

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
SPECIAL MEETING  
AUGUST 7, 2009**

**APPROVED 10-09-09**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The special meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger, at 1:00 p.m., Friday, August 7, 2009, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Island of Maui.

Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger: Welcome to the August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009 Special Meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency. Staff Leilani, Erin Wade, members Bob Horcajo, Warren Suzuki, Katharine Popenuk will be here late, Ray Phillips is excused and Corporation Counsel Mr. Giroux. I call this meeting to order. First on the agenda is the approval the June 19, 2009 minutes. Did all the members receive it via e-mail, and had a chance to review? I did also, and I have only one comment, Leilani, on page 16, lines 17 and 18, refer to when we went into executive session, it says Lana`i Planning rather than MRA. So that would be my only correction comment on the minutes. Any other comments on the minutes, members?

**B. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 19, 2009 MEETING MINUTES (via e-mail)**

Mr. Robert Horcajo: I make the motion to approve the minutes subject to the change offered by the Chair.

Mr. Warren Suzuki: Second.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes subject to the change just called out. All in favor?

Agency Members: "Aye."

Ms. Betts Basinger: All oppose? It's passed.

**It was moved by Mr. Robert Horcajo, seconded by Mr. Warren Suzuki,  
then unanimously**

**VOTED: to approve the June 19, 2009 Maui Redevelopment Agency  
meeting minutes with the amendments as discussed.**

**C. PUBLIC TESTIMONY: Testimony will be limited to three (3) minutes per  
testifier. At two minutes, thirty seconds, a thirty second notice will be given.**

**With the recommendation of the Chair, an additional three minutes may be granted.**

Ms. Betts Basinger: We're going to move on to public testimony. And we have had a request from someone in the public to testify and I'm going to open public testimony, members, after item D3, if there are no objections.

Mr. Horcajo: No objections.

Mr. Suzuki: No objections.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you very much. So at this point, we're going to move right into – roll up our sleeves – and move right into picking off where we left off – strategic planning – at our last special meeting. Erin, thank you.

#### **D. STRATEGIC PLANNING**

- 1. Actions outlined in the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Plan**
- 2. Discussion on remaining actions**
- 3. Discussion on expanded and/or new actions, funding and timing of actions**
- 4. Prioritizing actions of the MRA**

Ms. Erin Wade: Sure. I provided in your packets the notes, the summary notes basically, from our previous strategic planning session. And we were working off of this large 11 by 17 sheet. We were right at the bottom, the last two. If you don't have a copy, I have extras today. But basically, the discussion was centering around reviewing the existing action plan items and making comments about whether or not they're still appropriate or if further refinements or clarification is needed. So I will leave it to you to begin where we left off – that's urban design and beautification, UDB-3.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Ah, yes, I remember. I thought those were the last two items till someone mentioned turning it over.

Mr. Suzuki: In the back.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. UDB-3, implement the Market Street landscape design and beautification plan and underline expand to surrounding streets.

Ms. Wade: That's underlined because the first portion of the sentence was completed on the upper segment of Market Street, but the project is planned and has been scoped to

continue through Happy Valley. So it is not a complete project. Half of it done.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Members, any comments? This says expand to surrounding streets, so I'm wondering if the intent was that it would expand to Vineyard, Church, perhaps?

Mr. Horcajo: I have a comment Chair. I believe that the construction plans or the design plans that were approved included at least going all the way down to Mokuhao, but it was phased to Kahawai. And I guess, I thought I heard possibly that through the Federal – whatever – part money that somebody gave the (inaudible) because it's already a (inaudible) program, possibly funds could be used for that purpose. Any comment about that?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, the extension is programmed for Public Works to begin it during this fiscal year, so the Happy Valley segment would begin during some portion of this fiscal year. It hasn't been bid out at this point, but construction plans are complete.

Mr. Horcajo: So there's funding in the budget for that purpose, per se?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I was fortunate to be at a meeting with the State Department of Transportation head who actually said that project was going to begin at the end of September.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Why don't I clarify for you when Public Works is going to start.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. So, Erin, it looks like –. Well I guess, members, then the conversation would be around whether or not this body wants to expand it to surrounding streets.

Mr. Suzuki: Chair, that's a question, as far as it came up in my mind, in terms of what do we mean by saying surrounding streets because it's very general. You know, is it going to be so encompassing where you could be looking at majority of the streets within the redevelopment area? Are you looking at only those streets that might intersect, let's say, with Market Street? Are you looking at those what you consider to be your primary streets? So, it's unclear to me, you know, just with this language here, in terms of, you know, what is our intent? There may be a need to be more specific.

Ms. Wade: I would think that would be true. You know, generally, you'll have a core, like a spine within the business district which is definitely Market Street. But expanding your improvements out, to reflect the entire business district, it might not be at the same scale and the level of treatment that Market Street was given, but certainly continuous sidewalks

would be warranted throughout the districts.

Mr. Horcajo: So Chair, I guess, my question is we're looked – I guess the overall question here is whether we basically keep this in the plan, number one. I guess we answer that question first. The second question is, I guess, whether it's there within the two to five years, or six to 20 year, I guess, field here. But I guess for me the issue of whether we specifically say let Vineyard Street be next between Market and Church, or Market and Central, we don't necessarily have to have that discussion now because if it ends up at the end of this exercise that, yes, it is a priority but it's on the middle range, and there's others that are more priority, we can kind of focus more on the details of those. So that's why I look at it that, for me, it should stay in here as it is because if we undoubtedly if we even talk about taking it out, the merchants on Vineyard, and Central, and Church are going to say, why the heck did you do that? But we can also say leave it in, but we haven't prioritize as to what street we start on next.

Ms. Betts Basinger: There might be another option and that is to separate it. Separate the Market Street project through Happy Valley because it does fall under our purview – all of the streets in our district – so that's just simply, to me, an underlying responsibility to upgrade the sidewalks and the street scape et cetera – every where. So perhaps we could separate them and make them two, and time line out the priority of the rest of the streets without – like Warren said – to be specific as to which street first, which kind of beautification.

Mr. Suzuki: Well, if you look at this plan that we have here, it extends out 10 years?

Ms. Betts Basinger: 20. Six to 20.

Mr. Suzuki: So, you know, within that time line, what streets in particular, you know, given the time line and being realistic from the standpoint of funding and everything else that's involved in getting through the process, what streets, you know, would we envision would be the ones that we would look to in terms of improving, you know, within the MRA area?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, and if you noticed the implementing and coordinating agency here is Planning and Public Works, and they probably have some long range plans for improvements on a variety of our streets. The only reason I suggest separating them is that at the end of this fiscal year perhaps we would be able to then check off as accomplished the Market Street phase one and phase two, and rather than having it hang on with this additional and expand.

Ms. Wade: The only thing I would say for prioritizing streets is if or when the parking structure moves forward, Vineyard Street is going to be a total disaster based on the heavy equipment that's going to be coming in. And then the water line that they're putting in now

is already going to make it kind of messy. So, to me, that would be the number one after the parking structure is completed, and then probably Central and obviously Main – Main we haven't done any treatment on really either.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Isn't Main a State highway?

Ms. Wade: It is. That doesn't mean you can't partner with them.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. Okay, so are we ready to move on then to UDB –? Four now becomes five, and UDB-4 becomes implement street landscape design and beautification in surrounding street, or streets within the MRA district.

Ms. Wade: You know, we have a lot of substandard streets in the district. They're just like all barely a one lane and that's part of what gives the district character and you don't necessarily want to include that in the statement. So maybe what you want to define it as is the business streets or the business core or something like that instead of the kind of fun residential street.

Mr. Suzuki: You don't want to touch those.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, I don't think you would.

Mr. Suzuki: No.

Ms. Wade: That's my feeling though.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Or you know maybe we can just take that part off because it is – it's just part of our area. So if there were a project that were – . No, I don't know.

