away from the aquifer below Mauna Kea. I demand that you apologize for your wrong and insensitive behavior to Native Hawaiians. I demand that you give Mauna Kea back to the Native Hawaiians for ceremonial purposes only.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Jocina Alani <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:16 PM

My name is	Jocina Alani
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	kehaulaniapua@gmail.com
I reside at	Kealakekua, 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:	I object the UH board of regents management plan for Mauna Kea. They already proved to us that they are unworthy to take care of this sacred area.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sharal Au <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:36 PM

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

My name is	Sharal Au
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	aikerrack@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:	The University of Hawaii's many years of mismanagement of Mauna Kea needs to be corrected. During this COVID-19 pandemic all construction planning on Mauna Kea needs to be halted. Why should planning meetings be scheduled if school is not in session, and the community still cannot gather to voice concerns? This is a deliberate act of undermining the needs of our community.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ernest Cabatingan <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:16 PM

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

My name is	Ernest Cabatingan
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
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:	Not appropriate time!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Mahina Chillingworth <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:24 PM

My name is	Mahina Chillingworth
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	mahinadahui@gmll.com
I reside at	Wahiawā 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:	Kū Kia'i Mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Paul Cullen <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:18 PM

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

My name is	Paul Cullen
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	paulkauka@gmail.com
I reside at	Kaunakakai, 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 highly oppose



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Hui O He'e Nalu DA HUI <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:32 PM

My name is	Hui O He'e Nalu DA HUI
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	mahina@dahui.com
I reside at	Waiale'e North Shore 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 Hawaiian Lands in Hawaiian Hands!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Emily C <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:35 PM

My name is	Emily C
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
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:	It is wrong to deny indigenous people of their birth right and duty to protect what is sacred.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Odetta Gonzalez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:32 PM

My name is	Odetta Gonzalez
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	odettagonzalez@gmail.com
I reside at	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:	Keep sacred lands sacred



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kalani Guerrero <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:16 PM

My name is	Kalani Guerrero
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kamuela, Hi big islad
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 Kia'i Mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lorraine Harmon <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:33 PM

My name is	Lorraine Harmon
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Portland, OR
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



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ilima Ho-Lastimosa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:35 PM

My name is	Ilima Ho-Lastimosa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	ilima888@gmail.com
I reside at	Waimanalo
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 the madness!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Hercules Huihui <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:30 PM

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

My name is	Hercules Huihui
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	huihuihercules@hotmail.com
I reside at	Waipahu, 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:	Kanaka input should be a priority Shame on da board



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bryson Poloa Ieais <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:25 PM

My name is	Bryson Poloa Ieais
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	bryson8h0i8@yahoo.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:	AOLE tmt



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bianca Isaki <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:20 PM

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

My name is	Bianca Isaki
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty, Alumni
I reside at	Honolulu
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 continually takes the path of most resistance. This is ill advised.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Daniel Kahalehoe <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:31 PM

My name is	Daniel Kahalehoe
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waipahu, 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:	Ku kiai Mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Alyssa Kahalehoe <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:30 PM

My name is	Alyssa Kahalehoe
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waipahu, 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:	We as kanaka say no!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Mary Jane Kahalewai <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:19 PM

My name is	Mary Jane Kahalewai
My email is	kahalewaimaryjane532@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:	Mainakea is being polluted don't need more pollution, please remove da telescopes & return Mainakea to it's natural beauty! Too much "murders" I lost my daughter to "one crazy" one, we don't need more & more people (tourists) coming to HAWAII to KILL OUR CHILDREN!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bronson Kobayashi <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:26 PM

My name is	Bronson Kobayashi
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	bkobayash25@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:	Do not attempt to build this telescope anymore . W have stood and stood and voiced our opinions and we do not want this telescope on our mauna . Enough is enough.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

mtada347 <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:20 PM

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

My name is	mtada347@gmail.com mtada347@gmail.com
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: mtada347@gmail.com
My email is	mtada347@gmail.com
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:	mtada347@gmail.com



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Andre Perez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:31 PM

My name is	Andre Perez
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Pearl City, 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:	The University of Hawaii has a long history of mismanagement of Maunakea, this plan would take us from the fying pan to the fire. UH has not demonstrated the ability to successfully manage Maunakea. No way José to this plan!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Michelle Pillen <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:19 PM

My name is	Michelle Pillen
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	michellepillen@gmail.com
I reside at	Kailua, 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 am ashamed at my alma mater for the shoddy leadership and actions taken in this process. Respect and make room for everyone's voice and vision. Listen. Collaborate.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Teresa Purugganan <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:20 PM

My name is	Teresa Purugganan
I am	other: Filipino
I am a UH	other: Community member
My email is	teresa.purugganan@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:	Any and all discussions around management of Mauna Kea should be made with ALL stakeholders involved, including community members and above all the native Hawaiian community. Moreover, discussions such as these should be left for after stay-at-home orders are lifted to protect and maintain the health of the entire community.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Susan Rosier <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:24 PM

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

My name is

Susan Rosier

I reside at

Pahoa, 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):

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:

