

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
SPECIAL MEETING
APRIL 29, 2010**

APPROVED 06-18-2010

A. CALL TO ORDER

The special meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Mr. Robert Horcajo, at 1:30 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Island of Maui.

Mr. Robert Horcajo: Chair calls the meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency to order, April 29th, 1:30 p.m. With us today are all the Commissioners. Thank you very much. Katharine Popenuk, Vice-Chair; Warren Suzuki, Alexa Basinger and Ray Phillips; our Counsel James Giroux; Erin Wade, Staff; and Leilani Ramoran.

B. 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. There will also be time for public testimony during each agenda item.

Mr. Horcajo: Sorry, scolded already. Item (B), Public Testimony. I would like to first say that we did receive a letter that we will accept as public testimony into the minutes. Now the Chair will open the floor to anybody who wants to submit public testimony on any item.

Mr. Richard Dan: Is there any way I can get a copy of the letter you talked about?

Ms. Jocelyn Perreira: That's not for public consumption. That's for you.

Mr. Horcajo: Hang on a second. We'll talk about that. So again please identify yourself, who you represent, if any.

Ms. Perreira: My name is Jocelyn Perreira. I'm with the Wailuku Main Street Association/Tri-Isle Main Street Resource Center. I did give you folks some information from our Board of Directors. We are aware that somebody gave you a communication that we totally – the unanimous comment of the board is considered the source. Our contributions has been well documented over the vast many years. Our connection to the MRA, our public partnership, has been gone through. We have – we have submitted to audits and everything else, and our organization is verifiably an entity that represents a segment of this community. We have at long advocated for it. We will continue to advocate for the community that we represent. And we bring along with us very much professional expertise in every single kind of career path that you may wish to entertain,

APPROVED 06-18-2010

so thank you. And we are of the understanding when somebody submits something in writing, it's not necessary a part of the minutes. The verbal testimony, of course, is part of the minutes. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Excuse me, Counsel, the question was asked from the audience whether this written letter can be gotten. Your response.

Mr. James Giroux: As far as your rules state it that anything on the agenda you are to receive written and/or oral testimony. Once that is entered into the record, it is public record, so the public can have access to it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any other public testimony? Can you give Mr. Richard Dan a copy of that?

Mr. Dan: My name is Richard Dan. I met with Brad Segal about a week or two ago, when he was in town. And he says to me – sorry – he says to me, Richard you should have shut off your phone. He says to me that he can get close to 50 new parking spots out of the existing parking lot that we have back up there. And I say, well that's fantastic. He says to me, he's going to come by the next time with his line drawer guy, his architect guy, and – to show us how to do it. So I go ahead, I hear this, I pick up the phone, I call up Erin, and she says to me that Bob Horcajo has got an existing plan for the parking lot also. I say, that's interesting, what's going on. So I pick up the phone, I call up Milton Arakawa. So I say, Milton, can this parking lot get more parking spots? He says –

Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger: Excuse me Chair? I'm curious as to what agenda item this testimony relates to.

Mr. Dan: It's public testimony, I can talk about anything I want.

Mr. Horcajo: Let me ask Counsel. As far as I remember from last time, if somebody wants to testify about anything, they can. We don't necessarily have to talk about it.

Mr. Dan: Right. I'm just bringing you guys a heads up.

Mr. Giroux: If it's not on the agenda, you can't continue to discuss it.

Mr. Horcajo: Right, but we can at least take their testimony.

Mr. Dan: You guys figure out where you want to go with this. I'm just telling you where I'm at. So I went ahead and I talked to Milton, and Milton says –. I say Milton, can we get more parking spots in the lot the way it is right now? He says well you have to go to County Council if you're going to change the hours, and you have to go the County Council

APPROVED 06-18-2010

if you're going to take out fixtures and things like that, like take out the flower pots. And I understand that about two or three years ago, on the behest of Doug McLeod and Stan Rippey, the County came in and relined the parking lot. It needed it and it wasn't a big thing. So I went ahead and I hired Chris Hart's firm after hearing this and I spoke to Bill Mitchell. And Bill Mitchell and I talked about this. And I said, what can we do that doesn't go ahead and start a County Council request and big thing? What can we do that's simple that can add us some parking spots into this parking lot right now? He said, all you've got to do is make the spots six-inches wider. He went out there, he measured it and he said, six inches narrower. If you narrow the spots six inches, it still falls within County Code and we can end up with six to eight more parking spots in that parking lot right now. Not tomorrow. Not six months from now. Now. Six to eight more parking spot after the County took away 23 parking spots. It's a big advantage. It's a step forward. And it doesn't seem like it's a big deal. The parking lot needs to be re-paved. And if they're going to re-pave it any way –

Ms. Ramoran: Three minutes.

Mr. Dan: What?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Three minutes.

Mr. Horcajo: Richard, can you conclude your testimony?

Mr. Dan: Sure. I think somehow you guys should get together with Milton, and have him re-pave the parking lot or reline the parking lot so we can leak out that six more parking spots that we can get one, two, three. Not a problem. That's it.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright. Thank you Mr. Dan. I see no other public testifiers, so if we can move onto agenda item (C) which is update of the Wailuku market base plan, I guess, Erin.

C. UPDATE ON THE WAILUKU MARKET-BASED PLAN

Ms. Erin Wade: I just wanted to share that the consultant team was in town last week and we had a whole series of task force meetings, or community meetings – some with individuals, some with focus groups and they all stirred up a lot of energy. You know, I think, basically there's been kind of forward steps going on throughout Wailuku for quite a long period of time, and now it looks like there's a whole lot of possibilities. And there's a lot of positive energy being generated, and a lot of anxiety as comes with any kind of change. So we're trying to keep up with people and their interest and ideas as best as we possibly can, and direct them to kind stay part of the overall general conversation of the group. So essentially the message from the consultant team as we're having several people kind of go off in tangents to pursue all different kinds of projects is, you know, the

APPROVED 06-18-2010

project is going to conclude in July. And at that point we will have final recommendations. So we're trying to organize so that in July when the recommendations are ready, we're ready to move forward right away. But right now they're just betting a lot of ideas with a lot of different people. So any way just the message to the community, I guess, is stick with us as we complete the project and come together with very organized program to move forward.

Mr. Horcajo: I would like to mention something. Erin and I were talking the other day that she's going to -- I guess how often should the MRA Newsletter go out. We had the Winter one come out in December. The intent is to do one for Spring, and this is still part of Spring. So in that Newsletter, I believe the intent was to update the community as to where we are in the market base plan process. As she said there's a lot of people. We're kind of gaining steam. So as much as we can relay that information to general public and ask for their patience, that's part of the intent of the March Newsletter. Any questions for Erin from any board member?

Ms. Wade: Public comment.

Mr. Horcajo: I'm sorry. I keep forgetting about. I should've done that first. Any public testimony on item (C), update on the Wailuku market base plan?

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association. I'm just happy to report that we're receiving very many surveys. There is an awful lot of interest, our membership, and people again that we advocate for have taken a real concerted interest and I think that's wonderful because we will have in addition to comments coming from the government sector. I think we're going to get good, you know, pockets of different kind of opinions that will actually -- it's going to be validating this process. I think it's a good process and I think everybody is hard at work. And I think when we see the recommendations from the group then there will be additional discussions I imagine. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Yes?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would like to say, regarding the survey, they reported back on what they had received thus far, all of which I think was on the electronic survey.

Ms. Wade: Correct.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. And I think it was 500 responses back then. In the interim, it's been on Facebook, in addition to being on the front page of the County website. So we're hoping that, you know, they consider it a qualified measurement when it gets over about 1,000, 1,100, 1,200, so we'll put out good thoughts and spreading the word like you did this morning is really good. To just let people know to go the County website.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other comment? Katharine?

Ms. Katharine Popenuk: I was wondering about –. I just asked some people in my office if they had heard anything about it. And everybody said “no.”

Ms. Betts Basinger: So you told them?

Ms. Popenuk: I did tell them, yeah, yeah. I was thinking by virtue of how we're publishing it, it's sort of, there's potentially a biased running. And I was thinking, is there some – can we get it in the Maui News or something like that so it's a broader spectrum of different kinds of individuals? Maybe they don't know me or don't work in my office, or your office – you know what I mean? Like sort of in with the County?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I believe the County did put out a press release about it, and I actually think there was something in the Maui News.

Mr. Horcajo: There was.

Mr. Dan: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Popenuk: Oh, good.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So it is getting broad attention.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Warren?

Mr. Warren Suzuki: I was just kind of wondering, you know, the point that Katharine raised about depending upon who responds to the survey might provide some sort of bias as far as the results. And, you know, my understanding is that when surveys are done, there's also a tracking made of demographics in trying to make adjustments, you know, based upon how the survey responses are received and what, you know, categories they fall in. Is that something that's going to be done, or are we just taking the gross numbers and just going with that?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Wade: Well because we're doing the online analysis, everything that's coming from online, we can actually evaluate based on their IP address. So we will know from where they took the survey, if they tried to take it more than once. It does shut you down if you try to take it more than twice, I saw. But it will determine if it was taken from a County computer, a State computer or a personal computer. So we will know all of those things and can break out the information based on those. And then on top of that, the survey itself asks about income, gender, where the person lives, and how long they've lived in that location. So we can correlate any number of the variable based on the demographic information.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Have you taken it yet Warren?