Mr. Horcajo: I think we need to keep that on.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Because we may initiate –

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, you need some reference on future projects that you would do within that so called six to 20 year window.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, and plus, you know, maybe a Council Member may feel that this is a, I don't know, substandard change or something like that. You've just got to reword it.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, implement landscape design beautification plan for – I don't know how you would describe those street – for blank streets.

Mr. Horcajo: For adjoining business – commercial business streets.

Ms. Wade: For maybe like –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, how about just for the region? Because if it's a residential, quaint street, the beautification may be just planting or changing out trees, but it wouldn't include sidewalks.

Mr. Suzuki: But you don't have right-a-way to do that. Because in the older areas, the property line basically comes right up to the pavement, so you don't have even shoulder area to put sidewalks or even your own trees. But as Erin said, that's what gives those areas that unique character.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. How about saying appropriate streets, instead of regions.

Mr. Horcajo: I was going to say what about like main arterial traffic streets. I mean, it's not a 60 feet wide, or 150 foot right-of-way, but in a business district and old town is just kind of the main –

Ms. Wade: Collector streets?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'm trying not be so defined.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, but what I heard from Erin is that if you kind of probably say everything. I mean, what's to stop some small street north Maluhia for saying, you know, what it's on the plans. You know I've got my neighbors saying we want you to improve the streets because it's on the plan, so do it. You know, then we have to fight that argument in the future. Let's deal with the main streets.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, maybe just use this surrounding streets. Use the same line.

Mr. Suzuki: That's too general.

Ms. Wade: What about that collector streets within the district?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, check with Public Works. I'm not too sure exactly how they describe streets depending on the level of traffic.

Mr. Horcajo: They do, and that's why I didn't want to use collector because I think collector is 56 feet. Arterial is not a term that they use. I mean, they use minor roadways, major roadway, collector, minor collector, major, so that's why I didn't want to use those terms.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So Erin, you'll check with them for the proper wording to separate that out?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: You understand what the intent is?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. And so – and that one will have – we checked off in the six to 20 years. Still working in coordination with Planning and Public Works.

Ms. Wade: Six to 20. Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. Ready to move on?

Ms. Wade: Underground over head utility lines is UDB-4.

Mr. Suzuki: I have a comment.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Which would now be UDB-5.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: I've got a comment on that. And I've realized that in an ideal world, you know, people like to see overhead lines converted to underground. But my understanding is that in the older towns, the older areas, that's part of what gives it the character. And are you really providing a benefit to those areas by so called modernizing it and converting to underground? If you look at the Makawao-Pukalani – that Country Town Guidelines – on the front of the book, when they show the building, they show the overhead lines. But that's part of what it was back when. So why would you have language in there to convert it from overhead to underground? The second point is that I don't think people realize the cost to do that. I mean those costs are huge and significant. And it's not just the lines that run along the road. You also go the service tail that goes into the building. So if a particular building has an overhead service, overhead wire, and you convert the mainline to underground, you're going to have to convert the service from the mainline to build it underground. And then how do you get to the building and what sort of retro-fit is required within the building? So I don't know, from my perspective, it's something that should be done and, I guess, realistically, can't be done.

Ms. Betts Basinger: This task was –. This was part of the 2000 plan?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: I have a comment. I was curious whether in the past there was discussion about requiring any new project to have underground service. I mean, granted, we only had maybe one vacant lot now, undoubtedly. I mean, the Pono Center was built of course. So I assume there wasn't any requirement. But do you think there was some discussion about that? You know, 50 years from now, there's a chance that we'll lose less lines crossing from the main street or something. Is that something that we want to even talk about?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, you know, we notice members that it's in the six to 20 year, and the partners are Maui Electric and Hawaiian Tel. And in reality, today, they would also include the cable companies and all the others that attach. I think it's probably always going to be under our purview and it's something that we should watch if the prices drop. But that character thing you're talking about, the only thing I can think of here that we might want to do have some language that limits it to appropriate streets. But then appropriate doesn't quite define. Do we just want --? If there's going to one day in Wailuku be underground overhead utility lines, do we only want then it in one area of our MRA region or do we want --? Or do we want to take this out?

Ms. Wade: Well, the challenge with the overhead is the conflict that you get with trees, and it can be resolved with species -- the species that you select. And I think that was considered with the Pink Tacoma that was chosen for Market Street. It does limit you and the trees that you can utilize if you've got the overhead lines. But, other than that, almost all utility companies will tell you it's much easier to repair utilities when they're overhead. It's much easier to find the source of the problem when they're overhead, and ends up then causing the use less as a result. So being able to consolidate might be something that we strive for. You know, consolidate the amount of lines that are up, or not having multiple poles for multiple utilities. It's kind of like a cell tower does. We have cell towers to consolidate where possible. If you want to move away from the underground and completely statement that could be something else that doesn't add to what's already overhead.

Ms. Jocelyn Perreira: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Betts Basinger: We'll open it up to public input at a later point.

Ms. Wade: I think actually she's got some really good information about funding as well.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, and we're looking forward to it. So on this one members, it's an important issue, but maybe like what Erin is saying it should be expanded to utility lines in general. You know, like, do we want them, even if they're going to be above ground? Do



we want to clean them up a little? Consolidate them? Do we want them to be of a different material – that kind of stuff – rather than just a single issue of moving it all underground?

Ms. Wade: I don't know how to advise you on that to be honest.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, I have a question, but, you know, most of these or all these other proposals have verb. You know, develop, acquire, improve, review, develop, adopt, implement. This doesn't say anything. So I guess my question is – I mean, one option for us is to say, you know, review, you know, potential for underground utility lines and that review may basically come back and say it's not worth it, get rid of it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So that might be something under one of the studies that we're going to be funding.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, right, possibly. You know, so, basically it is an action item because we're saying we're going to do something. And then if the something say, you know, don't waste your time, don't waste your money, then it's checked off this list.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Alright, so this is a potential remove in general, and then if a project comes up for that, it would have to come before this body.

Mr. Suzuki: No, that's not what Bob is saying.

Mr. Horcajo: No, no. I'm just saying that we change the statement –

Mr. Suzuki: Reword it.

Mr. Horcajo: – to reword to say, you know, like, review whatever implementation of underground – or feasibility of underground utility lines –

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's good.

Mr. Horcajo: – so that it's – it's an action. And then basically the action is we review it with the study, and the study may come back to us and says it worth it, it's not worth it. If it's not worth it, then it's gone.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. That's excellent.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Does everybody agree? So review underground/overhead utility lines.

Mr. Horcajo: The feasibility of –

Ms. Wade: How about investigate feasibility?

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Whatever.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And then, do we want to put that in next two years? Next two to five years?

Mr. Horcajo: I would move it up, from six to 20 –

Mr. Suzuki: Two to five years.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Two to five. Okay. And hopefully Maui Electric and Hawaiian Tel, and maybe we'll add the cable company – might be funding partners in that study.

Ms. Wade: Let's remember to ask Ms. Perreira because she's got good information about that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. Okay, moving onto –

Mr. Suzuki: Where's that sound coming from?

Ms. Wade: Leilani? Is anyone's cell phone on?

Mr. Suzuki: That's just static. Cell phone –. Is there a portable mic or whatever?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Infrastructure action chart, remaining tasks only. So, Erin has already siphoned through all the tasks.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: (1), implement waste water drainage and water line improvements as listed in the 1991 infrastructure assessment report. Is this one of the reports that we're going to be updating?

Ms. Wade: This is –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, it's this one.

Ms. Wade: Right. So the majority of this, unfortunately, is exactly as it was when this was done in 2000. Almost no infrastructure improvements have been made. So, in fact, I-1

through I-4, those are still as they were stated in the plan there. There are no additional ones. This is where the least amount of improvement has taken place in the district from the plan written in 2000.

Mr. Horcajo: So the waterline work that's coming down Vineyard. Is that on that plan?

Ms. Wade: So that would be – yes – part of this.

Mr. Horcajo: That's part of that plan there.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Exactly. So that would be one of the improvements.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And it is in the six to 20 years. It falls right in, in it's spot.

Ms. Wade: So, does everyone have a copy of this assessment?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: I'm not sure if I do.