Today the Senate delayed actions where public testimony was pertinent. It is the proper thing to do! These a huge issues of concern to a major number of people on these islands! It is bad enough that every time big decisions regarding the Island of Hawai'i are held in Honolulu and we ar required to travel all the way to O'ahu to testify, but to make decisions on such controversial topics when we cannot participate at al is outrageous! Please follow the lead of the Senate today and postpone this document until such time as the public can participate. Mahalo



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Rebecca Rustin <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:34 PM

My name is	Rebecca Rustin
I am	other: Canadian non-Native
I am a UH	other: Concordia alumni (Montreal)
I reside at	Montreal, Turtle 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:	It's important to work closely with the people who k ow the land best



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Nina Sabahi <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:31 PM

My name is	Nina Sabahi
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	nsabahi@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Kea'au, Hawaii'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:	By ceasing to move forward with this restructuring affords the UH BOR the opportunity to begin to once again strive for the trust of the local community, which it has squandered over decades of questionable decisionmaking.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Richard Stevenson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:26 PM

My name is	Richard Stevenson
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	richdahui808@gmail.com
I reside at	Wahiawā 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:	Kū Kia'i Mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Rosaline Todrigues <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:35 PM

My name is	Rosaline Todrigues
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	mrsrosarod.dtvjj@gmail.com
I reside at	Hawi 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 UH has had their time to upkeep and maintain Mauna Kea. They did a poor job at it and therefore it shouldn't be entrusted to their care. The unattended observatories have been out of use for several years and yet still there abandoned. All they want is progress And build. Well, you need to be a good caretaker of little things before you can be entrusted to the bigger ones. Damage has already been done, but we the Community cannot afford any more damage to the 'aina (land).



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kyndal Vogt <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:23 PM

My name is	Kyndal Vogt
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Santa Barbara, 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:	The world is watching how you will respond in these difficult times. You are operating under the weight of historic and systemic injustice against native Hawaiians. With this project, you have the opportunity and the power to change the course of this story. I urge you - be empathetic, be humble, be creative problem solvers. We have a vast wide world. Leave Mauna Kea - a sacred site - to those with the kuleana to care for it.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lanakila Washington <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:36 PM

My name is	Lanakila Washington
I am	other: I'am Kanaka Maoli in spirit as I was bestowed my name from Kanaka Maoli
My email is	clearwaterlotus@yahoo.com
I reside at	Yelm Washington
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:	When I learned how sacred Mauna is to the people of Hawai'i, and hear that you want to even suggest building on this sacred land, it makes me wonder what kind of up bringing and morals you were raised with to not care what the people say and if you are Kanaka SHAME ON YOU FOR TURNNG AGAINST YOUR ANCESTORS.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Gracie Wild <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:24 PM

My name is	Gracie Wild
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Mainlander, Past resident of Kauai, Big Island & my only
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.,
Additional Comments:	I OPPOSE & OBJECT TO THE UH BOARD OF REGENTS MOVING FORWARD ON MAUNA KEA RESTRUCTURING AND MANAGEMENT PLANS



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Monica Williamson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 6:19 PM

My name is	Monica Williamson
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Student, Study Away to UH through Michigan State University
My email is	will2770@law.msu.edu
I reside at	Lansing, Michigan
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:	My time in Hawai'i and on the Mauna taught me the importance of standing for the mountains and the water. As a resident of the Great Lakes State of Michigan it is clear to me that the time to protect these vital pieces of our world is right now. There is no time to reconsider. There is no time to restructure.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Waiala Ahn <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:39 PM

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


My name is	Waiala Ahn
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	waiala.ahn@gmail.com
I reside at	Pāhoa, 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:	Any actions or plans for Mauna Kea or Mauna Kea Management should be put on hold until the community, kia'i and everyone in the fake state are able to be involved in the planning process



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Marissa Bartleson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:47 PM

My name is	Marissa Bartleson
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
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:	we must protect the sacred  Land and culture. Mahalo



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Carolyn cabais <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:27 PM

My name is	Carolyn cabais
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	tonyncarolyncabais@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:	Wrong



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ramsey Calimlim <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:29 PM

My name is	Ramsey Calimlim
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	calimlim96731@gmail.com
I reside at	Kahuku, 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:	I object the UH board of regents moving forward on Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Guessandra cornwell <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:30 PM

My name is	Guessandra cornwell
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
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:	none



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Linda Davis-Tafaoimalo <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:19 PM

My name is	Linda Davis-Tafaoimalo
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	tainunu@hotmail.com
I reside at	Kea'au, 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:	In person testimony should be taken by all who wish to the UH Board of Regents.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kamaka Dias <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:28 PM

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

My name is	Kamaka Dias
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Hilo, Hawaii'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:	Kū kia'i mauna!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Yngrid Feeney <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:41 PM

My name is	Yngrid Feeney
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	ygfeeney@gmail.com
I reside at	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:	Mauna Kea is a sacred space and I support Native Hawaiian's voices solely on this matter.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:22 PM