Mr. Horcajo: Ray, any questions? I would like to say that back in March 18th, we got an actual email from Erin I guess with a list of where the survey was going to be distributed electronically. Besides the County and the State, Maui Medical Group, Kaiser, the hospital, UH, Maui Arts & Cultural Center list serve, Wailuku Main Street, WCA, First Friday, and then hard copies in even as far as Valley Isle Credit Union in Kahului, CPB banks, so there's a broad reach. Aside again there was a press release from the County site and stuff.

Ms. Wade: I should clarify. The only one that didn't work for was Kaiser. They wouldn't let us use their company equipment for the distribution, so they do have some hard copies at the facility though.

Mr. Horcajo: I guess lastly too, I was asked by Teri Edmonds of WCA to speak at the rotary this morning, which I did. I was introduced by Alexa and we did both share the news of the survey for those who did not have it, left some hard copies, gave them the location of the site for them to do the survey. I already had a couple of calls already from the people, that morning, who had actually done the survey. So they have a big list of people too. Not just for Wailuku rotary, but the rest of them as well. So hopefully the word will spread so Erin can make more money. Okay?

Ms. Wade: The qualification of that is, I have a bet going with the PUMA consultants. I make zero money by those surveys.

D. EXPENDITURES AND BUDGET

- 1. Allocation of funds for 2010**
- 2. Prioritization of funds for 2011**
- 3. Communication with stakeholders and Council regarding budget**

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, moving on to item (D), expenditures and budget, item (1), allocation of

APPROVED 06-18-2010

funds of 2010. Is there anybody out there who want to provide public testimony on this agenda item? Okay, seeing none. Members, I'm happy to see that Erin gave you a big leger size of this, of what I call a spreadsheet. And again I did this a couple of weeks ago, just kind of putting all of my thoughts down. But I think what I want to do if it's okay with you folks is kind of just go down the job list real quickly to explain what it's for because there's some stuff that doesn't have to be on this as a real job. And then once we kind of eliminate the things that really do not apply and then we can get specific into based on what I believe we have left for 2010 where we want to allocate the funds. So if you don't mind, can I suggest if you can look here, you folks. If you can fold it like this so that this note section is just the next column after the job. That might be a good way just to quickly go through what these things mean, the jobs, and then start to eliminate the stuff that does not apply.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair, quick question.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Is this also what you've presented us also meant to be like a task list as well?

Mr. Horcajo: Yes.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So it's not just simply for budget. It's a task list, right?

Mr. Horcajo: No it's not. You know, my goal was to remind us that we have a big task list based on the WR – the actual plan – so we went through the strategic plan last year to prioritize all the tasks that are on that list, and that's on this list too. So now my intent is to go through this list that I presented and ask you folks if you have stuff we can add to this before we then prioritize based on what I think we have for our 2010 where we want to allocate our funds if that's okay.

So public, I think you have copies of this as well. So real quickly then, banners, last month as you know the Malama Wailuku came forth and got approval for 13 banners. We all realized that it did not include the banners, the four light standards, I guess between Wells and Main Street. And we had discussion that it would be nice if all the banners were, I guess, there were banners on all the poles included in the Market Street improvement project. They cannot get any more money through HDA so I know they're out there trying to get some private funds. So that is what this is for. If we chose to allocate some of our 2010 funds for the four light standards between Wells and Main.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: Yes?

Ms. Betts Basinger: An update on that from Yuki Lei was that in fact she was able to secure some additional funding, I believe from Bank of Hawaii and –

Mr. Horcajo: First Hawaiian.

Ms. Betts Basinger: First Hawaiian and she was waiting to hear back her contact from Bank of Hawaii. So that amount is yet to be determined.

Mr. Horcajo: Correct. Right. Okay branding of Wailuku, I think we know what that is. We talked about that last meeting and that's going to be a couple of month process probably. Cash in lieu ordinance, again, that's part of our BCT-10. We know we've already vetted the process. We're just waiting for it to go to Council. It's really more a planning function, but at the same time it is a task list. I don't think we're going to have to spend money for that, but, again, it's on this list here. Community display board – I put this on –

Mr. Joseph Alueta: I'm sorry Mr. Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Excuse me?

Mr. Alueta: Sorry. On that item, the primary hold up I guess was –. So you are –. I take it you're supportive of the cash in lieu?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, we're supporting it to get to the proper hearing process. Yes.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, it's my understanding that that as well as the branding of Wailuku we're holding off till we get the PUMA plan which would have recommendations. So, although they are task lists, they're not things that we're going to do prior to the PUMA studies.

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead Erin.

Ms. Wade: Just to clarify. The PUMA study will identify the demand for parking in the downtown which will help us for the needs assessment required to go to Council. So that's piece one we're waiting for. Piece two is the construction cost and the determination of how the fee would be calculated. So once we have that, we're ready to move forward. We can even move forward if we have a general idea about the fee as long as we've identified the process by which that would be build.

Mr. Horcajo: Joe, did we answer your question? Excuse me.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Alueta: No because –. I mean, I don't want to sound testy but the thing is primarily the hold up for this is not the studies. It's part of it, but it was primarily the function of when the last we came here was this board did not know which way they wanted to go. And I, the department, ended up trying to defend or advocate I guess for the cash in lieu and tried to in stone why we thought it was an important, politically, why we thought it was important. And also financially why we thought it was important. And the numbers as far as the cash in lieu, to me, is irrelevant because it's determined on whether or not you're going to have – it's going to be based on a percentage. Nationwide, that's where the numbers signifies where each person would pay, the cash in lieu would be 55% of the actual construction cost. But this board, at the time, was adamant that one, the cost never goes above \$5,000, no there shouldn't be a cost, and it became a very sticky wicked I guess, and it put me in a very uncomfortable position. And now, I definitely don't want to think that somehow the Department or me in particular is holding up on cash in lieu when that was never the case.

Mr. Horcajo: No.

Mr. Alueta: We've had a draft bill and we were ready to go and actually send it up. I just want to make sure that we –

Mr. Horcajo: No. What I again –. We all know that the cash in lieu ordinance was drafted back in 2002 by John Summers. The MRA maybe, might, have looked at a long time ago, but last year this body did have two special meetings to go over the 2002 draft, made our comments known, and again, that was actually – you might have already been out of here and maybe Erin was here then. So, yeah, basically we had already gone through that, made our comments known, and as far we knew, we were waiting for the appropriate time for it to be presented to the Council on the floor. So we are in support of it. There were no numbers as far as the fee because that is really is not there yet. But as far as the language in that cash in lieu draft ordinance, we had already vetted that last year.

Mr. Alueta: Okay. And what did you come up with? I guess I mis-communicated internally but I'm like – so are you in agreement with the 55% regardless?

Ms. Betts Basinger: No. We should have a comment.

Mr. Alueta: So what was the comments? Basically, the way it would work is we were trying to hold a public hearing with this board.

Ms. Wade: We did.

Mr. Alueta: Get your comments to it. As to whether the department agreed with those comments, right, and incorporated it into the draft legislation was debatable because we would decide. So if you had a disagreement, it doesn't make any sense or it's very difficult

APPROVED 06-18-2010

for us, we respect this board and we respect your comments. And so if we go up there with two different – meaning you have your own proposal, and the department has a proposal, it sends a very confusing message to the County Council. And that is why we held off on trying to push the ordinance up to Council without a clear consensus by this board.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: Maybe just to offer some clarification Chair. My understanding, Joe, is that we went through the draft ordinance, and we provided our comments and we made certain amendments to it. We got to the point where we would start to talk about, you know, how we're going to assess, if we're going to assess individuals, you know, for the parking. The real crux of the cash in lieu ordinance. And we seek some advice from Corporation Counsel in terms of, you know, how we might go about doing it. And the advice of Corporation Counsel was, you know, one thing we need to have as far as before us is the needs assessment. Because without the needs assessment, really, we wouldn't be able to put forward an ordinance to the Council because there's no real justification to having that ordinance. And we talked about the market base study, we talked about different things, and we just wanted to have in front of us all the documentation that we felt that we needed in order to do a proper evaluation on the number of stalls required, what's the demand for the stalls, and figure out from there – and the cost involved – and figure out from there, you know, what might be the logical way of coming up with a cost, you know, for each of the stalls that would be provided, you know, for let's say a commercial operator in lieu of them providing a stall. So, you know, we're at the point where that that's the area that we need to kind of touch on, but we don't have all the information before us as yet in order to have that discussion. So it's not as if we're going to go forward with a proposal that might be contrary to what the department is saying. At this point, we don't know yet really what our position is relative to what we're looking as part of the cash in lieu.

Mr. Horcajo: So Joe maybe – excuse me.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair, and also maybe we should get into the habit of I know this body elected to call it a parking assessment fee ordinance rather than cash in lieu.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So, Joe, I guess maybe your confusion is that I had said what I guess maybe misquoted was that we're kind of waiting for it to be submitted to Council. But it sounds like, as Warren reminded me personally, is that until we get, you know, the needs assessment, and then we, with the Planning Department, can determine potentially what that fee will be because what we had reviewed had nothing to do with the fee. It just says that there is a fee. So we should bet the rest of it like what that fee should be with the Planning Department before it goes up to Council. Is that what we're talking about?