Mr. Suzuki: I don't think so.

Ms. Wade: Let me make sure that you folks get one because the thing that's the most helpful, to me, when reviewing projects and when taking a look at what we want to accomplish next are these charts. It includes charts. In this one, in particular, is the waterline size, and then it identifies what the waterline size is today and what the County guideline is and if it's substandard, yes or no. So you can see all of these – I mean, those are all nos – but there's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine – there's 20 yes sub-standards for waterlines in Wailuku.

Mr. Horcajo: Chair, I have a question. This I-3 here, I guess, what you're insinuating is that that report is not – does not answer this question – prepare regional infrastructure assessment and improvement plan.

Ms. Wade: I think the improvement plan section is the one that's lacking.

Mr. Horcajo: It's lacking. But that's what you would consider the assessment plan?

Ms. Wade: Exactly.

Mr. Horcajo: So should you underline the "and the improvement plan for those areas?"

Ms. Wade: Sure. Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Should we separate as we did before or not?

Ms. Wade: You know, actually, the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Plan is suppose to be the improvement plan. But you can see exactly that this is not as specific as we might like it to be. You know, having – maybe what we – in my ideal world, we would work with Public Works Department, identify the most outrageous problems in the district in terms of the infrastructure and then identify a preferred phasing for redevelopment and construction, and base that on projects that we know want to be redeveloped simultaneously so we're being able to do a cost savings. They've hired, now, too an infrastructure coordinator that's suppose to be doing that Countywide. But I don't see any reason we couldn't do that on a micro level, in the MRA area, given that we can get priority funding for a lot of things.

Mr. Suzuki: Can I ask a question Chair?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes, Warren.

Mr. Suzuki: So with the Market Street improvement that have recently been done, within the section that's been improved, are all of the infrastructure – the water, sewer, your drainage – up to standards?

Ms. Wade: Yes. So everything that they've done on Market Street is up to standard.

Mr. Suzuki: Because, from my perspective, one of the things I think we need to realize as far as MRA is concerned is that I'm sure there's instances where individual property owners have had that desire to improve the property, but when they go in for the necessary permits, they're advised that the infrastructure within the road, fronting their property, is substandard. So along with the building of their development of their property, they're being looked at to upgrade infrastructure which really is not fair and feasible especially for the smaller properties. So, for me, I think one of the things that if you really want to assist in the redevelopment of the Wailuku area, government needs to step forward to some degree. And there could be assessment made if that's what the decision is. But government needs to step forward and be proactive and lead the effort in upgrading the infrastructure in the roadways, which from my perspective will definitely lead towards people then developing their properties.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I agree with that 100%. I have a question, Erin, though, about all the infrastructure on the beautification of Market Street from Wells all the way through. Did it include water all the way through or was it just surface improvements on, you know, pavers and sidewalks? It was my understanding it did not include.

Ms. Wade: I don't know the answer. It looks like Ms. Perreira knows the answer. I don't know for sure.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, so we'll wait for her. So on this whole area then, do we want to leave it exactly the way it is? Keeping that I-3 in the next two years for that improvement plan?

Mr. Horcajo: I think that's –

Ms. Betts Basinger: That she was talking about coordination with the new infrastructure.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. I think that's the most critical action item. Excuse me a second, but, I'm assuming that – I didn't have to ask – but PWWM, all of that is being changed, right, to DPW?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Good idea.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. Good catch.

Mr. Suzuki: But Erin you mentioned that the infrastructure report has been updated. So it's a 2000 version now? Or is it still 1991 version?

Ms. Wade: This is 2000.

Mr. Suzuki: So we need to change the 1991 to 2000.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Good point.

Mr. Suzuki: And I also have a question on I-2, Chair, Holowai Place?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes?

Mr. Suzuki: You know, my understanding is that Holowai Place is they're physically on the ground, but there's no define right-of-way for Holowai Place. So I'm not too sure. First, we're going to have to establish a right-of-way legal jurisdiction before we can, you know, improve it, allow for a just clear cut, any sort of access along the Holowai Place. So has anybody looked in terms of what is the situation of Holowai Place from a legal perspective? Because I know people that live towards the end of Holowai Place and they've come in, applying for building permit and apply for loans, and the banks have come back to them saying we can't lend you money because you don't have a legal access to a public roadway. So Holowai Place is there, but it's not a defined right-of-way.

Ms. Betts Basinger: You know, it sounds exactly like this is something that the MRA should be on top of and be interfacing and interacting with Public Works about what the status of that is especially since it says six to 20 years. So maybe we should –

Ms. Wade: I have an answer –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Ms. Wade: – to his question. Joe Alueta did research this because as you might guess he was looking at purchasing a piece of property on that road. So he contacted Public Works and they're not willing to accept it because there is no dedicated road. There's no easement. They really don't want to work with it. And there's really –. Actually Jocelyn and I drove it just to check it out in depth a couple of months ago, and I've talked with Public Works since and I don't know if there's a solution to be honest. I mean, in fact, Joe's recommendation was to remove this as an action item thinking that it's probably an impossibility. And I don't know where that leaves people like your friend. You know, maybe what we need to do is some consultation with them and find out if there's something that we can do for the banks. There's nothing we can ensure though, as a County, that they will have access, and the fire trucks can't necessarily get to the house.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. I guess for me, I mean, there is a process. It's whether the County wants to do it. I mean, the County could condemn all the existing roadway that traverses people's properties, and decide to make that a substandard County road for the benefit of the owners up on that section. I doubt if the County wants to do, but, again, that's a process. So, for me, I somewhat agree with Joe, maybe it should be removed, but for the purpose of following a process, I'm wondering whether like the one that we talked before, we change this to say investigate feasibility of, you know, Holowai Place becoming a public a right-of-way. And that investigation from legally will probably come back and say no. But at least it's been in this plan since 2000-something. We haven't done anything, but basically this here is really not – this really is not the first step. The first step is investigate whether if even can be. Now if Joe and Corporation Counsel – if we have a letter now that says, you know, Corporation Counsel say no way, then we can say remove it. But, for me, unless we have that, we haven't really not logically followed a process to deal with this proposal. So my point then is we can amend it to say investigate feasibility or something. That's kind of my thoughts.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think that maybe I agree with Joe and Warren that it's an impossibility for this agency, at this point, to do anything other than just follow what's happening. And I frankly would like Holowai to stay just the way it is. So I would be for removing.

Mr. Horcajo: Can we actually vote on this? Like I –

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: We both have family property. My property comes down Holowai. I'm the very end of that row.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I'm just within –

Mr. Horcajo: Her property wraps within that we own. I don't care.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I mean, but, the access that – the access that I have to that property is either I go up to Bob's house and walk down the stream or I drive to the end of Holowai and cross the property there. But still if the County is unwilling –

Ms. Wade: There's a lot of disclosure going on here.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well our family has had that property way before Holowai was there so –

Mr. Suzuki: So there might be a conflict. But, I mean, from my perspective, I wouldn't have any objections to deleting it.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. But let me ask you this. Does it make sense to have Corporation Counsel give an opinion of this? I mean, we're not going to vote on this whole package now.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: Does that make sense?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: So I think where I'm a little confused is do you want the Planning Department to seek the letter confirming that we can't move on this, or would you like an –

Ms. Betts Basinger: An opinion.

Ms. Wade: An opinion.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Just an opinion.

Mr. Horcajo: And I would think I probably shouldn't vote, anyway, when we get to this point.

Mr. Suzuki: Opinion on what?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I don't think you should vote because you about it.

Ms. Wade: Basically it would be an opinion from Corporation Counsel, Public Works and Fire Department. I'll ask them for agency comment about incorporating Holowai as a public street. And from their comments, maybe then you can determine whether or not you want to keep I-2 or remove it.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, well, something in writing from the County people would say get rid of it, and Public Works say forget it, Corporation Counsel saying it's nearly impossible, Fire Department saying whatever.