My name is	Karen Johnstone
I am	other: Filipino and Northern European
My email is	karenjohnstone108@gmail.com
I reside at	Seattle, Washington
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 own a timeshare interest in the Island of Hawai'i s and have long time family friends who are Kanaka Maoli who reside on Hawai'i Island. Hawai'i is a very special place and Mauna Kea is a true treasure. It should be protected from any further development. I sincerely request that the UH Board of Regents be fully transparent and include the larger community in decisions and to prioritize the protection of Mauna Kea as the Hawai'i community determines. Mauna Kea should not be commodified, but protected from development.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Leianaikarose Sing Kahalehau <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:36 PM

My name is	Leianaikarose Sing Kahalehau
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	lsk_808@hotmail.com
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:	I disagree University of Hawaii Board of Regents SHOULD NOT be allowed to Manage Maunakea in ANY WAY!!!!!!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Radcliffe Kaina <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:21 PM

My name is	Radcliffe Kaina
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Makakilo,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:	Leave the mountain alone. It is sacred



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Heidi Kerr <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:16 PM

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

My name is	Heidi Kerr
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Papaikou 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:	Please respect the Native Hawaiians and their Aina.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Maile Lavea-Malloe <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:34 PM

My name is	Maile Lavea-Malloe
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	mlavea@hawaii.edu
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:	To have the President of the UH system as the Chancellor of UH Mānoa screams corruption. Aole Pono UH



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Tehani Maielua <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:33 PM

My name is	Tehani Maielua
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: applicant
I reside at	Waipahu, 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:	It is time that the University meant to educate Hawaii's people shows that they understand & value the knowledge of Hawaii's native people.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Elijah McShane <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:37 PM

My name is	Elijah McShane
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	aliileadership@gmail.com
I reside at	Waipahu, 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:	It is extremely vital for all members of the BOR are offering their most truthful foot forward giving proper procedure, transparency, and documentation in this process. Being that this is a very delicate issue to not only the Hawaiian people but many people around the islands and the planet, bringing any proposed construction at this time of COV-19 is a non-compassionate decision that potentially creates further division between the co-operating entities of this project. Please reconsider. Mahalo



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kristina Mekdeci <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:48 PM

My name is	Kristina Mekdeci
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	art.kailua@gmail.com
I reside at	Kihie 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:	This is not your land to do anything on !! And you know this is the law. We know how corrupt you are and it's time for you to stop. And you know this is the law. We know how corrupt you are and it's time for you to stop. The descendants have spoken!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Loranzo Molina <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:18 PM

My name is	Loranzo Molina
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	molina_loranzo@yahoo.com
I reside at	Ewa Beach, Honolulu
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:	We as the people of Hawaii should receive knowledge and understanding of any activity being done to our aina



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kalawai'a Moore <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:46 PM

My name is	Kalawai'a Moore
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty, Alumni
My email is	peterm@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Honolulu
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 lineal descendant whose Ohana has lived and is buried on the slopes of Mauna Kea in Onomea for generations, this decision should be postponed until public hearings can be held. You have plenty of time to do so between now and 2033 when the community is not on lockdown. Do the right thing and postpone this decision now. Hold piublic hearings after the threat of Covid 19 has passed.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Michelle Morin <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:28 PM

My name is	Michelle Morin
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Went to UH for 4yrs no degree
I reside at	Honoka'a, 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:	NO!!!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

'Eleu Novikoff <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:46 PM

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

My name is	'Eleu Novikoff
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	eleunovikoff@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:	Please hear the people!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Chelsi Papas <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:13 PM

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

My name is	Chelsi Papas
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Former student
My email is	chelsickpapa@yahoo.com
I reside at	Waianae, 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:	Ku Kia'i Hawai'i'



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:12 PM

My name is	Elizabeth Schowalter
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
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:	Kamala Maoli and Kama'aina ALL deserve a transparent process.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Amy Sommer <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:38 PM

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

My name is	Amy Sommer
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Hilo
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 native people



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Melissa Tomlinson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:20 PM

My name is	Melissa Tomlinson
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Lafayette, 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 strongly object. I'm sure there are many other testimonies coming in from everyone including native Hawaiians. I urge the board to listen and take care of such testimonies. Please do not disregard the voice and opposition that is being brought to you with good reason. Please do the best thing for Hawaii and for the Hawaiian people.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kairie Aiona-Peppers <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:21 PM

My name is	Kairie Aiona-Peppers
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	To propose any changes during a time when all Hawaiian islands are in shut down from the COVID-19 pandemic is cowardly and unjust. If the courts are not open to hear criminal or family cases UH should not make any legal moves either.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Hanohano Aken <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:19 PM

My name is	Hanohano Aken
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	wendellhaken@gmail.com
I reside at	Las Vegas, NV
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 refrain from any consideration or restructured desecration of sacred places. The University of Hawai'i at Manoa along with the fake state of Hawai'i have gone too long with the mismanagement of Mauna A Wakea. They should ultimately consider halting any further activity on Mauna Kea and close down and decommission all telescopes that are currently in use and no longer active.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Andre De Almeida <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:03 PM