Mr. Alueta: Yeah, and that's where we were last left. And again, I respect that that you

APPROVED 06-18-2010

guys want to wait for it. I guess it's just a different perception in philosophy. You want to wait for this study that kind of dials in how much is going to be the fee. Whereas from our philosophical stand point, it doesn't matter what the final number is because it's just more of are you going to charge a fee and it should be, and it would be a percentage. But I see where you're trying to get it down because you actually want to know what the actual number is going to be. Whereas to me it's a non-emotional thing. Numbers, real dollars, makes it emotional. Whereas, if you say, look it costs this much, it doesn't matter whether it costs \$15,000 or \$20,000 per stall, you're going to pay a percentage. But you want to know the actual dollar amount, and somehow that dollar amount could change your perception of how the fees are going to be done. Whereas I'm more looking at it as a straightforward. It's a percentage. The rest of it is being covered by the rest of the tax payers. And businesses are being asked to cover a certain percentage.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Joe, it's also my recollection that this body was looking at a parking assessment fee to be part of a multiple basket of tools that a developer might take advantage of including a tax abatement. So it's certainly not the sole thing that the municipal parking is depending on as a source of funding for the structure. That it would just be one part for the builder or the developer.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. I want to ask Erin. So what's your opinion of what Joe is saying that whether we – I thought we were heading this path waiting the needs assessment to come with a dollar. Joe is saying, you know, that's really not necessary now for the purpose of vetting the ordinance if it's a percentage. What did we – why did we head down that path, I guess?

Ms. Wade: Well, his point is accurate. I mean if you feel that – and if research indicates that 55% of the price of construction of a stall is a standard, and so whatever that cost might be, that's what you would expect the developer to pay. That's one route you can easily go. You know, it allows us to complete the ordinance. Then all we have to do is worry about the needs assessment and then we can move forward. If you've got concern about that total dollar amount because that doesn't give us any control of what the total dollar amount is, but then again, you know, there is a price to all construction. So you folks need to weigh that.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, I'm going take a quick thing, I'm going to suggest we move on to the budget because it's an issue we can bring up next month or something.

Mr. Raymond Phillips: Just one item. We have two variables unfortunately. The first variable is how many developers are going to have to show up. Second variable is how many parking spaces you're going to need to have, so no offense. I'm sort of in the ball park with the Planning Department – all the 55%. No comment. Just a number.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: It's my memory that it was a legal issue. In order to draft a legal document, a law or whatever it is –

Ms. Wade: For the needs assessment.

Ms. Popenuk: The State Statute said we must have the justification.

Mr. Horcajo: Right, but that's a separate issue.

Ms. Wade: Well, the issue is it's an impact fee, right? It's an impact fee to charge for the provision of parking. And so you have to provide the needs assessment, which is why we're waiting for PUMA. But the number, the dollar amount, PUMA is not going to tell us what that dollar amount is. We have to have design drawings, and construction costs to know what the dollar amount per stall is going to be. So by the time we're done with PUMA we're still not going to know what that money, what that cost is going to be. We have to get all the way through the construction design to know what that cost is going to be.

Mr. Giroux: Just to comment. I mean, I think Joe is picking up on something that's –. You know, when we originally commented on it, Corporation Counsel's major thing was that there wasn't any study whatsoever, and nobody was even looking at doing a study. And so, you know, our red light was that. We were like throw the brakes guys. Let's get this duck in order. I mean, we can't just get it up to Council, and they're going to ask us, do you guys have needs assessment anywhere? That's what we were afraid of. So I think what Joe is saying is you guys are getting your ducks in order. If you come up with an ordinance, and within that ordinance, it says we will refer to the budget or we'll refer to another ordinance in order to solidify our dollar amount, then maybe we can start progressing, you know, in that direction, if that's the will of the body to move forward. Because what usually happens in ordinances is that you have an ordinance that establishes we shall do something. And within that, it says we shall do it in accordance to what the budget says we're going to do.

And so you have two ordinances. You have an ordinance that says you're going to do it, and then you have a flexible ordinance that continually is modified through the years. Every year the Council comes up and says, well – like Parks – your park fee. Your park fee, there's an ordinance that says every developer when they subdivide shall pay a park fee in accordance to the budget, the yearly budget. And then every year the Council says, or the Parks Department comes up and says we did a study, we need this many parks, it's going to cost this much, and we feel that the fee should be raised to this much per unit. And so the Council, every year, updates theirs. And so the developer, at least they know there is fee. They're going to try to calculate that into their project but they've got to wait

APPROVED 06-18-2010

for the budget to come out, and the budget will say, okay, here it is. And you know, I mean, you've been hearing it from developers. Hey, the park's fees are crazy. We can't afford that. Blah, blah, blah. But, hey, there's a study, and the study says this is how many parks Maui County needs, this is what it's going to cost, and if you want to subdivide, this is what it's going to cost. So there is a type of certainty, and that's the whole reason of the State law is they want these impacts to be addressed. They want it scientifically addressed. They know that there's not going to be absolute certainty, but they want the flexibility for the government to at least point to a study and say well we did think about doing a study, we actually did a study, and this is what that study did for that year. And if the government wants to change that amount, they've got to go back and address that scientific issue. So, I hope that brings some clarity.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair? Before we leave this topic, I know that this body worked diligently line by line on updating the language in that ordinance. And if we could see a draft of where we are because perhaps we're at a point where all we need to do is plug in some things when the needs assessment is delivered, et cetera, et cetera. I would like to see a final draft.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, yes, I'm going to bring it up on a future agenda. Our purpose today is budget really so I don't want to debate every one of these issues. It's just more of quick education because a lot of this has nothing to 2010. I just wanted us to all look at the big picture – 2011, 2012, 2013 – all these tasks that we're suppose to be doing based on the WRP. So I'll just go over really quickly.

The community display board, I just added that in. We had, maybe, a discussion a couple of months ago about using when the Police Department was talking about not using the police resource center. There was some discussion about putting up some kind of board there. Crosswalk improvements, when we went through the strategic plan, it was one of the items identified that we move up on the job list. It might have been from, whatever, two to five years, we moved it up to one to two. Curb and gutters maintenance, we already have that right now with Teens On Call. Design review, I've actually axed that out. It's basically – I put in parenthesis as part of the manager's salary if we have a manager. But that's really for the Planning, the actual Planning Department's job, so technically I don't think this should be here. Easement from Main Street acquire. This is certainly not a 2010 budget item, but I think we all know what that is, BC-3, access to the parking lot from Main Street.

Entertainment district plan. I wrote that in there because it's part of the discussion item through the PUMA program so I don't want to get into too much now. That's at least a 2011 budget item or maybe longer. But again, we're going to wait for the PUMA report to discuss that at some future meeting. Grant writing, I'm going to suggest it not be here. If you look to the right, I put part of manager's salary. We had put that if when we have a

APPROVED 06-18-2010

manager who's got some grant writing skills, that might be appropriate. But I also noted below that, grant writing consultants. We could certainly, I believe, chose to go out and advertise for grant writing consultants of which we would be paying them a management fee. And whether that's for capital improvement projects, constructions, you know, there's a whole bunch of different funding sources. Iao parking lot, county management, and I put to the right part of manager's salary, so what I had suggested a while back is that we could, for example, maybe at some point in time start to take over some parking structures, county owned, and so that would be part of the manager's salary. So I'm going to suggest this. These doesn't have to be on this job list, I guess.

Land acquisitions. We've talked a couple times about the potential of buying or needing to buy even satellite parking stalls beyond -. I mean, we need potential parking sites besides the parking lot itself, the parking structure, so that's, of course, obviously pertains to lease of temporary parking lots.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Ms. Betts Basinger: On land acquisition, would you be referring to leasing and is this for construction or beyond construction?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, for me, I'm looking at it beyond construction. And frankly, part of that could be part of, further down, parking management plan because we would be talking with, you know, temp parking. But we also could be talking long term parking like future satellite, permanent satellite parking stalls. But, also, it talks about satellite parking parks open space. I mean, who is to say the County may not want to buy the Banyan Tree park lot because it's potentially for sale as an open space. And again leasing, I put here during construction phase. But, this, I would imagine, you folks, Erin, will probably be part of the parking management plan. Does that make sense? So we'll eliminate that here. Liaison with County, I'm going to eliminate, probably, unless you folks say no. Liaison with landowners because that's part of the manager's role. Litter program, we already spent money for Teens On Call in this case, so that will continue to be a job until we say otherwise. We talked about the manager. I just put on the right, note, part-time initially. Market base plan, we undoubtedly have encumbered already out of our budget \$10,000 plus another \$10,265. So we'll talk about that later. Mini park improvements, managements, similar to the Iao Theater parking lot, I brought up the suggestion before, we could potentially start to manage that, mini park, although it's only temporary, just as a start of our management role as the MRA.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair? Quick question on that to Erin. Is the PUMA study addressing – will they have recommendations for those potential green space at Iao Theater where the

APPROVED 06-18-2010

parking is now?

Ms. Wade: They asked me what the planned use was, and I gave them the mini park design, and they just thought that that was perfect. So I don't think they're going to re-think something that's already be thought through. You know, if they just see it, it looks good, they might just acknowledge good work, find the money to build it basically.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, next item, municipal lot re-striping diagonal. I put in the notes here, when we went through the strategic plan we had identified that as one of our next items. I was mistaken, I wrote under here \$25,000 under Department of Public Works 2011 budget. It is not there, okay. So if we chose to spend money, 2010 -2011 budget, if we choose, it's going to come out our budget at this point in time. We'll talk about that further in relation to Richard Dan's comment as well. Municipal parking lot manager, we've already been paying out of this years budget. It's three years already, right?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: In this case Nishikawa, so we know what that is. I'm going to suggest that the parking district, the parking meter purchase, is all really combined as the parking management plan, BCT-7, BCT-10; and including parking meter purchases.