Mr. Suzuki: You know, I guess from my perspective, you know, why does it have to be a public street? I mean, I'm sure there's roads within the MRA that are private roads. They're not public roads. So what would be the reason for converting Holowai to a public road and not other roads within the MRA – private roads within the MRA area?

Ms. Wade: I think the only reason would be the issue your friend is running into – to provide some assurance to lending institutions and things like that. That these homes can be serviced when necessary and that they have access in and out of their properties. And if we're able to resolve that with private road standards, I don't see a reason we can't do that, but it is an exceedingly long cul-de-sac. I don't know that we could possibly permit that private road because there is no other outlet.

Ms. Betts Basinger: There is con activity, the Muliwai above, so there is access to those homes.

Ms. Wade: At the top?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Okay. So that could be part of the investigation.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I mean, there's actually a road – when cut short – on Muliwai down.

Mr. Suzuki: I would just leave it at that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So you'll just get an opinion?

Ms. Wade: I will.



Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So last thing if you don't mind. I-4, what is the status of whatever that is – tax increment financing public facility district? Has any study been done for that particular item?

Ms. Wade: Your district boundaries are your district. But as I was explaining at the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, you actually have to go through the formal process of – and actually the County Council has to go through the formal process – of creating a tax increment financing district. So you would provide to them a recommendation of basically how much you would like to capture, from what date you would like to capture and what that boundaries would be. And I wouldn't recommend changing it from your existing district.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. So the answer is no previous MRA body has attempted to move on this condition.

Ms. Wade: Correct. My understanding is that has been advised by staff which I didn't know at the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. I understand that staff had said that they felt that the tax capture would not be worth going through the political battle of creating a district. I don't know if that still is true given the amount of property owners that I have heard are looking forward to redeveloping their properties. I think you would get quite a lot of tax capture actually within the next 10 years if you created the district. So, I don't know. Anything else should be worthwhile.

Ms. Betts Basinger: At our first strategic planning meeting when Erin gave us the background on additional sources of funding for the MRA, this was the preferred one over a BID so I do think that I would like to move it up to the next two years that we at least investigate this and have real numbers to discuss if we want to do an ordinance to Council.

Ms. Wade: And will just add then too, you know, what we talked about on the 10<sup>th</sup> is laying the ground work for the political will to do something like this tax capture is incredibly important for its success. So as many small little things that we can identify that would lead up to us proposing to Council to do an tax increment district would be really good. You know, the more that we can illustrate the MRA's –

Ms. Betts Basinger: At our next regular meeting when it's agendized, I'll be sharing – Katharine Popenuk and I – our visit with the Mayor last week, and we did talk about this tax capture with her. Okay, so on that one we're suggesting moving it up to next two years. Any other comments, members? So ready for Market Development Action Chart: Remaining Tasks. You'll note that the implementing and coordinating agency here is Office of Economic Development. Promotion and event development; expand use of Iao Theater; develop a visitor market development plan; business recruitment initiatives; develop a walking historical tour; and develop Wailuku town activities and business opportunities website. Comments?

Mr. Horcajo: I guess my quick comment is, you know, stuff like marketing development, our promotion – I mean, that's kind of an on-going thing, I guess, forever, so, I mean, shouldn't there be, I don't know, an on-going category? You know? Expand use for Iao Theater, as an example. I mean Maui On Stage is doing really great with what they've done since they've had the lease. Now, I mean, so is this job done or, you know, can it really expand further? So I'm just running about – you know, because some what the goal is to go through these things, and if it's done, then remove it. But when you're talking about marketing it's kind of continuous.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. Yeah. Real good point. You'll notice then that it's Economic Development Office and implemented by private non-profits, and merchants and et cetera. So really the MRA in this particular segment – would you call it just an overseeing?

Ms. Wade: I would call it a partner because there will be opportunities where – like first Friday – to they asked for seed money to kick something like that off, they might ask for you to help with that. Those type of things. They might ask for –. They will likely have some permits for events and activities, road closures and those type of things that would come through you. You'll be a partnering agency then, almost.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And then I know with the testimony we had with Malama Wailuku on the walking historical tour, they have been funded through Economic Development HTA to do that, MD-5. MD-6 was developed and has now morphed into the MRA website which, of course, will link to the Wailuku Town activities website. So you're right, these are kind of on-going so maybe they should just all be checked to two to five years and six to 20 years just to show it's on-going.

Mr. Horcajo: That would be easiest way to do it, I guess.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: The one issue, though, that was raised at the alliance discussion – the marketing analysis and implementing plan – is something that has actually come up from the Office of Economic Development asking if we would like to move forward with a marketing analysis and implementation plan. We do have a private offer for some seed money to do that. I clarified that offer, and it's not much. It's maybe 5% of the total, of \$76,000. So OED is willing to coordinate the grant for us and provide us also some money. But I would need sort of a direction from you for whether I should continue to seek some additional private funds, whether MRA would like to contribute some funds to do that marketing analysis for Wailuku, and I do have a draft scope which I can provide to you too.

Ms. Wade: Thanks Erin for reminding me. That amount was for an extremely comprehensive study that we may not need all portions of it. So I think, there's room to

negotiate the cost of that particular study. But I definitely think we should do it because revitalizing Wailuku means finding out what kind of businesses will really work there, and then going out and marketing for that. So, yeah, continue what you're doing.

Mr. Horcajo: So specifically that would be – I mean, it's not specific to any one of these, right? Because it refers to MD – I guess mainly MD-3 or is it even MD-1?

Ms. Wade: It's sort of a combination.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: A combination, right? Yeah? Which I think is great. I mean, you've got one particular land owner on Market Street that has gone down to shops in Kahului and Paia and say hey don't you want to move up here to my space? I mean, it takes an effort.

Ms. Betts Basinger: You know what, you're right. Should we take out the word visitor and just say develop a market development plan? A comprehensive market development plan that would include visitors, residents, people coming into town to do business.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, I agree.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Develop a comprehensive market development plan.

Mr. Horcajo: So do we remove what's in parenthesis or do we just add to it to include the local, sort of speak?

Mr. Suzuki: Add to it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: I don't know. The only reason I struggle with that is the visitor plan is a very specific targeted project that can often be overlooked when you do a general analysis plan. With the overall marketing plan is it will look a little bit at the tourist's dollar, but the majority will look at who's there now, where did they spend their money, how can that money be attracted to spend in Wailuku, you know, instead of elsewhere, and what the needs would be for housing, if there's a need for a hotel rooms, and how many rooms could the district support – that kind of a thing. So –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Maybe we should then clearly say that it should include a visitor component.

Ms. Wade: I wonder if you want to do both. I don't know. It might be appropriate to phrase

it in a way that one doesn't exclude the other. You might want to very refined market – or a very refined visitor analysis and plan, and then a more general market analysis.

Mr. Horcajo: But the present proposal, RFP, is mainly geared towards to – as far as you know – having granted the local business.

Ms. Wade: The scope?

Mr. Horcajo: The scope.

Ms. Wade: It's primarily towards existing users of Wailuku – government employees – that kind of thing. People who are in the district now.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And it's not listed in any one of these clearly so MD-3 would be the closest one to augment by. And it could be plural – develop comprehensive market development plans which would include a visitor component.

Ms. Wade: Sure. Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Or you could say local and visitor, if local is the right word to use or something, without the resident and visitor market development plan.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: I have a question. If you look at the MRA area, you know, we have included within the area, businesses and a lot of residential properties. And I don't know the background as to why the residential properties are included within the MRA area. But when you look at this marketing plan, it's geared primarily towards the business commercial component. And I don't know if the residents would want a marketing plan for their individual homes for residential component of the MRA. But I'm struggling because somehow they're included, yet, at the same time they're not included in all the talk and the discussion. So I'm kind of wondering what's the intent of including the residential property within the MRA when it seems like the main focus is just on your business commercial core area. Because even the walking tour, you know what's wrong with taking people through a certain residential area and showing them the old plantation homes and how the people might have lived and some history in terms of, you know, why the streets are as narrow as they are, why the homes are designed and constructed the way they are? I mean, because if you look at the tour, it doesn't seem like it includes a tour of the residential area. And people may not want people walking, you know, in their residential area. But, again, it seems like the residential component is not included, you know, in a lot of discussion and in a lot of the plans that are brought forward.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Jocelyn and I and Office of Economic Development, a few years ago, worked on that original website to be a marketing piece that appealed to living in Wailuku, what are the neighborhoods, what are the schools, what is the character, working in Wailuku, the businesses, the opportunities, shopping in Wailuku, the government in Wailuku. So this marketing action chart really does, Warren, cover all of that, so – in addition to visitors.