My name is	Andre De Almeida
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Concerned citizen
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:	Until the last aloha aina



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Derek Awong <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:15 PM

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

My name is	Derek Awong
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Vocano 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:	I don't feel that UH should be stewards of the Mauna based on past practice and misuse of our 'Āina.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Chaydeen Crivello <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:52 PM

My name is	Chaydeen Crivello
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	Keaukaha89@Gmail.com
I reside at	Hilo, Big 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:	Mauna Kea is ALL around BLESSING to the BIG ISLAND && the rest of the HAWAIIAN CHAIN. Mauna Kea made this Land && she is the Provider for Us , Protector for Us & everything in between. Mauna Kea speaks Volume. Leave her alone



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Jonathan Demayo <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:56 PM

My name is	Jonathan Demayo
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Haiku, 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:	Only w the Consent of "The People" The People of Hawaii



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Melissa Garcia <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:52 PM

My name is	Melissa Garcia
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	mlg4@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Hilo, Big island of 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:	Please stop this disrespect and honor the Hawaiian people! This is not your island!!! Look what damage you have allowed!! Enough already!!!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Rebecca Maria Goldschmidt <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:18 PM

My name is	Rebecca Maria Goldschmidt
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Pālolo Valley, 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:	AOLE TMT!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lori Halemano <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:11 PM

My name is	Lori Halemano
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waikele, 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:	Please take my objections into consideration. Mahalo.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Marie Eriel Hobro <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:06 PM

My name is	Marie Eriel Hobro
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: None
I reside at	Wahiawa, 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:	Going forth with TMT is an insult to the culture and livelihood of Kānaka people everywhere. We must protect what's sacred on their land do what is right.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Al Hubbard <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:02 PM

My name is	Al Hubbard
My email is	alhubs@aol.com
I reside at	Honolulu
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:	Listen to The People.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Randy Kahahane <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:00 PM

My name is	Randy Kahahane
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	bud4ran@outlook.com
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:	Enough opala on the Mauna.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Duke Kamaka <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:15 PM

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

My name is	Duke Kamaka
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	dukekamaka@gmail.com
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:	Let's not rush this. I see the obvious reasoning behind this and it's not right. Enough is enough. Listen to the people who call Hawai'i home and are direct descendants like me and my ohana.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Shae Kanakaole <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:09 PM

My name is	Shae Kanakaole
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	Please take in to consideration the impact these decisions will have on future kanaka maoli. We need to do everything in our power to ensure a brighter future for those ahead.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Roxane Keli'ikipikāneokolohaka <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:13 PM

My name is	Roxane Keli'ikipikāneokolohaka
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student, Alumni
My email is	roxanek@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:	I would love to see all the oral & written testimonies for and against TMT & the role of UH in the management of Mauna Kea made public. Having been at many public hearings I heard an overwhelming NO from community. If you say there is so much support, let's truly see every piece of testimony.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Mitch Kinnster <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:52 PM

My name is	Mitch Kinnster
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Community Member
I reside at	Puna, 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 level of mis-management and lack of proper proceedings through this arduous series of events is appalling. Please, represent yourself and your community with decency and integrity. Please leave Mauna Kea to be the majesty which it is, or consider the ramifications of continuing with ill-advised actions. Mahalo



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:19 PM

My name is	Katherine Kleving
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-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:	Protect the Sacred. We are not separate but One. Malama Pono.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Maelani Lee <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:02 PM

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

My name is	Maelani Lee
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	maelanilee@yahoo.com
I reside at	Waianae, HI 96792
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 am an heir to Mauna Kea (Kaohe) which is officially filed with the State of Hawai'i Bureau of Conveyances and I am against any development or plans for development on Kaohe Mauka. Please see document No. A-69410632. My family and I oppose any plans for development on Kaohe Mauka and we have undivided interest to the land. Please contact me with any questions. Thank you.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Tasha Lindsey <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:06 PM

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

My name is	Tasha Lindsey
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: The Lindsey Ohana
My email is	alialanalove43@aol.com
I reside at	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:	Keep Hawaiiia Lands in Hawaiian Hands



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lopaka Lonoaea <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:01 PM

My name is	Lopaka Lonoaea
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	llonoaea@gmail.com
I reside at	Mililani 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 they didn't take care of the Mauna Kea at all give it back to Kanaka Maoli...



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Leihua Naeole <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:12 PM

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

My name is	Leihua Naeole
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	lnaeole.smk@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:	Please start listening to the native Hawaiians and stop disregarding our please to injustice! Facts show the mismanagement. Stop catering to corporations!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Thomas Robertson <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:15 PM

My name is	Thomas Robertson
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	t.drew.robertson@gmail.com
I reside at	Ewa Beach, 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:	Transparency and openness is the only way to proceed to an acceptable solution for all parties.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Hanaila Starks <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:21 PM

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

My name is	Hanaila Starks
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: A person who wants to protect Mauna Kea
I reside at	Seattle
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 leave sacred land ALONE



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Maura Sullivan <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:07 PM