Printing miscellaneous, minor. Public property improvements, we've already spent money in this year's budget for trash can replacement and repair. Rental of office space, undoubtedly, we don't have any for 2010, but at some point in time, 2011-2012, that may be a budget item. Resource Center improvements, we still don't know what's going to happen with the police officers, but Erin had mentioned to me the need potentially for a lockable storage area for the MRA, and for maybe some other things. So Erin can talk about this when we get into specific to 2010 budget items because it may not cost a whole bunch for us to spend some money there. The TIF financing ordinance, we know what that is. We've talked about it. Not much we can probably do with 2010, but that's on this long range budget spreadsheet here. Vehicle and pedestrian circulation plan, VPC-8, again, something we brought up in updating the strategic plan. Vineyard Street improvements, I put on the note here, 2011 concept plan, 2012 construction plans, 2013 improvements, so I'm suggesting that that's probably where we're going to be spending money. In the WRP, if I'm not mistaken, Vineyard Street was suppose to be the next street to be improved after Market Street. And especially with the County municipal parking lot being improved, we probably need to start looking at that street sooner than later. And I think that might be one of the place that we can maybe take some of our 2010 money to start that process.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That would be a multi-department collaboration, correct?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: Yes, definitely, yeah. Website, we already, of course, know what that is. WRA design guidelines review, we've already done, of course, we did part of that work last year on the WRP, and the design guidelines, I guess, a couple of years ago, that was update right? I just put that in there realize that maybe in future years, we're going to be updating that. And also Alexa brought up in an e-mail maybe a couple of weeks ago about spending some money printing to update our, maybe the website on the changes we made to the WRP. Okay, I have a couple of more things that I wanted to add on this list, but I want to ask members if you have – I don't know when you adopt this – but any other potential jobs or tasks that we want to add to this list before we get into specific of where we could want to spend the \$22,000 -\$23,000 we have left for 2010.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think you've done a really good job of taking from our strategic plans and our priorities. There are some comments I'll make that, on some items, later that I think are post the PUMA study, and definitely not going to be part of our 2010 remaining funds.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright. Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: So Chair, how much money do we have remaining in the 2010 budget?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Did you get that?

Mr. Horcajo: As far as I know – is it \$23,000?

Ms. Wade: This is actually not totally up to date. We still have a little money that's going to be coming out for Teens On Call, and then we also have the \$10,000 that was allocated towards the PUMA study, \$10,600 something. It doesn't show up here yet because the grant category hadn't been created at the time this was printed. And this was done for our last meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: I think if you look at my spreadsheet under 2010, minus the \$1,000, I feel pretty confident that this is accurate, so really we've used or allocated \$65,852. I've taken everything from this budget, including what's not here, like the \$10,265 that we allocated to PUMA a couple of meetings ago.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And Chair, just to remind members that the \$40,000 taken out of our budget for the parking lot coordinator contract is still kind of up in the air because they haven't billed that much. And our agreement with the Planning Department was that we would pay half of that amount, up to \$40,000. And it's my understanding that they have billed us just for – is it \$15,000?

Ms. Wade: That was last month, \$15,300.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, up to last month, they had only billed \$15,000 in total, so that, I think, is something we should urgently try to clear up.

Mr. Suzuki: So Chair, how much do we have?

Mr. Horcajo: Are far as – and Joe or Erin maybe you can fill in – as far as I'm concerned, what we have is, in respect of what is actually been spent, the allocation was there, \$40,000 from our 2010 budget. So we have roughly spent \$65,000 out a \$90,000 budget.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, that leaves \$23,147.10.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (Inaudible.)

Mr. Horcajo: Wait, I'm going to say something, then I'll ask. I guess, any other comments or additions because I do want to add a couple of more things that we've talked about one in particular to this list here. One is I'm going to call it a re-org study. We've talked various meetings now, at least since I've been here for a couple of years, about strengthening the MRA. And the range is from what we have now to the HCD on Oahu that has more than what we'll ever get to, to something that Alexa brought up maybe at the last meeting or maybe the meeting before about even starting to look at adding public director, just something that is actually part of our actual board and increasing the board size. The question – so the options for us I feel is we either try to ask the questions ourselves, you know, plug along at it, or maybe consider hiring a consultant who understands the process. Because we're talking about Charter change, ordinance change, a whole bunch of other stuff, and then that consultant can give us the options, well, this is option one, two, three or four. Whether it be semi-autonomous like the Board of Water Supply use to be, or Liquor Control autonomous, or something in between. So that is one item I want to kind of suggest. And if we end up with just a little more money, I'm going to suggest another bricks and mortar item. I'm going to call Taste of Wailuku. Part of our WRP talks about our job to encourage activities on the street, so, you know, that's one option we can talk about that. So I'm going to suggest we add those two things.

Ms. Betts Basinger: You mean like an event? A signature event?

Mr. Horcajo: Like an event. A signature event.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so that makes sense so far? We've gone through this list here. We've eliminated six or seven of them that are not really not necessarily a job. It's more part of what a manager would be doing, and combined a few with the parking management plan.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Suzuki: So Mr. Chair, question. So, in looking at – can we start looking at numbers for 2010 now?

Mr. Horcajo: Yes. So, but let me say one thing first. In the 2010 line right there, the only items that we have not appropriated yet is the \$600 for the banners, Malama Wailuku, the very top line, and the very bottom one, the \$400 for, this was for printing costs based on our email from Alexa about a month ago. Everything else is within this budget from the Planning Department staff. You folks mind if I get a quick public testimony first?

Mr. Suzuki: Can I ask a quick question first?

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: So in the case of the litter program, we're only going to spend \$1,900?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, that's all we've spent so far.

Mr. Suzuki: But that's what we're going to be spending going forward?

Ms. Betts Basinger: No, it goes way up the next year.

Ms. Wade: No. If you – actually if you look at the budget, this, everything that shows in blue we spent, we carried over from last year because we knew, we had a contract with Teens On Call, so those were the actual costs. If you look under professional services, Teens On Call, those were the actual costs spent this year. But we carried money over from last year because we already had a dedicated contract for that service. So that \$1,900 only represents our most recent payment to Teens On Call. It doesn't represent a full years worth of trash collection.

Mr. Suzuki: I guess the question I have is that – and going back to the question I asked about how much money do we have left remaining that we actually might be able to use for new projects. That's not really the case because the \$1,900 is going to be significantly more than what we have here.

Ms. Wade: Well, the \$1,900 is about what it's going to take to get us through the end of June. So that's correct.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, I misunderstood your question.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, Jocelyn, did you want to offer public testimony? Because we're going

APPROVED 06-18-2010

to deliberate after this

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association. The first thing I'd like to note on this list that you have is where you're calling the second item the branding of Wailuku is not really the branding of Wailuku, it's the branding the MRA area because Wailuku – and so you need to note that because Wailuku is a much broader area.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. That's fine.

Ms. Perreira: So that we do not have confusion, we need to make that very clear.

Mr. Horcajo: We're going to say branding of WRA.

Ms. Perreira: Okay. WRA. Thank you. Then a point of clarification, did you say re-org study?

Mr. Horcajo: Re-organization.

Ms. Perreira: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: I just say re-org study. Yeah.

Ms. Perreira: Re-organization study. I guess we would like to have more details in what you are envisioning or what you're thinking because I'm sure we would like to have, provide comment to that, and I would request that on behalf of our organization. And then of course, you have design review. That's the area that the public/private partnership that we participate most heavily with you. It's something that we see as one of your necessary things to do. I think we're going to have more and more as Wailuku expands. You're going to have both new and rehabilitated projects, so I think that's a really important area. I think what you might want to consider on this is somehow circulating or allotting funding so that you can have the property owners aware of the rules and regulations because people seem to forget. And sometimes people, the businesses are managed by, you know, property manager or a manager, a business manager on site, and they just have an assumption that they can do anything they want. And I think it's really good that the MRA remind them, and that they have something, hard copy, you know because not everybody has and can go online. And sometimes they forget. Their projects –. In fact, Alexa and I were just talking about a new proposed business that wants to come in. And they go ahead and they're not aware of the places they can go to get the resources for assistance. You know, I think that's really important that something is readily available that way. So that would be my only thing that I think we would like to see you try to allot some money to that because the Maui Redevelopment Agency is not primarily for marketing of Wailuku. It's more a regulatory agency. And I think our expectation is to see it with some of the brick and mortar

APPROVED 06-18-2010

projects, so on and so forth. Although we are not supportive of a signature event, that's a good idea as well. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any questions for the testifier? I do want to mention something regarding what Jocelyn had just talked about. You know, as to, we've had this discussion at this board before about the confusion that applicants have when they come before us first, and get a waiver and then go to the County Department's Planning and Public Works and get what they consider – or they're kind of lost. They thought going through us was kind of the end of the process but realizing it's really not the end of the process. So I will bring it up at some future meeting. We're talking about a little inter agency discussions about how we can improve the process. Whether we really act more like the BVA. Whether they go to the County process first and then come to us if there is any issues. But also at a minimum using the KIVA system that they have up there to tag if the property is within the WRA as they do now if it's in an archaeological sensitive site. And we have a separate sheet up there that talks about, you know, if you are within the WRA then this kind of check list to include talking with Erin. So it makes sense for us as well that we just want to increase the efficiency of our job here, as well as lessen, you know, the actual burden of the public applying for projects. So we are working towards that.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (Inaudible. Did not speak into the microphone) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: Exactly. Yeah. Okay. Thank you for your testimony.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Yes?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think that would be on your re-org. When you look at re-organization, I think that would be one of the items to clarify the roles that they should be going to Erin if it's in this area. And I would suggest that that be a function of the manager.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Wait, one quick thing. So, we have \$23,000, did you say?