Ms. Wade: The reason –

Mr. Suzuki: That's not the impression I get.

Ms. Wade: If I can answer your question why is housing in the district. It's to protect those very substandard things you mentioned because of the code relief opportunity is within the MRA district. So the road widening requirements can be relieved of. They can be relieved of a lot of building code requirements. They have that opportunity. So it's almost like a historic preservation tool without being in a historic district. I think that was the intent of including those homes. However, it does also provide an incentive to those property owners to redevelop because it offers code relief. You know, so it's sort of – that's why your role is so very important because anytime a new small project – even if it's a house now and they want to convert it into an office, sometimes that's going to be appropriate and sometimes it's not. But a lot of times keeping the structure itself is the most important thing for the district because the use is sort of unknown, but the look of the building and the way it's set back and the way the cars or the traffic comes and goes from it, is more important. So there are very few other areas in the County where you could have offices in the little single family homes that we have in Wailuku. So it provides those people opportunities to do something like that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would suggest then maybe in the wording of MD-3 to develop a comprehensive market development plan that include visitor and resident components. Anything else members under market development? Also, it reminds us that we need to, maybe, be a little proactive in engaging the Office of Economic Development in this part of the plan – maybe monthly or whatever – just having them come and talk stories with us.

Mr. Horcajo: Excuse me. I agree with you. So I guess the scope, was that created strictly out of OED and then they created the plan, the scope, and then the plan itself?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think Jocelyn will be able to answer that when she testifies.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright. I guess because I'm asking, I mean, if we do – because it sounds like for example, MD-4, as written is not kind of part of what their plan is. So if we have a way to incorporate that as well, business recruitment initiative, which for me means try to get new businesses in town, that would help the redevelopment. So that's my point. I mean,

I agree, we should be in touch with them. But even for the point of this funding thing, how we can incorporate other proposals within this action chart to get them.

Ms. Wade: Great idea.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well you know it's interesting because with the funding for the municipal parking structure, economic revitalization and business enticement are going to be really big, and it's my understanding that there would be money in that bigger pool to apply to studies like that tell us where we should be looking to bring business in. So, yeah, comprehensive plan is important.

Mr. Horcajo: So at the end of the meeting today we could potentially talk about having them schedule some time?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, the next step I believe, Erin –

Mr. Horcajo: Get a current update anyway of what we're doing.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: – is to go back through –. I believe that we did prioritize as we went along. Or did we say we were going to do that at the end?

Ms. Wade: At the end.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. If we have no more discussion on market development, then I'd like to open it up for Jocelyn to come and testify before we move into prioritizing what we've gone through.

Ms. Jocelyn Perreira: Good afternoon commissioners. I have many, many questions because – and thank you for this opportunity to have a discussion now. I think you need to consider a few things before you go ahead and just decide to prioritize. That you may want to adjust a few things and hopefully I can provide some assistance on some of these matters. So I do have some questions for clarification if you can bear with me. Can we start with this page?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Do you have a copy of this? We've been working off on.

Ms. Perreira: I do, but I want to point to a particular item on this.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We were actually working off of this that's why.

Ms. Perreira: And I'm going to get into that. I just have one item that I wanted to – it's the fourth bullet from the bottom, under outreach ideas, and it says include and investigate – include and invite agency testimony. And I just wanted to remind the commissioners – this is the page that you have sent, Warren.

Ms. Wade: This is the one that was in the packet that we sent out. It says notes from strategic planning brainstorming.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay. I see it.

Ms. Perreira: I just wanted to remind you or have you considered provisions for confidential or sensitive issues relative to when you have agency testimony? There has been times in the past where people have gotten up and said outrageous things about commissioners and so on and so forth. And, you know, there needs to be, I think, some kind of provision that how you react with or something sensitive that's being worked on, not ready for disclosure, if there is a mechanism by which you handle that.

The next item I wanted to address – was not having seeing this before – I do think there's an on-going section is needed on this, and I talked to Erin, I think about if she was going to have an on-going section because the design reviews are like on-going.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Perreira: And I just thought that you didn't have it on here because you didn't have items that would be on-going and that would be like what you just discussed about your marketing is an on-going, but so is design review, so I'd like to recommend that. Then underneath –

Mr. Horcajo: I just wanted to ask a question. So, as far as the design review, specifically, where is that in the –?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well this document that Erin made up is for things that are not on. All the on-going things we do, were not reviewing. We're reviewing things that are left.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. We actually did –

Mr. Horcajo: I realized that.

Ms. Wade: We did.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Oh, yeah, we did.

Ms. Wade: It was in the cover letter that I sent with this, for the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: That's right.

Ms. Perreira: So we're just assuming that the on-going is, you know, left in tack. And then this under vehicular, VPC-6 –

Ms. Betts Basinger: VPC-6.

Ms. Perreira: I'm sorry, P-7. VPC-7 – that your comprehensive parking study – is that something you want to update?

Ms. Betts Basinger: We don't have VPC-7 on the remaining task.

Ms. Perreira: Yeah. It says parking analysis should be MRA implementation. Over here it says Planning is the coordinating agency.

Mr. Horcajo: You're looking at which one Jocelyn?

Ms. Perreira: Now, I'm looking at the matrix.

Ms. Wade: Update the comprehensive parking –

Ms. Perreira: Actually I'm using the matrix and this – the update.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Perreira: But this is the first time I'm seeing this so –.

Ms. Wade: Right. So the recommendation for VPC-7, update the comprehensive parking for Wailuku area was that parking analysis should be an MRA implementing action instead of just Planning.

Ms. Perreira: Okay, we concur with that, and we're noting that we're continuing to be a private partner for resource information. And then VPC-8 – now wait now – yeah, number 8 – Planning, MRA also included with the WMSA planning and I guess appropriate community organization also. Yeah. And then VPC-10, the shared parking cash-in-lieu ordinances – that's been turned over to MRA to implement right?

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Ms. Perreira: And now under Urban Design and Beautification, UDB-3, the street scape



plan. You guys were talking about terminology. I think the terminology that's worked well before is primary route. It's a terminology that should be used instead of collector's route because collector's route can mean something else. Primary routes is very clear that if you're on a primary route there's more extensive treatment of primary routes, and therefore, not everybody thinks that their side streets are going to be treated in the same particular manner.

And then you had over here, review feasibility or investigate potential for underground. I do want to speak a little bit to that if I can. We have had extensive discussions on this particular issue. It's one of the reason why underground overhead utility lines was placed in this plan because Warren is right and our feeling is that generally speaking, small towns, we want to keep the poles and we want to keep the line because that is part of the flavor and character. But, we think that the, you know, the transformers, the big transformers, and the big trunk cable lines and what not, those need to be, if possible, the transformers can be placed on the ground and obscured with planting, some inappropriate places. And you guys need to start maybe talking with the appropriate cable companies, and our understanding is that they have a mandate that they have to convert to fiber optics and they have to do it so many miles per year. So what you need to be able to do is probably take the primary streets. And the streets that we talked about before that were appropriate for this because I mean it's heavy, heavy duty cables running along Main and Market, going into Happy Valley and all that. That if you can target like Main and Market for starters, I mean, realistically, and try to get on the list of you want to be a priority, this should be a priority for the fiber optic allocation that they have to do every year. I think that would be really good. The idea of consolidating poles and lines, I think, is also a really cool idea. That's really, really good. So I guess when they –. It would probably be important to coordinate any kind of bearing of that cable lines or using the fiber optics when they're doing routine repair works, so we're not digging up the streets over and over again.