My name is	Maura Sullivan
I am	other: Native American from CA
I am a UH	other: PhD student in linguistics
My email is	sycamaura@gmail.com
I reside at	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 stand with the kanaka maoli people



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Piialoha Teves <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:53 PM

My name is	Piialoha Teves
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
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:	You can not move forward without community input. Do the right thing



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sonya Zabaa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:06 PM

My name is	Sonya Zabaa
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	zabalasonya@gmail.com
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 wait. This is inappropriate as was Mayor Caldwell's re-digging in Sherwoods. Not ok to push forth when everyone is in lockdown.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Keli'i Abordo <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:50 PM

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

My name is	Keli'i Abordo
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
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 do better by your constituents. Listen to Us!!!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Rowena Afoa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:52 PM

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

My name is	Rowena Afoa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	waiolamaafoa10@gmail.com
I reside at	WAIANA E 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:	Aole TMT



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ember Behrendt <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:49 PM

My name is	Ember Behrendt
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	saraemberhawk@gmail.com
I reside at	Haiku, 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:	To hold such meetings at a time of restricted public participation is sneaky and will not be tolerated. Stop your longtime abuse of the Mauna now. Stop your abuse of power. It is not okay.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Jamie Boyd <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:41 PM

My name is	Jamie Boyd
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	boydj@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Kāneʻohe, Oʻahu
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 strongly support a postponement until after our State is completely recovered and open for face to face discussions to resume. Dr J Boyd



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Judith Carroll <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:40 PM

My name is	Judith Carroll
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kihei, 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:	Focus on Covid.. give TMT up



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Wallyn Christian <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:35 PM

My name is	Wallyn Christian
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	kanoelani68@gmail.com
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:	Any further discussions on Mauna Kea must cease immediately because all people are not allowed to attend such meetings!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Malachi Daw <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:31 PM

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

My name is	Malachi Daw
I am	other: Diné, from Houck AZ, U.S.
I am a UH	Student
My email is	malachiisboss@gmail.com
I reside at	Albuquerque
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 contact with the original people, or passing a bill that is not actually for Natives of the land is a threat the Diné people know all too well. The coal companies infringing on our sacred land and water when they said we would get half or less of whatever was made off it is one example. Another example is the Uranium poisoning the imperial power (The United States of America) has been all too good at. I stand with Mauna Kea, and their fight against the UH along with any or all other bodies threatening their lands.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Michael Ferreira <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:47 PM

My name is	Michael Ferreira
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: my father is alumnus.
My email is	traductormichael@verizon.net
I reside at	Long Beach, California (O'ahu is home)
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:	In the age of space-based telescopes for astronomy, to continue to build on the terrestrial-based model is nothing more than another cash cow that benefits the few (remember sugar, sandlewood, and pineapple) to the detriment of the many and the land that sustains us all.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Anna Funk <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:38 PM

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

My name is	Anna Funk
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Local resident
My email is	skndeeptattoowaikiki@gmail.com
I reside at	Hawai'i Kai, 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 power of what is done with the land should be determined by the Hawaiian people in the best regards to the health of the Aina. People over profits always!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Naomi Gomes <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:55 PM

My name is	Naomi Gomes
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Lihue, Kaua'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):	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.,



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Freida Harris <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:27 PM

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

My name is	Freida Harris
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	freidah@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Pukalani, 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:	It's time to let go of the Mauna and give her back to the people, please do what's right.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:25 PM

My name is	Malia Hulleman
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: former student
I reside at	kahalu'u, o'ahulua
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 quite clear to me that these proposed models of restructuring "management," on Maunakea seek only to serve for the wealth of "stakeholders," and astronomy. The actually health and wellness of Maunakea does not look to her served, other than to maintain a "pristine atmospheric conditions" for astronomy research. This extreme continuing of capitalism around the most sacred place to a still thriving and very much present culture, indigenous to the very land you all reside on is a disgrace and quite actually pathetic to even consider being a precise way of "management." The fact that this discussion of "management" even has to be had is already what's wrong, there sholx have been no disturbances on Mauna a Wākea in the first place.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:35 PM

My name is	Jennifer Jones
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Resident of Hawaii Island 7 years
My email is	jen4phoenix@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:	Your building a telescope on a place of worship , would you build on your church?



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Shayna Kahakai <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:52 PM

My name is	Shayna Kahakai
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waimanalo 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:	A'ole TMT we r mauna and mauna is aloha aina



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Matthew Kahaloa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:54 PM

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

My name is	Matthew Kahaloa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	Aole TMT

OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Sara Kahanamoku <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:52 PM

My name is	Sara Kahanamoku
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waialua, 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:	Kanaka maoli have been tokenized as "consultants" throughout the Maunakea management restructuring process. If UH claims to be an "aloha 'āina" university, it must defer to kanaka maoli leadership on the management of 'āina. This process blatantly disregards the wishes and needs of the Hawaiian community, as well as disregards the rights of indigenous people to determine what happens to their homelands.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Christopher Langan <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:52 PM

My name is	Christopher Langan
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	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:	MaunaKea is the People' Mountain



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Desiree Lee <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:42 PM

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

My name is	Desiree Lee
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	A University or Academic Institution does not have the knowledge nor capacity to properly manage and or oversee lands, preservations, conservations and natural resources in a proper manner.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Hikurangi Mangu <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:35 PM

My name is	Hikurangi Mangu
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	toimangu@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:	He mokopuna au nā Māui Tikitiki a Taranga tēnei noa he kohanga Aroha nā te ngākau mahaki



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Gail Noeau <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:54 PM

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

My name is	Gail Noeau
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	noeaugail@gmail.com
I reside at	Hawai'i 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 AM AGAINST UH BOR HAVING DECISION MAKING POWER WITHOUT HAVING MEANINGFUL KANAKA MAOLI COMMUNITY INPUT !