Ms. Wade: \$23,147.

Mr. Horcajo: Do we agree or disagree Joe?

Mr. Alueta: Pardon?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: \$23,147.

Mr. Alueta: I'm assuming that's it. You've encumbered. As far as the contract with Nishikawa Architects, you've – the money is encumbered once we encumber it through a contract amendment, and that's been done regardless of what they bill us. It's just that we've encumbered it.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. Exactly. Warren?

Ms. Betts Basinger: So what does that mean?

Mr. Alueta: It means we've spent it out of your budget.

Mr. Suzuki: It's gone from the budget.

Mr. Alueta: It's gone from the budget.

Mr. Horcajo: It's gone.

Mr. Suzuki: Even if it hasn't been paid to Nishikawa, as far as our budget is concerned, it's encumbered and it will be spent.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And where did it go?

Mr. Suzuki: It's just sitting there.

Mr. Horcajo: Waiting to be paid.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So it will be paid out in 2011, or 2010.

Ms. Wade: Or whenever it's billed.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: So a question. Vehicle and pedestrian circulation plan, you know, my recollection we kind of talked about this at one time. And isn't this something that we're going to try and do?

Ms. Wade: Uh-huh.

Mr. Suzuki: But we haven't initiated any actions on this yet?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Wade: This was something we also wanted to tie in with the EA for the parking structure because we figured whatever recommendations are going to come with the development of the parking structure and the design, and getting to and from it, that whomever is doing the traffic study and pedestrian circulation study, we would like to basically tag on from there with that consultant and go okay, now we need a plan for improvements, in addition to the evaluation of what's the impact is going to be and what is our circulation. You know, can we now request for a plan to improve any connections and circulations within the area? The RFP for the EA is only just starting to go out so, but we should organize. If that's something you folks would like to move forward with, then we should organize to also do an RFP for the plan.

Mr. Horcajo: Maybe if I can start the process. We still have a list of 20 items here even after we deleted five or ten. I guess I'm going to give you my opinion I guess as to where we may want to look at spending the money. I had asked for 2010 budget, I'd asked Erin to kind of maybe call and get some idea of actual costs and stuff. So my thought is this, I know, I guess, for me, I personally want to focus on probably mainly three big items but I don't know what the cost is. Anyway, one is the parking management plan. You know, we've had, we've heard Mr. Dan here today. We've heard Mr. Dan last week. We've heard Mr. Noble last week. Everybody seems to be talking about parking. We heard a little bit from – was PUMA here last month?

Ms. Wade: They were here February and last week.

Mr. Horcajo: At the meeting? Anyway, I guess but in the couple meetings I went to and hearing a little bit about the survey, the results of the survey so far the big issue is still parking, okay. So, and, parking management plan is undoubtedly is listed under two items in our BCT, BCT-7 and BCT-10, so for me that's one item we should, depending on what the cost is and whether we can truly appropriate the money by this fiscal year, that's something that we should look at. I also put in here municipal lot re-stripping diagonal. I had asked Katharine recently because we were talking about parking and stuff, and she alluded to the fact that she has designed a lot of parking stall in her business as an architect. In fact she came here today with a plan that was done by Waltery for diagonal parking. I didn't really take a good look at this yet. I didn't really look at numbers yet. So, it's an item I brought up even before I got to the MRA that we should try to think outside of the box. We have three more years before the building goes up. If we can somehow gain, whether Richard is correct in what PUMA says of 50 stalls or 20-30 stalls is probably worth it for us to see where we can gain stalls. It does need an ordinance. But again it's going to take, of course, money for somebody to revisit any potential designs to see whether it makes sense. And at some point in time, maybe 2011 budget, if we chose to go forward, get money out of our budget or find it someplace else. So that would be another, I think, a priority.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

The re-org study I would consider being the next top, or at least on the top three. Only because in the couple of meetings with PUMA, or during the PUMA meeting here, one of them we had was with Finance. And I asked Kalbert Young the same question I've asked other people including our Counsel here, you know, what happens if the County chooses to give us a parking lot to manage? The Lao Theater parking lot, the mini parking lot. Kalbert would love to give us the municipal parking lot today for us to manage. So my question to them, well, really can we take and can we do it? There's so many different answers, you know, that I would rather us find somebody who really understands what this all means and gives us the options so that if we can in 2011 or 2010 legally get the, if we so chose, to get any of the County properties to manage with a manager. So my point being, I really don't think we're ready for the manager yet. I want to focus on being sure that when we go, when we're ready to get a manager, we have all our ducks lined up as to the steps to be autonomous or semi-autonomous with the manager, and it's a no brainer during the 2012 budget process to the Council. That's kind of my thought process of these three things, and maybe some bricks and mortar minus off the banners mainly I guess because -. So I want to start your thinking there.

Mr. Suzuki: So Chair, just a clarification. So explain to me what would be involved in a parking management plan?

Mr. Horcajo: We're going to have our expert here do that.

Ms. Wade: Once we've got a sense of the demand which is what PUMA is going to give us, we could move forward to determine where the spaces are and where the premium spaces are. They're basically assigned values to all of your parking spaces within a defined district. And we can define the district however big we want, but I think the recommendations in past communities has been to look at on-street and off-street parking. And then to evaluate, in terms of management - are they paid? Are they free? What is the term to allow for those parking spaces? Do you allow permit systems? - all of those type of things. Do we allow any reserved spaces in public parking for any reason? So they would evaluate all of those things with the entire district in mind and to minimize the negative impact or additional creep into residential neighborhoods. Because the whole point is we don't want to assign a cost to a parking place only to impact the residential neighborhoods. They would test then the market and determine what people would be willing to pay and how could we then manage the parking better.

Mr. Suzuki: So how would that fold in with the EA and the parking plan? How would that -?

Ms. Wade: That's the trick. We've got a moving target. You know we have a situation before a parking structure and we'll have a situation after. So I think what we would want is -

Mr. Alueta: And during.

Ms. Wade: What's that?

Mr. Alueta: And during.

Ms. Wade: And during. So we would want an evaluation of existing and how to manage. And then the plan for during construction and then the plan for post construction, once we have the facility built.

Mr. Suzuki: Now, do we as the MRA have the jurisdiction to assign priority, assign reserved stalls for the areas within the MRA? We don't, right? Once we park it, we don't have any control, right?

Ms. Wade: Right. We have to – well, we'll have to go to Council with a recommendation to say we would like this both to charge a fee, to change the hours, or to do a reservation of a parking stall. We have to go the County Council. But, you know that your best chance of doing that is actually evaluating it comprehensively and having a district wide plan for that.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, next question. On the municipal lot re-striping, my recollection is when the parking lot was first built it was diagonal.

Mr. Alueta: I think so.

Ms. Wade: Really?

Mr. Suzuki: And the reason why they changed it to the way it is right now was to increase stalls. So I'm kind of, as an engineer, I'm the same with Katharine, I've designed parking lots before, and you pick up stalls by going with the type of striping they have right now. You lose when you go diagonal. And that's the reason why they went from diagonal to the perpendicular stall. So I'm kind of wondering why would we look to going diagonal when that's the way it was?

Mr. Alueta: I think – if I may Mr. Chair – is that everybody has looked at it, and from PUMA and from everyone else, is that one of the main things that needs to be done, it's more than just re-striping. We would remove the islands and reconfigure the island, and also narrow up the isles, the lanes, to make them one way because right now you have dual traffic, so that's the key issue. You've very limited on how you can re-stripe it because you have the islands. And you're right, it was diagonal. And if you look at some the isles where they straightened them out, they put in the white blocks or whatever where you create that pie shape that use to be there. And so I think that what we've looking at is potentially

APPROVED 06-18-2010

bulldozing the islands and creating maybe a whole new lane row of parking if we can get a one way traffic.

Mr. Horcajo: So, go ahead Ray.

Mr. Phillips: Well, if you have a one-way, if you have a one-way egress and ingress, parallel is obviously – I mean diagonal –

Mr. Alueta: Diagonal. Correct.

Mr. Horcajo: You know, and again, I really didn't know that it was diagonal, but you know I kind of –. I mean, I know for parallel parking you need a minimum of 20 feet between cars. For diagonal you need 12. You know, so, I kind of made this design a couple of years ago, showing everything is actually one way with 12 feet between the lanes and thinking and looking like you can gain another, you know, who knows, x-amount of stalls.

Mr. Suzuki: It's more than 12-feet though. It's 18 ½ I think.

Ms. Popenuk: You need adequate clearance to be able to back out without smacking the car behind you. In very general terms, if you have two-way lanes, 90 degree parking is usually – with the Waltery design, there's two options there. One is diagonal and one is 90 degree. You get more stalls from the 90 degree configuration. If you're going with the one-way traffic pattern, I don't really know how it works out.

Mr. Horcajo: I don't know either. You know, so, really I only brought it up as kind of a question as a potential, do we want to spend some money.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, but one thing that is true though is that maybe by re-stripping the stalls and making the stalls narrower, we're still allowed to do compact stalls in the WRA. And the WRA compact stalls are even smaller than a regular compact stall. It's seven foot, three-inches wide.

Mr. Phillips: You could crawl out the windows.

Ms. Popenuk: We don't care about that part.

Mr. Phillips: That's right. Who cares?

Ms. Popenuk: We just need another stall. So, yeah, re-stripping would probably generate some additional stalls just from that.