Mr. Horcajo: So, Jocelyn – Chair, excuse me.

Ms. Perreira: Yeah?

Mr. Horcajo: So I guess you're saying – you've said, I should say – that the WMSA has done extensive studies. Have those studies been given to the MRA?

Ms. Perreira: In the past, many years ago, actually.

Ms. Betts Basinger: She said that there's been lots of discussion.

Ms. Perreira: No, but we did have studies and we did present it to the MRA a long time ago. This has been maybe when Joe Pontanilla was involved in the discussions.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so we can't find it, can we get another copy?

Ms. Perreira: I've got to look for our copy. If you can't find it, yes, yes, but I want to make clear, it's not comprehensive study.

Mr. Horcajo: No, I realize that.

Ms. Perreira: It's preliminary, but at least there was an understanding and there was discussions and there was even talk with Maui Electric Company about removal of certain poles at their expense and not Maui Redevelopment Agency expense and so on and so forth. So that's why those kind of things are worth while.

Okay, now, I'm on infrastructure action chart. It says, there are –. Erin said there were no infrastructure improvements since 2000, but there has been on Vineyard Street as we know. The area that I'm concerned about is this realignment of Holowai Place that we went holo-holo on. I think it's important to investigate the feasibility. But one thing I do want to say about that is that it's really, really important since this was a document that was in public review and it was adopted in the light of day, that there maybe some people who have expectations and I think it would be a concern to just have Public Works ID the most egregious problems in the area and target areas for improvements without some opportunity for discussion and open meeting so that if somebody wanted or was expecting to get improvements that they could go to lending institutions or concerns about access to services and so on and so forth, that it wasn't just taken out of their hand because it is listed in the official document. It's kind of like a big change if you're just removing it. That's just a recommendation.

The next thing is I-4. I think it's really cool that you folks are doing – trying to investigate and go through a formal process investigating – you need to create a TIF district. I think a TIF district is something that if you look into the future of Wailuku, that is something that we're going to have to seriously look at because it's your best opportunity to capture some capital. It's really a good idea, and I do think that it's going to take a lot of political will so laying the ground work is really, really important as far as that goes. That doesn't mean that BID is pau. You guys eliminated BID?

Ms. Wade: No.

Mr. Suzuki: No.

Mr. Horcajo: No.

Ms. Perreira: Okay. That's what I wanted to check up on. And then under the –. Back again, I'm sorry, about infrastructure, and somebody mentioned about having the road work

or the line up to standard along Market Street. I think Warren you were talking about that concerns – that people want to make improvements on their property? Okay, we need to get a real good detail on that because in the past we also had people that we worked with on projects and they were discouraged from doing improvements because when they went to go and do improvements, they were told that they had to participate in the development, into the contribution of improvement on these water lines or these sewer lines or whatever lines they have out there. But they had to go from their establishment to the source. So there's a big difference from when you say okay, in your particular area, because I know in the case of at least three of them that we've dealt with, it was a deal breaker because they had to go from their establishment to the source which is down Happy Valley, so it's a quite a ways. I wanted to make note of that.

Now on the marketing, relative to this – I think I lost something – I wasn't clear on something. There was a discussion with Office of Economic Development that I'm not aware of. Was there something recently?

Ms. Wade: Yes. In the last two weeks basically, Office of Economic Development said that they were approached for a request for a grant to do a market analysis for Wailuku area. And I mentioned to you that I met with a couple of people about it.

Ms. Perreira: Who requested it?

Ms. Wade: A private citizen. So we have a proposal and a scope from a national marketing company that does this kind of thing all over – pretty much all over the world.

Ms. Perreira: And this was initiated by a private citizen?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Perreira: Can we know who the private citizen is?

Ms. Wade: It was Jonathan Starr.

Ms. Perreira: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Okay, well, that's cool. I just wanted to note that I understand your desire for comprehensive plan, however, you may want to rethink that because some of the discussions that have been in the past have been – that have been beneficial at least as a first initial step – is to do like marketing development plan that you know what is the slippage and where's the audience you want to capture from the local residents that you want to keep and especially because of the plan developments in and around Wailuku that seems like a natural audience that you wanted to capture. But that you also may want to try to do like a visitor interpretive plan which is completely different from that kind of stuff and I cannot see having knowledge of what this involving. I cannot

see that being merry. Maybe elements of it once they're both separately done, but it can go into a consolidation comprehensive plan, but I think you want to try to investigate that a little bit further. And that is all I have relative to this. Thank you very much for the opportunity to get some clarification and provide some input.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thanks Jocelyn. Members, any questions of Jocelyn? Erin?

Ms. Wade: I just wanted to comment on that visitor interpretative plan. Thank you for bringing that up. That's exactly what I was trying to separate when I was making my comments about the marketing analysis. I think it would be way too costly for us to try to bring a national company up to speed on providing a sense of what is Wailuku about to visitors. Where, probably, we would want a local component doing that. Whereas the national, you know, marketing tools that they always look at any downtown. That's a lot easier to do from a national perspective, so that was my reason for suggesting the separation in the first place too.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. Members, so going over quickly what we went through today. And Erin, on UDB-3, regarding the Market Street, what the underlying infrastructure improvements were married to the Market Street beautification plan. We're going to write -- We're going to find out about that? We're going to check?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. And are you going to be checking with the --

Ms. Wade: I'll check with Public Works. I don't know if Joe knows the answer to that question. Do you know the extent of the utilities upgrades done during the Market Street improvements?

Ms. Betts Basinger: And water.

Ms. Wade: Particularly water.

Mr. Joseph Alueta: I know they did up until the bridge, so, like the utilities and other stuff was done up until the bridge. I know that the land acquisition was done for the entire project because they did the surveying and land acquisition.

Ms. Wade: So from Wells to the bridge, water was improved?

Mr. Alueta: I'm not going to say water, but whatever utility improvements such as drainage. That's why you had the sidewalk. They dug up all of that. So whatever improvements they needed to do as far as utility improvements were just limited to the scope that they stayed

within. So they didn't go down to Happy Valley. They were going to wait until they tear up the road all at one time to do it.

Ms. Wade: Exactly.

Mr. Alueta: So they didn't want to tear it up in Happy Valley and then not come back and pave it.

Ms. Wade: So I'll find out. Actually, I think, that water line was adequate.

Mr. Horcajo: I can kind of answer the question too because I'm on Market Street, and I haven't seen the plans. Undoubtedly, you know, there was no water line improvements – infrastructure improvements. So it's basically the drainage because of what they had to do with tearing up the paving and stuff, and of course, irrigation for the plants and stuff.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So there was no water line improvement.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. As far as I know, that was done before.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Like what they're doing on Vineyard, they did not do it on Market.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Can I just clarify real quick?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Sure.

Ms. Wade: On Market Street, from Main to Wells, it says that line is substandard so we would have to find out if that needs to still happen. And then Market from Main to Pili which is, you know, right – that is not substandard, so that is actually adequate. What's on the, you know, from basically the corner of Main to Pili. And then from Pili to Vineyard, that is also not substandard. From Vineyard to Mill, that is not substandard. So the only portion that actually would require improvement, and perhaps this was done, is Main to Wells. So I'll find out if that was done.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. Also on Urban Design, UDB-4, I would like to throw out to the members that at one of our upcoming regular meetings, we invite Maui Electric, Hawaiian Tel or the cable companies to come and talk to us about their infrastructure plans for our area. Does everyone agree?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, and if you can ask them to focus on what Jocelyn had mentioned, you know, there's kind of fiber optics and priority. I do remember – I think we all remember that Hawaiian Homes got a lot of money years ago – some Federal funds to take fiber optic to all – .

Ms. Betts Basinger: Sandwich Isle.

Mr. Horcajo: Waiehu Kou. They came down Main Street. They tore up the street and went down Market Street.

Ms. Betts Basinger: They have their own –

Mr. Suzuki: That's only for Hawaiian Homes property?