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Caleb Spencer <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:52 PM

My name is	Caleb Spencer
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Vendor
My email is	caleb@warriorprintinghawaii.com
I reside at	Kāne'ohe, 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:	Out of all the issues and concerns that the community is facing at this very moment during a world-wise pandemic, you choose one of the most controversial topics/issues/decisions at such a time. Not only is this not smart, it's just wrong.... for both sides.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Noa Spencer <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:36 PM

My name is	Noa Spencer
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	Ku kia'i mauna



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Nancy Strada <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:41 PM

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

My name is	Nancy Strada
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Kilauea, Kauai
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:	Holding these meetings during this time of quarantine is incredibly covert. Thankfully there are many watching your actions and alerting us all. Please do the respectful, pono thing.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

DUANE WAIOLAMA <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:53 PM

My name is	DUANE WAIOLAMA
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	Sole TMT



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Summer Yadao <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:43 PM

My name is	Summer Yadao
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Ewa Beach, 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:	The choices you make will change your trajectory in this life and affect all the generations of your family and the rest of the planet. Please remember that what happens to one of us, happens to all. Look at the floating plastics in the ocean, the rising sea levels. Effects may not happen right away but they wil happen. Choose love, honesty and protection, not hate, greed and destruction. I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b)



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Lani Almanza <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:04 PM

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

My name is	Lani Almanza
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
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:	As a kama'aina and UH alumni, I want to see our UH system recognize they must listen to our lahui.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kayla Andres <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:04 PM

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

My name is	Kayla Andres
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Los Angeles
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:	Do the right thing please.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bronson Azama <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:09 PM

My name is	Bronson Azama
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	bazama02@gmail.com
I reside at	Kaneohe, 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>The university of Hawai'i at Mānoa has revealed itself through the TMT crisis and now the COVID-19 crisis to be incapable of proper stewardship of Mauna A Wākea. Simply being opportunistic to hold meetings in a time where the public is in no capacity to be able to extensively research this issue. I have deep distaste for how the University has run their processes with the public, often times ignoring the plea for justice of our 'Āina. I would has that this meeting be postponed for a later decision when The COVID crisis is no longer an issue. I would also request that during this interim time that the University of Hawai'i improve its plans by looking to decentralize it's control of the mountain transferring it's control to an entity that best suits the public's interests.</p>



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Jerry Bess <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:11 PM

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

My name is	Jerry Bess
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Forestry
I reside at	Kamuela
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):	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.,
Additional Comments:	Hawaiian lands are not for destruction of sacred land for money and science.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kalei Bingo <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:07 PM

My name is	Kalei Bingo
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Sports supporter
My email is	s.bingo@yahoo.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:	Backsliding BOR efforts WITHOUT assessing with Hawaii County communities, is a perfect representation of the slight of hand guise of BOR, State of Hawaii officials, and other divisions of illegal governance over Hawai'i. This will halt immediately. Forward movement by any and/or all entities involved in any context concerning Mauna Kea, should require the public as well, in FULL TRANSPARENCY on this cultural concern.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Katie Caldwell <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:02 PM

My name is	Katie Caldwell
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	kmc32@hawaii.edu
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:	As a UH instructor, I'm appalled at the behavior of my school. We claim to be a "hawaiian place of learning" - let's actually uphold that claim, shall we?



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kira DeGaetano <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:05 PM

My name is	Kira DeGaetano
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Honokaa
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:	TMT will not be built

OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Darren Duquette <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:57 PM

My name is	Darren Duquette
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	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:	Leave the Land to the people !



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Aria Grace <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:59 PM

My name is	Aria Grace
I am	other: NZ Maori
My email is	smitharia87@gmail.com
I reside at	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:	We Stand With You, KIA KAHA!!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ramona Hussey <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:02 PM

My name is	Ramona Hussey
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty, Alumni
My email is	ramona.hussey@gmail.com
I reside at	1914 Liliha st #B, Honolulu, HI 9817
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 you know Mauna Kea mismanagement is an extremely important issue to the people of Hawaii. During a lockdown is NOT the time to make decisions on this issue.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Nancy Iokepa <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:57 PM

My name is	Nancy Iokepa
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	haynsweetie96792@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:	I am adamant you will do what is "PONO" during this unfortunate times.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Damien Kealoha <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:58 PM