Mr. Horcajo: I just want to make mention to Warren's comment. You know, for me, we

APPROVED 06-18-2010

have to also consider that the parking – bite my tongue – but the parking structure may not happen. You know, as much as we can gain, look at the options from the parking management plan, you know, looking at satellite parking stalls – Central, High – you know that’s an issue. So, for me, that’s part of the parking management plan is looking at –

Mr. Suzuki: The reason I raised the comment is that the task is municipal lot re-striping diagonal.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, no, I’m sorry. That’s really the first thing.

Mr. Suzuki: I’m not sure it should be. I’m not sure if it should be specific to diagonal. I think municipal lot re-striping analysis.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: I see. I agree with you. Okay. Any other questions about anything?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, the only other thing I have on the re-org study, you know, I’ve been in the MRA for about a year or so, and I’m still not even close to where I need to be in terms of having an understanding of what is all involved. So I’m struggling as far as spending money to do a re-org study when I don’t know if we all know what’s all involved to begin with. And to think about you’re going to possibly change it when we don’t even know what’s involved, to me, would be very premature.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I agree with that conservative prospect, and I know that Erin is going to be scheduling an orientation which we do every year. It would have been nice if it was done at your first meeting, but didn’t we have a date?

Ms. Wade: I remember him being here because remember I did that power point?

Mr. Suzuki: I was here. But I still don’t have a real firm grasp for all that is involved.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. My suggestion was to have that be part of the scope of work the MRA coordinator who would always be here regularly defining. And it would be their task to really understand how we’re organized, what our powers are, what we have to do if we want to make a change here or there, or add more board members. So that’s that kind of knowledge that should reside somewhere that remains historic with the agency. So instead of calling it a re-org study, maybe it should just be part of the scope of work of the

manager or of the administrator.

Mr. Giroux: I don't want to take up too much of your time, but I just want to, you know –. My history on the board, I really, you know, I see that and I see that as an important element of what you guys are going to spend your time on because I mean as your counsel, you know, I'm asked these legal questions and I get into it. And I'm like, Oh. My. God. Wow. They didn't teach us this in law school. And if somebody came in and did a comprehensive look at this organization, it's powers, duties, codes, laws, I tell you could use that. You, this organization, could be tweaked just a little bit, and your powers could increase. I mean, just a little bit of leverage could increase your powers tremendously.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And knowing what we need to do, what the process is to do that, that's valuable information. And I know that it makes some of us reluctant in a way to vote looking forward because we don't have that clear definitive green light, if you will, if there's any other word.

Mr. Giroux: Again, so, I you don't want to stick to the word re-org. But organization, I think would be a good word because you may not want to change the nature of this organization. But in learning where you get your powers and how these powers are exercised throughout the County and how you could clarify these channels of power, that's going to help you guys a lot.

Mr. Horcajo: Ray, excuse me.

Mr. Phillips: You know, I seem to remember, I think Alexa was with – we were both on the board when we looked into this situation and we got a lot of push back from the administration. We had push back from the Council, or proposed that we were going to have push back from the Council. You know, we came to the same conclusion, we really don't understand our powers. We don't know how we're organized. And I think even the Planning Department, we had some push back from. So let's say that we did go about and we found out what our powers really are, and we go out there and we say, hey, this what we're really suppose to do. Do you think we're going to be acknowledged that this is capable? That we are capable of having these powers? Because I don't think anybody else understands them either.

Mr. Giroux: You know, you've got to understand that this board has been here for over 30-something years. And I think politically if you understand the history, if you understand the Charter, the County Code, the budget process, ordinance process – all of these things and how – it's a fine dance on how a board gets its powers. And to understand that if there is political support, your roles can be defined by the policy makers much more clearly in order to allow you to move more freely within the powers. The way I like to say it "impliedly have." I would rather see you explicitly have those.

Mr. Horcajo: Erin?

Ms. Wade: I just wanted to comment that evaluating all of the organizations that operate in downtown Wailuku is part of the scope of the Progressive Urban Management Associates, and they are going to be making some preliminary recommendations. They're not going to leave here until basically we've got a consensus of where everyone understands what their roles is and what their function is within Wailuku. So defining a scope for reorganization might be premature before we know what PUMA is going to suggest. But the other thing I would say is, you know, almost every State in the nation adopted an urban renewal law, and Hawaii isn't all that unique. It's very similar to a lot of the other State's enabling legislation for urban renewal, as is the legislation that gives you folks the power, the redevelopment agency. And the power really lies in efficiency. The whole goal of the MRA is maximized efficiency for redevelopment. So that's with financing, and it's with permitting, and it's with organizational structuring. You know, so with those three things, I think, if that's the focus of the redevelopment agency, and PUMA is going to look at this too, but if those are the primary focuses and then you have complimentary agencies focusing on the remainder of what the WRA's plans says, you maximize the efficiency of all of Wailuku. So that is what I'm anticipating in terms of an evaluation from PUMA. I don't know if that's what it's going to be, but, any way, that's why you're only a five member board now.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: I just wanted to say that I think it's critical that we know what our current status is and what our current powers are. And I would agree with Warren. I've been here for two years and I'm still confused. But I don't want to stop there. I want to make sure that we look a little deeper and see if there's ways that we can improve it. Would it be an improvement for us to be self-sufficient. If we were – instead of relying on budget trickling down to us, maybe, I don't know, maybe if we re-organize in some way, we're going to be generating if we get this TIF ordinance written or I don't know what else is possible. Maybe it really moves up to the next level for us. So I want to make sure that we just don't kind of just stop here. But, yeah, we need to know who we are because if we don't know that, how is everybody else is going to know who we are.

Mr. Horcajo: Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: You know, I think the comment that Ray made, as far as in my eyes, is pretty much as the saying goes, hit the nail on the head, when he said that even if let's say the ordinance or whatever else allows us to do anything and we take something forward, are they going to listen to us? And that goes back to the fact that maybe the MRA doesn't have the creditability or the recognition in the standing in the eyes of, you know, many people that are out there. And we need to first move ourselves in a direction where people start

APPROVED 06-18-2010

to have some respect for MRA, what we have done and what we are doing. And I think that's one of the reason why when you look at the budget each year, the budget keeps going down and down and down because as far as the eyes of the Council, maybe as far as the eyes of administration, MRA may not be doing a whole lot of stuff that warrants they being provided with additional funding. So we need to step back and maybe do things that show that, you know, we are doing something that is truly beneficial to the MRA area. The Main Street improvements or Market Street improvements, to me, is positive. But one of things that typically happens whenever government does a project is that they spend a lot of money to design this project, they spend a lot of money to build a project, but once it's done, then everything goes to hell. Excuse the language. So maybe, and I drive through that area quite a bit and Bob's office is there, maybe we need to spend some money, allocate some money from the balance. Let's do a regular maintenance program. You know show the community that, you know, be proud of the improvements that are done, and let's keep it clean. And let's kind of set the standard as far as, you know, keeping the area clean and be proud. And once we do that, then I think people start to kind of buy into it. But if we do things the way typically things are done in government, you get it done, once it's done, okay let's move on to something else and let's forget about the maintenance side. And the maintenance side is just as important as the initial construction side. So for me, I think a priority would be set aside a fair amount of money to come in and regularly maintain the improvements that we just completed.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair? I agree with that because by maintaining the progress in the street scape, that invites more interest in development to begin with. So it's a cause and effect for what our mission is as well. So I know we do have – did we get three proposals Erin?

Ms. Wade: For what?

Ms. Betts Basinger: The Teens On Call, the regular maintenance which also included the municipal parking lot.

Mr. Suzuki: But that's just for trash pick up. We can regularly come in and have people come in.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But I believe we looked at landscapers and –

Mr. Suzuki: Sidewalk maintenance?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, we did cost all that out at one time, and I think Erin probably still has all that information. But I agree that's an ongoing responsibility that we should be doing.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so are we specifically talking – I mean, already right now we have a litter thing with Teens On Call. We have the curbs and gutters with Teens On Call. Those things we contracted them for. We chose not to so far contract them for maintenance of the municipal parking lot, whatever six months ago. And we have had no discussions about maintenance on Vineyard Street. No, Market Street, we do have maintenance programs there.

Mr. Suzuki: But that's only for trash pick up.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, trash, and curbs and gutters.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But not for the landscaping or the watering.

Mr. Suzuki: And sidewalks.

Mr. Horcajo: So are you talking specifically Market Street, or beyond that, Vineyard? Because that's where we need to talk about.

Mr. Suzuki: I'm talking about –

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'm talking about the beautification project.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We put it in Market Street. We should keep it shiny and bright.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, that's fine.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I would limit it. And if our budget gets to be, at some point, self generating or whatever, and we can expand, then --.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, we – I think it was --. When does the contract end now with the contractor for the project with Diversified? But that's still less than \$5,000.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It was one or two years after.

Mr. Horcajo: Right, but that's still \$5,000. Joe, did you want to make a comment?