Mr. Horcajo: What's that?

Mr. Suzuki: That's only for Hawaiian Homes.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, but the point being, they brought hopefully major trunk lines down Main, down Market. Anyway, so my point being in relation to what her said – asked that that be part of the discussion.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So have an educational component from all those folks. And then, just to clarify that, under infrastructure action, we are going to request an opinion on the realignment of Holowai. And lastly, on market development, the comprehensive study which include a local visitor component which perhaps we can solicit a partnership with MVB.

Ms. Wade: MVB?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Maui Visitors Bureau.

Ms. Wade: For the funding?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Ms. Betts Basinger: They're pretty rich.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And maybe through an alliance kind of relationship.

Ms. Wade: Right. Right. Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Any other comments members? Thank you. This is just huge – huge work.

Ms. Wade: I guess the last thing would be to prioritize actions and we still have a number of things that are slated for the next two years. So I'm wondering if you want to give me some direction about the next six months. Obviously, as I stated at the last meeting, we do have a parking coordinator, who's on board now which takes a little pressure off Joe and I now, to be doing all the parking coordination issues. So hopefully that will be moving forward and we'll provide him a little bit of guidance, but that freeze me to work more on some of the tasks on this sheet. So of those, you know, I was directed today to invite Maui Electric and I'll be working on the market analysis. I see maybe those as two top things. Are there a couple of more handful? Because usually get going on one and then it stalls so you can work more on another one?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, I have a comment based on what you just said about your parking coordinator. I guess I have a few questions. Number one, is that just for small town or any parking regulations that are in the code? That's the first question.

Ms. Wade: You lost me.

Mr. Horcajo: The parking coordinator, that's staffed out of the Planning Department. Is that correct?

Ms. Wade: It is. No, that's just for your parking structure.

Mr. Horcajo: Oh, that. The parking. I'm sorry.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We pay half of his salary – half of their –

Mr. Horcajo: Excuse me. Okay, then I won't ask the rest of my questions.

Ms. Betts Basinger: For maybe I didn't check them enough, under Land Use-2, that's next two years. Does that stay there? Because LU-3 should actually move up to next two years.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: From two to five, so –

Mr. Horcajo: I would move LU-2 to 5 given, I guess, I think the consensus of the merchants around Market Street is not doing anything until the municipal parking lot – I mean, the building is complete.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's a good idea.

Mr. Horcajo: And if we're talking five years from now, at a minimum, then we shouldn't even have this within the next three years.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Warren, do you concur?

Mr. Suzuki: That's fine.

Ms. Betts Basinger: VPC-3, next two years?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. Definitely.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I have their standard operating. VPC-4, next two years?

Ms. Wade: That actually raises this thing from my notes that I had, the vehicular pedestrian and parking study and plan, maybe that is what we make our third.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. That's what I was thinking.

Ms. Wade: Yeah?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: And that's a lot of work right there.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. So everything in VPC moves up to next two years?

Ms. Wade: Pretty much.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Urban design –

Mr. Horcajo: Can I – excuse me a second – and go back to VPC? I guess VP-7 on this spread sheet, but I believe it's 8, review and provide recommendation on vehicular and pedestrian circulation improvements. I guess circulation for me talks more about maybe the street improvements for driving. But in everybody's mind, does that include looking at satellite parking issues as well that we – Joe talked about, but would that be part of VP – this one here?



Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Yes?

Ms. Wade: I think that's kind of what I tried to summarize is that many of these that are listed in your VPC chart would be consolidated into this one study.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Alright. Thank you.

Ms. Wade: Parking, vehicular and pedestrian.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, so back to UDB. Is everything moved up now also? Well, except for review of –. We're going to start with the educational portion of the overhead utility issue by inviting those folks to come and let us know what their plans are, so I guess that moves up to the next two years.

Mr. Horcajo: I'm sorry. Are we talking UDB-5?

Ms. Wade: Did we leave the wording as it is stated – underground/overhead utility lines?

Mr. Suzuki: No.

Ms. Betts Basinger: No. We added a verb, like review.

Ms. Wade: That's right. Study the feasibility. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Just a comment too then on UDB-3, what we did on the marketing was to have an "x" even on six to 20 years because it's not just a two to five year project. It's a long term project. So, shall we do that?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. That's right.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's a good idea.

Mr. Horcajo: Under both of those.

Ms. Wade: Then you had asked this evaluate and adopt feasible – oh, not that one – prepare a regional infrastructure assessment improvement plan. Maybe that's fourth where we work to coordinate with Public Works and Water and everyone to find out how and when and where utilities need improvement. Infrastructure study. That's a very full plate for this

board.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And then market development, we were just – all those were going to be checked off in all of the columns, so it's just an on-going kind of effort with the market comprehensive market development study visitor component within the next two years.

Ms. Wade: So to summarize, the focus then of this year will be the parking structure because that's a given; the market analysis; a feasibility of power lines and education; the vehicular pedestrian and parking study and plan; and the infrastructure study and timing choreography.

Mr. Suzuki: That's more than enough.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Ms. Wade: That's more than enough to do.

Ms. Betts Basinger: The good news is you'll have help.

Ms. Wade: I think this will get you quite a ways though. I mean that's some progress.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: The market analysis; the power lines or utility lines education; the vehicular pedestrian and parking study and plan; and the infrastructure study.

Mr. Suzuki: Can we take a two minute recess?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes. We're in recess for five minutes.

*(The Maui Redevelopment Agency recessed at approximately 2:22 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 2:27 p.m.)*

## **E. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE**

- 1. Cash in lieu update**
- 2. MRA Expenditures and Budget Update**

Ms. Betts Basinger: Maui Redevelopment Agency is called back to order, and we have finalized strategic planning. Congratulations everybody. We've prioritized the actions and we have a lot of work ahead of us but it was a really good effort to give us our marching

orders. Moving on to (e), the Planning Department update on cash in lieu update. We have completed out work and it went back. Is that –?

Ms. Wade: No.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Bring me up to date on where we are on that.

Ms. Wade: We got about half way through the editing of the ordinance.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's right.

Ms. Wade: We specifically did not get into the fee discussion because we wanted the updated cost from Waltery for the construction, and there was discussion about the needs assessment so that's why Joe is here to talk about the existing studies we have, whether or not we can use them for the needs assessment, and what we might need to have updated.

Mr. Alueta: Okay, I think, two things. With regards to the Waltery, you know having them redo a parking cost, I don't think that's necessarily needed because I think – first of all, the policy issue that you need to address is it going to be based off a percentage of the construction cost. It doesn't matter what the construction cost is. If it's a percentage, it's a percentage fair wise. And the current ordinance proposes to be 55% of whatever the cost is at the time that we decide that we construct it. If it's going to be a flat fee then what's the rationale for that flat fee and what would be the valuation of that? I just think that, again, in most fairness, we were going with the percentage of whatever the cost is to build it and it wasn't going to be 100% cost recovery for the County. It was just going to be 55%.

With regards to the studies, again, the studies were done kind of like at the same time this ordinance was first written, and shortly thereafter, and back in 2002. So every year – every time we wait – the longer we wait, the more stale the studies get. So if you feel that we need to redo the studies, the studies would primarily focus in on what is the existing capacity or use of the existing service parking lot. And then given what we know about developers in the area or property owners in what they plan on redeveloping, what would be the level of demand for new parking stalls? And that was the primary study. At that time, it showed that the existing parking lot had adequate parking stalls for what we had out there. Meaning given the level of vacancy on Market Street as well as the surrounding buildings, as well as some other characteristics. But however, given the potential redevelopment of properties in the area primarily – you had Jonathan Starr's property; you also had the corner lot where Betsill was going to go in; and at the time, there was some other projects inline that they couldn't move forward because they knew there was not enough parking in the parking lot to get a parking waiver, nor did it make economical sense

to have half of their lot be surface parking. For them they needed to do the densities that was allowed within the design guidelines. And from a County encouragement standpoint, the karat side, was that we wanted the design where you didn't have postage sized parking lots located all over or parking in front of the building, you know? You know, where they couldn't potentially meet the entire capacity. So we were trying to encourage people to move or develop fully their lot, pay a cash in lieu and we would handle their parking requirement in a larger structure. And so based on that study of who wanted to develop, there was more than adequate – there was a known quantity that we needed to increase the capacity by at least 150 stalls to 200 stalls. And that's where I think the number of the parking structure came out.