My name is	Damien Kealoha
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	koolaupoko, 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:	UH Board of Regents, DLNR, Fake state of Hawaii and any u.s. american entity have absolutely NO authority or say in The Hawaiian Kingdom and on Hawaiian Kingdom matters.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Amber Low <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:14 PM

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

My name is	Amber Low
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Was a summer student
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:	Our kuleana to Malama 'Aina



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Jon Mabuni <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 8:58 PM

My name is	Jon Mabuni
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	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:	No voting! We are in ths position today because of the lack of oversight and the egregious damage to Mauna Kea. I oppose this!!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Danielle Martinez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:19 PM

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

My name is	Danielle Martinez
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
I reside at	Wahiawā, 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:	Ua mau ke ea o ka 'āina i ka pono



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kahaiolo Morales <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:14 PM

My name is	Kahaiolo Morales
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	kahai.morales@gmail.com
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:	'A'ole TMT.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Winona Ramolete <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:04 PM

My name is	Winona Ramolete
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
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:	UH has not acted in good faith or protected Mauna Kea from the beginning. Enough already



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Bryan Revell <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:18 PM

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

My name is	Bryan Revell
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	Revellutiontech@gmail.com
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:	Leave our sacred mountain to the kanaka and our kingdom



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Renea Ruark <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:06 PM

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

My name is	Renea Ruark
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Kapolei
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:	If the people are against it, then what right does anyone have to do it? Science is no excuse for greed!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Michelle Tomas <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:15 PM

My name is	Michelle Tomas
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: My son will be attending UH
My email is	Pelehiika@hawaii.rr.com
I reside at	Big 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:	Its not time for business as usual. We need to seriously take a look at the future with Kanaka Maoli input.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Noe Tupou <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:03 PM

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

My name is	Noe Tupou
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty, Alumni
I reside at	Mānoa, 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:	During this time of healing and recovery major decisions such as the one before you would be inappropriate and culturally offensive. It seems illogical to do all that you are suggesting during this time of lockdown.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Vernadette Gonzalez <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:26 PM

My name is	Vernadette Gonzalez
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
My email is	vvg@hawaii.edu
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:	It's been made clear over many years that there are significant objections to the building of this telescope, particularly from the Native Hawaiian community. As an institution that owes its existence, land, and identity to Kanaka Maoli, UH needs to finally listen and act in an ethical manner in accordance with research protocols. Permission has not been granted. This has been made loud and clear. There is no way forward ere hat does not violate research ethics.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Tracie Brewer <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:47 PM

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

My name is	Tracie Brewer
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
My email is	holualoabrewers@yahoo.com
I reside at	Holualoa, 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:	UH needs to seriously consider removing itself as the center command regarding Mauna Kea



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Megan Kaleipumehana Cabral <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:20 PM

My name is	Megan Kaleipumehana Cabral
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	kaleipumehana@gmail.com
I reside at	Kailua, 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:	The attempt to move forward on Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans during a worldwide epidemic is unethical and careless. Not only is this diverting attention from more pressing matters (i.e. dealing with a long-term COVID-19 plan for UH), but is also causing alarm & extreme stress for our Kānaka Maoli (and extended) community. Not to mention that this is already a time where so many of us are struggling to stay afloat, take care of our families & scramble to find/keep work. At a time like this, trying to move forward with anything Mauna-related is a low blow. Please reconsider your priorities and how you are affecting the health (both mental and physical) of our Hawai'i communities. Mahalo



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:27 PM

My name is	Michelle Castro
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
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:	The UH Board of Regents Should not move forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans (Agenda Item VII. b) without hearing from the community. All sides should be brought to the table and join the conversation.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Ka'ohu Cazinha <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:45 PM

My name is	Ka'ohu Cazinha
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	ohu1@aol.com
I reside at	Kāne'ohe
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 inappropriate to be going forward with sny of this during this time of crisis.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Beth Comstock <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:43 PM

My name is	Beth Comstock
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	bkcc@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:	Management plans need to be done in good faith. We need a long-term solution, not a band-aid or a power grab.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Maria Cortes <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:38 PM

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

My name is	Maria Cortes
I am a UH	Student
My email is	mcortes5@avc.edu
I reside at	Lancaster 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:	You don't have to be Hawaiian or live in Hawaii to know that this construction is wrong. This is a scared site and should be protected at all cost. Just because it's not a catholic or Christian site does not make it any less valuable or revered.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Callie Fahey <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:27 PM


My name is	Callie Fahey
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	callie.f27@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:	Native Hawaiian opinion is the most important opinion



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Adriana Faimealelei <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:46 PM

My name is	Adriana Faimealelei
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: Mother of a student
My email is	afaimealelei@gmail.com
I reside at	Kailua, 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:	Please do not desecrate any more hawaiian lands 



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

William Freitas <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:30 PM

My name is	William Freitas
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	pohaku7@yahoo.comili
I reside at	Kailua, Kona 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:	The board of regents have already approved decisions that have impacted of our Mauna a Wakea that till today is destroying the future of our mauna for the worse by influencing more development. This will increase desecration to our mauna.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