Mr. Alueta: I just – thank you Mr. Chair – I just think it's like --. As James and I both kind of cut our teeth on this board for many years, and it's, I find it ironic like every few – it comes up once again what's the meaning of life? That's seems to be the discussion. What's the meaning? We all get philosophical. What's the meaning of the board? And

APPROVED 06-18-2010

what's the purpose of the board? And it's evolving because remember your main charter or your main objective – and I went over this with you Mr. Chair – is like because you had such a limited budget and powers and duties were bound not only 53, but then the overall Wailuku Redevelopment Master Plan that was adopted by the County Council, that kind of gave you your marching orders. That told you, here, you need to accomplish this. These are your tasks assigned and who is it. And for the most part, the board is a policy wise, a broad policy and also the consolidation, as Erin said, efficiency of permitting. I mean, you all of a sudden, this board, consolidated the Urban Design Review Board, the Maui Planning Commission and the BVA all in one. That's three efficiencies. Okay, through that efficiencies, because you didn't have the money to acquire land or the powers to acquire lands, right, redevelopment in Wailuku primarily occurred through lobbying with government agencies such as the Parks Department, Public Works, and encouraging private development. And this board, I mean, I'm the biggest cheerleader, one of the biggest cheerleaders for this board and for their accomplishments, you've accomplished quite a bit. I don't know if you guys know that. I mean, you've had numerous buildings built or renovated. You had the Central Pacific Bank. You had Everett Dowling's building, the old First Interstate Bank. We've had McLeod's building go up on the corner. The redevelopment of Chris Hart's building. You had, I mean, you built bathrooms. We got bathrooms built for the first time so people can actually, when they're shopping, can go to the bathroom. A Police Substation. I mean, just countless. I mean, I can go through all of them if you want, but you a have a lot of be proud of besides the Market Street. It's what you've done to facilitate a private developer as well as the County, working with non-profit such as the Lokahi Pacific Building, the Blue Hawaii building, like I said, the bathrooms, the redoing of Lao Theater – all of that came about with – you all had a hand in it. And the easing of the code, the adoption of the small town code, was probably one of the biggest and most significant things that this board, from a policy standpoint adopted.

Now I kind of agree with, I mean to a certain, with Warren about wanting to maintain. But I always have been cautious. Do you want to be a mini Public Works? But I understand because sometimes you don't have the faith in what –. But that's the point where you're suppose to be lobbying with the Public Works. Now there's certain design elements that this board adopted which the Public Works adamantly opposed and that was the design of Market Street. So therefore I can see – and that's why it doesn't get maintained the way you want it to be maintained because they opposed the design. So I think it is encumbrance of you to become a mini Public Works in a sense. And I think that can be one of your task, but that's kind of one of your things that you need. You're redefining yourself. That is part of your (phonetics). We're going to become not only facilitate private development, encourage public development with through the improvements, but also take a responsibility of maintaining the public improvements. And that can be sold to the County Council, you know, with regards to your budget as well as we already talked about, you know, your self generating funds of taking over the management of the public parking lot. And that can be used as part of your justification because you're going to maintain it

APPROVED 06-18-2010

through your mini Public Works stance. So I've heard everything, but I remember, it's like you kind of went through this whole what's the meaning of life again, we have this discussion. But that's my nut shell of what you guys have done, what you're key responsibilities have been and how you've encouraged the private development, as well as encourage public development. And then, again, I hear you guys want to move on to the mini Public Works and that's fine. It's just you've got to have – that's part of your steps that you're going to go through, the morphing of this, the maturity, I guess, of this thing. I just don't want to see you in the past, you know, try to jump, over reach and if you over reach you can fall very hard. So just have a strategic plan with your organization and take the baby steps. And I think Kalbert Young has already reiterated that with your Chair in talking about what projects you want to take. You know, take baby steps, and I think you're doing good.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's an excellent comment from Joe's part, and I would like to add that I think this body has already seen the challenges of funding for like wanting to keep the projects we've completed looking good and inviting development. I don't suggest that we pay for everything ourselves, but I certainly do suggest that with a skilled manager, we can create more and more collaborations with other folks and organizations that also have a vested interest in Wailuku. So everyone is not living off of our budget, but we're working together to keep these things maintained. So I wouldn't look at putting a number in here that was 100% borne by this body on all of the things – on some of the things that we might want to do.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so specific to maintenance, now what we have not contracted for yet in terms of recent improvements is the maintenance of the trees, right? That's going to –. The contract with Diversified is going to end fairly soon. And we're not talking Vineyard Street. Am I correct? We're not talking the parking lot. Just the trees.

Mr. Suzuki: We're talking about the Market Street improvement.

Mr. Horcajo: The Market Street improvement from Wells to Kahawai now.

Ms. Betts Basinger: The planters and whatever tree landscaping.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. That is being maintained by Diversified. They use Kihei Gardens now. I've seen them out there. So is there kind of a general consensus we want to allocate some money from 2010 for that purpose?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: Do you –. I know that Erin contacted them. I don't think – I think we would need to contract that in 2011 which starts pretty soon. My vote would be to look at everything we might want to still do in 2010.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. Well, that's where I'm headed. I want to get down to –. We don't want a four hour meeting, right, we want to get down to it. So, yeah, 2011 comes up fairly soon and we're probably not going to discuss 2011 budget today. It's more of the 2010.

Mr. Suzuki: But I guess my question is that going forward, other than the trash pick up, and other than cleaning out the curb and gutters, there's no additional maintenance work required on the improvements that were recently completed?

Ms. Wade: The only other thing that we had a quote for Teens On Call for is the maintenance of the parking lot. We chose not to go with that for now. But that was a \$400 a month quote to pull the weeds. You know, there's weeds all along the sidewalk and stuff. There's weeds in the islands, and do that, and do some sweeping and keep the parking lot maintained. They would do that also for \$400 a month.

Mr. Suzuki: What about, as far as Market Street, there's nothing, there's no sidewalk sweeping that needs to be done?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, to your question and I might have to defer to Joe who would know the contract a little better. There are new street posts and benches, and other hardscapes that have been added to the beautification. I know in the discussion of banners, we were very concerned about whoever installs and takes down banner not be scratching the paint and ruining them. So there are maintenance items up and down the street, but I think that we haven't defined them clearly in an idea of how much is that going to cost and who will share that cost with us. So I think that is something that we should look at as a priority.

Mr. Suzuki: From my perspective, may be just providing an allowance. You know, \$5,000 from the balance of 2010 in the category of Market Street improvement and maintenance.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, we only have one more month in 2010.

Ms. Wade: Well, that was the thing though is – I mean, you can encumber – this is what we did last year. Encumber the monies for next year for maintenance program. So if you did that, your total maintenance program that we're funding now is \$9,162 for trash collection; \$4,800 for the curb and gutters a year; and if you added the parking lot to that, it's another \$4,800. So a total of \$18,762 you can encumber now for your next year's maintenance if you wanted to.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Suzuki: Of the \$25,000?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, you have \$23,000 left.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Or we can put it on our 2011 budget right up front.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, and that's fine too. Remember that even if we decide to put something on 2010 today, we have to know by – or Planning has to know by May 15th that we are definitely going to spend the money. So the contract or this kind of maintenance, that's easy to prove that because we have a history. Anything beyond that, parking management plan, Vineyard Street improvement plan, all that kind of stuff is going to take a lot more time and process. And as Erin mentioned earlier, you know, we may be a little premature before the PUMA study gets completed. I mean, we've talked a lot of these issues that PUMA will bring up anyway. But if the board decides, well, even though we have, let's kind of let the process work it's way through to the end, and then start with the 2011 budget. You know, I'm game for that because those kind of contracts are easy to assess by May 15th.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair, can we take a brief break?

Mr. Horcajo: Why don't we. We'll come back at 3:10?

Mr. Alueta: Can I say something because I'm not sure I'm going to be back here? So refresh your memory, some of the clean up and the trash, right, was originally was suppose to be covered by the merchants. Okay, and so you may want to try to seek partnerships with the Wailuku – what's being called the Wailuku Community Association I guess. Because technically when you talk to Public Works, just like your house, you're responsible to maintain and clean that sidewalk in front of your house. The merchants are responsible – are suppose to be cleaning up to them. And so I think that's –. If you're taking –. I mean, I'm not opposed to you taking on that responsibility, as long as you clearly define who it is. But you need to get credit if from it, or you need to maybe first try to talk with the W – whatever they're called – Wailuku Community Association and see whether some of them want to take over some responsibility of something. I mean, as they mature, they may find their own funding sources and relieve you of that burden.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So I'll make one quick comment before I forgot. And undoubtedly whatever we do we want to be sure that we follow the procurement laws whatever that maybe, three verbal bids, three written bids. So we're back at 3:15? Thank you.

(The Maui Redevelopment Agency recessed at approximately 3:05 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 3:15 p.m.)

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, where we left, this, I assume this is just a consensus thing. Do we all agree that we're going to allocate, at least in this case – well, I guess I would say no more than \$20,000 of our 2010 budget for 2011 maintenance to include –

Mr. Suzuki: 2010 maintenance.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Out of the 2011 budget.

Ms. Horcajo: No, out of the 2010 budget for 2011 maintenance. That's what we've been talking about right?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I vote no because that's just about all of our money and July 1 we have a new budget.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, but I thought that's what we were talking about. That's what Erin had suggested.

Ms. Wade: I just said if you want to encumber money quickly and you wanted – and because the program was raised, the suggestion was raised that that was a high priority to do the maintenance, I can guarantee you I'll have no problems securing \$18,000 for maintenance. And then you'll still have your full budget left for 2011, and you wanted to dedicate anything for maintenance, but you can parcel it out however you want.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. That's what I thought because she said that nobody questioned it. So go ahead Katharine.

Ms. Popenuk: Can I get some clarification? So any monies that we set aside now, it can't be like sort of an ambiguous, well we're going to hire.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It has to be a contract.

Ms. Popenuk: It has to be a specific – like almost bought more or less?

Ms. Wade: Yes. That's well put. Almost bought.