Mr. Suzuki: . . .(Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Alueta: Well, not the cost, but to increase the parking – to have the parking structure be approximately 435 vehicles/stalls in the first phase with the addition of doing another level later on. And that would be something that that new structure would handle, (1), existing 218 – you know make up for that lost of surface – as well as accommodate the foreseeable demand or redevelopment of the surrounding properties. And then potentially another level of parking lot would be added on as other smaller properties redevelop or if that 20,000 square foot remnant parcel – if that continues to remain a remnant parcel and not used as surface parking, the parking requirement for whatever gets developed there could be accommodated and expanded parking structure. So again, those are the studies. Now we can go back and reassess property owners that had expressed interest in redeveloping and to see whether they are still align. But given the economic circumstances now, you might, you know, again, show they're either not interested, or some of them may still be interested given that their plans are long term and given their property. But, you know?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Members, any comments? I do want to make a comment because things have changed and the economy has changed, and Betsill is going ahead with their project with their own parking.

Mr. Alueta: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So I first have just a procedural question. Had we scheduled the second meeting to finish up the –?

Ms. Wade: No.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. So we haven't even finished going through it, which I would personally like to do that before we talk more about studies or feasibilities. So at this point I would say when can we schedule a special cash in lieu meeting to finish the second half?

Mr. Horcajo: My only comment for me is this happen soon, but I'm gone the 14<sup>th</sup> through the 24<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's right. And then I'm gone in October. She made it, and you didn't miss much.

Ms. Wade: I don't know that need to do it as a special meeting because I don't see anything coming on your agenda in the near future that's going to prevent you from talking about it at your regular meeting if you'd like to do that on your August agenda.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: I won't be here on the 27<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, so what are the dates?

Mr. Horcajo: 28<sup>th</sup> is the next meeting.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And you won't be here?

Mr. Suzuki: And that's fine.

Ms. Wade: Otherwise, your next regular meeting is September 18<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, let's put it on the September 18<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Will we all be here? Okay.

Ms. Wade: Is that HCPO? Oh, no, the next week.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It will be a regular, so we'll try to keep that meeting light.

Mr. Suzuki: And for that particular meeting, we'll have the correspondence that Jocelyn sent over at the last meeting, on the agenda.

Ms. Wade: On cash in lieu?

Mr. Suzuki: No. It dealt with public comment.

Ms. Betts Basinger: For our next regular meeting.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: September 18<sup>th</sup> meeting because I mentioned I wasn't going at the August 28<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Wade: Thank you for reminding me.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. Any other comments on cash in lieu or can we move on to E-2?

Mr. Alueta: Just so that it can be, I guess, relatively productive that we can get it done, is like just a decision on, you know, the methodology in which this board wants to move forward with, if it feels comfortable with. And then just a patience worth for those – justification for why that methodology should be selected over other or the one that the department has proposed. And then if you feel that the study is dated, you know, and you want us to go out, then we need to know that too if that's your recommendation. Again, this body is not required to review the cash in lieu. It's just we prefer to have you, if you would, and then the department –. I think the department takes all your comments seriously so I don't think we're going to try to purposely act against contrary to what your recommendations are. But we'll let you know if we have problems, but I think this board is pretty good about staying on focus. Thank you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: So Chair, I have a comment about what Joe had said, I guess, I wanted to –. When we reviewed the cash in lieu the first time, I guess, we realized based on HRS and whatever that we needed, the needs assessments, that sort of question was asked – this one that was done back in 2000 – fine. Joe just brought up the fact which I agree that based on – well, in the study, it incorporated the existing users, the projects that were going to be online. Betsill's, which is coming online. Jonathan Starr, I think 75 lots which is not. Ron Kawahara, I think 13 to 16 which is not yet. I think the promenade was included in that. So from my standpoint, if you look at when that study was done and based on that, we have PC-1, 384 stalls and there's no other projects that we know running through the books right now. For me, this seems fine, and that's the decision we should make before we get into the next stage because that's a requirement before we talk about cash in lieu is we have a needs assessment. So, for me, we have to deal with that question first. So my personal opinion is based on what it was said for future projects, only one that's coming online now, there's still potential other stalls if the project like Jonathan Starr, he doesn't have any plan, or Ron, he's stuck on the master lease, it's good. So that was my comment. We should proceed based on that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, and I agree. I think that falls inline with what Joe just said that

we need to be prepared in the ordinance for justifications to the Council. So if we agree as a body that the needs assessment – even in light of the new economic situation – is still valid then that's our justification for the ordinance.

Mr. Horcajo: So do we agree now or are we saying we're going to bring up this question again in the future?

Mr. Suzuki: Bring it up.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would – yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: It's not going to be all the detail.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would rather us finish our endeavor going line by line through it, and we're only half way through. So when we get through the whole thing, then we'll revisit that.

Mr. Horcajo: So, my only suggestion for us, for staff, then is when we come back to the needs assessment that we really understand how that was analyzed, specifically these projects that was taken into account, so we can say, okay, this is this and then they can also bring up potential projects that are – we know are coming online and look at both of those and decide whether it's –

Ms. Betts Basinger: And not only that – the development of satellite parking and other things may also impact the need – you know the needs in a structure for how many? – so there's a lot.

Ms. Wade: Perhaps I can make a suggestion. What we gave you for the needs assessments was the series of studies not packaged as one document.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Ms. Wade: But that compiles basically the needs assessment. So maybe for your next agenda, the August 28<sup>th</sup>, we can have that compiled as a single document, send out, so for discussion by your September meeting, you can have read through it thoroughly and be able to comment on whether or not you that it's adequate or if there's like a couple of pages that needs updating or something.

Mr. Horcajo: Oh good. You know what? You just refreshed my memory.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I think we did –

Mr. Horcajo: It talked about an engineering firm and somebody who does the need assessment, so that was the other question. That's right because I asked you the question. Even by you doing that, does that really comply with the law because the law specifically, I think it says civil engineer and something, so I believe our Counsel kind of insinuated it's coming out Planning, it's probably not even though you are going to be doing what you're saying that you're doing.

Ms. Wade: But the studies actually Planning didn't do. We hired them out.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Wade: So we'll coordinate.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And we'll address that when we –

Mr. Horcajo: It's been a while.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I know. I forgot about cash in lieu. Any other comments on cash in lieu? We're just looking forward to doing the second half line by line. Onto MRA expenditures and budget update, which I guess we don't have one.

Ms. Wade: Right, I don't have any changes to the budget. We haven't spent any money. We certainly have identified a lot of ways that I can spend your money. So the market analysis quote that I have right now is \$79,000. So what I'll do is get you the scope for the next meeting and we can discuss how much of that we would like to do and where else to seek some funds and go from there.

**F. NEXT MEETING DATE: Regular Meeting on August 28, 2009**

Ms. Betts Basinger: So our next meeting date, August 28<sup>th</sup>, and on that agenda will be –

Ms. Wade: Shoot, I should have brought it with me. At this point, I don't have an agenda item for you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, you'll email all of us?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

**G. ADJOURNMENT**



Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. Any other comments from members? If not, this special meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much!

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

LEILANI A. RAMORAN-QUEMADO  
SECRETARY TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS I

## **RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

### **Members Present:**

Alexa Betts Basinger, Chairperson  
Robert Horcajo, Vice-Chairperson  
Katharine Popenuk (from 2:35 p.m. to 2:41 p.m.)  
Warren Suzuki

### **Excused:**

Raymond Phillips

### **Others:**

Joseph Alueta, Administrative Planning Officer  
Erin Wade, Small Town Planner  
James Giroux, Deputy, Corporation Counsel