KAIOLUHIA HAMAKUA <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:28 PM

My name is	KAIOLUHIA HAMAKUA
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni, other: Kanaka
My email is	KJMH90@GMAIL.COM
I reside at	Ewa Beach, 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 stop. Once its gone(destroyed, damaged, changed) its done. We cannot get it back.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kalau Herrod-Isomura <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:37 PM

My name is	Kalau Herrod-Isomura
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Waialua, 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:	It's not pono.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

ku'uialoha ho'manawanui <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:27 PM

My name is	ku'uialoha ho'manawanui
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Staff or Faculty
I reside at	Ha'ikū, Ko'olaupoko, 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:	UH has a long history of gross mismanagement of Mauna Kea and is not capable of management of any part of the mountain for any period of time.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Kaela Izak <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:21 PM

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

My name is	Kaela Izak
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student
My email is	kaelaik@hawaii.edu
I reside at	Kihei, 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:	KU KIA'I MAUNA



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Debra Javar <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:27 PM

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

My name is	Debra Javar
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Capt Cook 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):	<p>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.,</p> <p>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.,</p> <p>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.,</p> <p>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).,</p>
Additional Comments:	This should be postponed until the community can be informed, able to ask questions and provide testimony.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:35 PM

My name is	Elizabeth Kahn
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I reside at	Los Angeles, California
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 in respecting the spiritual sacredness this land has to your Indigenous community. Please respect them now more than ever. It's never too late to do the right thing.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Elston Kamaka <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:28 PM

My name is	Elston Kamaka
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	elstonkamaka@yahoo.com
I reside at	Kailua Kona 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:	Stop going about trying to be unnoticed please thanks



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

'Alohilani Kamaunu <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:42 PM

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

My name is	'Alohilani Kamaunu
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student, Alumni
My email is	pakaaiki@gmail.com
I reside at	Ewa, 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:	This is Hewa and not pono. We, Kanaka Maoli, do not need you to manage our Mauna for us. It is out kuleana! Please let us mālama our kuleana. Mahalo.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Alfreda Mactagone <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:32 PM

My name is	Alfreda Mactagone
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Student, Alumni
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:	The issue of Mauna Kea management should be with the people of Hawaii. This should be included on our voting ballots come November.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Melanie Park <noreply@123formbuilder.io>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:35 PM

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

My name is	Melanie Park
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: NONE
My email is	nalugirl08@gmail.com
I reside at	Ahuimanu, 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:	This is not the time to be doing these meetings or making these decisions. We are in the midst of a pandemic and it seems like more back room deals are happening. The BOR is a farce at best.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Shannon Rudolph <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:44 PM

My name is	Shannon Rudolph
I am	non-Kanaka Maoli aka non-Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	other: employer/taxpayer
My email is	shannonkona@gmail.com
I reside at	Holualoa, 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:	<p>I am a 37 year Hawai'i Island resident who has been following the Mauna Kea issues for a good 20 years. What you've got up there is a big fat rat's nest, to put it in plain language. To try to rush through yet another management/re-structuring plan during a pandemic with little public participation is disgusting and reeks of taking advantage of people's stress & distraction in a crisis - and nearly every long time Hawai'i resident that I know feels the same way. Please stop this farce. The mauna has been mismanaged for 50 years, postponing this meeting for a couple of months is not going to matter at all. If nearly 1000 testimonies were submitted on short notice to oppose Chris Yuen's re-appointment, I'd say that's a gauge to remind you, many Hawai'i residents are paying attention to the machinations of UH and Mauna Kea. Shutting out he public is undemocratic and will invite more lawsuits - with taxpayers on the hook, once again. Let cooler heads prevail & re-schedule this meeting until the virus is fully under control and residents can participate.</p>



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Caprice-Shawna Sambrana <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:21 PM

My name is	Caprice-Shawna Sambrana
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	capriceshawna.k.sambrana05@gmail.com
I reside at	Pukalani, 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:	Enough is enough.



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Noah Ah Mook sang <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:20 PM

My name is	Noah Ah Mook sang
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
My email is	noah.ahmooksang@imua.ksbe.edu
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:	The Mauna is all that your culture may have left. Our culture has been sold off as a joke for how many years. We're here to make sure we can at least keep what we haven't lost



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Astrid Sneekes <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:42 PM

My name is	Astrid Sneekes
I am	other: Dutch with a strong connection
My email is	astridsneekes@gmail.com
I reside at	the Netherlands
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 kokua the aina



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Rhanda Vickery <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
To: "bor.testimony@hawaii.edu" <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:26 PM

My name is	Rhanda Vickery
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
My email is	queenkuulei@yahoo.com
I reside at	Waikoloa, 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:	I object to the UH Board of Regents moving forward with Mauna Kea restructuring and management plans!



OBJECTION TO THE UH PROCESS TO PROPOSE MAUNA KEA ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:42 PM

My name is	Jennifer Young
I am	Kanaka Maoli aka Native Hawaiian
I am a UH	Alumni
I reside at	Kealakekua, 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:	'A'ole mau iā TMT!