Mr. Horcajo: But Erin – so as for the maintenance, she'll go out and get a minimum of whatever, three bids, verbal or written, depending on the estimation of a contract. And you know, we can probably segment the projects possibly, I guess. So for us to accomplish that part by May 15th would be pretty simple.

Ms. Popenuk: So for instance, even the re-striping, hiring a consultant to consider various re-striping, we would have to go out, and get bids and get all the way to a contract by

May 15th?

Ms. Wade: Well, we have to have three confirmed bids, and we have to have voted to encumber money up to a certain point for that process. So if we say we want to encumber money for the re-striping of \$23,000 or something like that, and then we have bids that fall within that range, that's enough to encumber. But we have to then execute the contract before the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: So does that makes sense?

Ms. Popenuk: Very tight.

Mr. Horcajo: To make sure I understand. So that, again, by May 15th?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Whatever, if we chose, whether it be parking, striping, manager, parking management plan, any of those studies, again, we can go out and get three verbal bids, but we have to get their bids back by May 15th. We have a meeting on May 21st. And if we chose to encumber the funds for one of those consultants, we're fine, as long as we get their bids by May 15th. Is that correct?

Ms. Betts Basinger: We need to vote, Erin, to do that.

Mr. Horcajo: Wait, let me – yeah, that's correct.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We have to vote today on that.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. Go ahead.

Mr. Phillips: We have the ability to carry over?

Ms. Wade: No.

Mr. Suzuki: No.

Mr. Phillips: That is standard.

Mr. Horcajo: That's why we're having this discussion.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Phillips: Vegas.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Alexa, go ahead.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair, if it's okay at this point, I would like to talk a little bit about a contract that can quickly be done like some of these others that we already have had proposals submitted and that is for the MRA Coordinator position. And this position has been talked about since Council put this agency into effect. Wherever you read it, including on today's County website, the MRA consists of five board members, and a manager. Because I believe it was the intent that of all of this work that has to be done cannot be done by five volunteers. But these five volunteers can direct the work to be done by someone else. And my years involved with this agency prior to becoming a commissioner, and even as a commissioner, only going to reinforce that notion. Nothing gets done because I'll be at work, enthused and passionate about it, we're still volunteers. We depend on Erin, and thank God for Erin that we now have – and not that Joe wasn't good – but all that experience, if it taught us nothing else, is that the need for someone to be doing our business is imperative. Just about everything you have listed in this task list is something that that person should be doing and reporting back to us about the progress of it, particularly as we prioritize it. Your meeting this morning with the rotary club is something that that person should actually be doing. So again, we have already worked over months trying to put a scope together of what we expect out of this person in the short term, and to be able to encumber up to \$24,999 to get this person on board, again, showing the powers that we need right now for our budget that we're taking what we do seriously. We're taking it so seriously that we're allotting our budget toward a person that can work hand in hand with Erin, and hand and hand with us, and start checking off as Warren says things we need to say this Agency is valuable because we accomplish things. So I think it's really short sided and idealistic to believe that five volunteers no matter how passionate they are can actually get the work done. Just ask Erin who's assigned really only 40% of her time, and probably spends 110% of the time just trying to do the little bit that we ask of her now. So I'm making my plea again that we take our remaining budget, that we look at those, that we define our scope very simply, and that we look at the folks. I've heard that we've received some intent and I know that people are inquiring about wanting to fill that position for us as a consultant in the same way as we hired Teens On Call or as we engage PUMA. Well PUMA was over the \$25,000.

Ms. Popenuk: That was my question actually. Is there enough time to do this?

Ms. Betts Basinger: There is. And the requirements are here. All of you got this handout. These are the procurement rules for the County. It requires us to have three proposals from three people who are saying I want to fill this job, this scope of work, this contract for

APPROVED 06-18-2010

services is what it is. They're not an employee. It's a contract for services that we define we ask them to do. So I know that's the second part of our agenda coming up is to – we spend a lot of time last meeting, and we spent time the meeting before trying to define the scope of work in a simple but flexible way. And that's what my hope is. All the rest of these things, they're already our priorities. We have a new budget amount, starting another \$81,000 coming in effective July 1. And I am still going to follow up on making sure that our next year's budget is not cut in half off the top. Like \$40,000 which may or may not be used by the EDA, the municipal parking lot coordinator position. So, that's all I have to say.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: So, again, trying to get clarification that Katharine tried to clarify. So you're saying that if we approve the remaining monies that are available for a manager, a part-time manager, you, Erin, would then go out and solicit three proposals. You'll receive the three proposals, and at the next meeting, the agency would approve one of the three. And with that, we would encumber the monies.

Ms. Popenuk: Our next meeting though is – when is the deadline?

Mr. Horcajo: May 21st is our next meeting.

Ms. Popenuk: And when is the deadline?

Ms. Wade: Well, I actually have to have out and have received bids by the 15th, and then –. I mean, you don't necessarily go with the low bid, you go with the best qualified. It's okay to go with the best qualified. It says in the procurement laws, you have to determine those things.

Ms. Popenuk: And how are we advertising? Are we advertising?

Ms. Wade: We haven't discussed any of that at this point.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's our next agenda item.

Ms. Popenuk: And I had one more question. Are just regular or operating expenses for the year – like stamps or whatever it is – is that something that we can use this money to pay for?

Ms. Wade: The Planning Department absorbs all of your operating costs. So all your mailings, everything, the printing – even the printing of these newsletters is paid for by the department.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Popenuk: I guess my question is there any like regularly occurring expenditures that we have that we can just take this money right now and –

Ms. Wade: The only thing really is the maintenance, the costs. I mean, the things, if you see in your spreadsheet, the things that are regularly and reoccurring are the Teens On Call expenses, and the Mana Web posting.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Maintenance, Teens On Call. We have some small contracts moving forward that we have a budget for.

Mr. Horcajo: Ray, any comment about –?

Mr. Phillips: I'm really in support of what Alexa has to say. It would be a terrible, dynamic, outstanding thing for the MRA to do, to finish up the budget year with finally getting itself a manager. And as long as we've been on this board, we've been looking for a manager and talking about a manager, and interviewing managers, and thinking about managers. I'm absolutely in accord. Spend the money and let's go home.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. The manager thing is the next – it's on the agenda item next. We can undoubtedly put this budget thing in the bin, if we want to go that route. Let me give you my opinion okay. Personally from when I got here, I felt like we needed the manager as well. But now that I'm in this seat and kind of poking around asking questions and stuff, I kind of feel we're premature. The MRA, as Joe had mentioned, had accomplished a lot with five volunteer members since whenever, 1997 - 2000. Ray, you alluded to the fact, well, even if we get a study done that talks about, you know, the options for self sustainability or working towards autonomy or semi, what are those guys going to say? I mean, we don't know. But the point being, we at least have to get the point where any new commissioner who comes in is going to know by reading it what the options are. Right now, one year, two years, three years. You know, I've talked with Kalbert Young. I've talked with different attorneys. Nobody really has the answer. So, you know, and we have this as Warren had mentioned, we need to do stuff. We need to maintain what we have already done, you know. And our Wailuku Redevelopment Plan and what we updated on the strategic plan talks about all these things - parking management plan - all that stuff. In talking with the Mayor when I first got on here, and other people, there's still some confusion even with Kalbert Young last week or two weeks ago as to really –. I mean, I realize this is a consultant versus a manager, but, you know, for me, what I've learned throughout the past couple of years is the hiring of the previous manager and the direction that the MRA went created so much ill will, of course, and now it's improving. So I kind of feel like we're going to be taking a step back. Let's just focus on jobs, jobs, jobs. You know, get all this parking management, Vineyard Street improvements, you know all this, actually get the job done as our bible says we should we doing, till we get a point where she needs to be a full-time or she's crying saying I need somebody, then it's a no brainer.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

And we're working with the Planning Department. We've talked about, you know, we've been building this inter agency bond now because of Erin here, with not just Planning, but with Public Works and with Water. I feel we still need to build on that as a group, then basically –. You know, because we're all still trying to learn. So for me –

Ms. Betts Basinger: No we're not.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, yeah. Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, I'm trying to figure it out and I think, again, having talked with Kalbert recently and having talked with other people, it's still, you know, if we don't get the support – we're a County agency – if we don't get the full support of Planning Department and the Mayor's Office as to where we want to go towards this, you know, thing. For me, it's a no brainer they're going to support us during the jobs that we're suppose to be doing. I don't think we're going to get the support right now of a consultant for stuff that we don't even – we talked about a half hour ago waiting for PUMA.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Who's support do we need?

Mr. Horcajo: Wait a minute. We're waiting for PUMA to basically before we deal with parking management plan, TIF, all these stuff, and now we're saying hire somebody to do all that when we just said let's just wait and let the process work it's way through. We still have 2011 coming up within a month, so we can focus on a consultant then. But let's, you know, let's not get too crazy with what we have now and focus on, you know, the bread and butter stuff – I shouldn't say it's within grasp – but I want to build the strength of the MRA. We all do. But I look at the political side of interagency relationship, administration relationships, so that when we go Council as I said in 2012, it's a no brainer. That yeah, we need \$250,000 or whatever it may be when we get to that point because we've got so much going on.

Mr. Suzuki: So what are suggesting Bob?

Mr. Horcajo: I'm suggesting that we take as Erin suggested, you know, in this case whether it be including website. But 2010-11 approximate budget out of the 2010 and focus on that for the remaining 2010 budget. You know, whether it be consultant, parking management plan, Vineyard Street improvements, studies, diagonal whatever re-stripping, let's wait because that's going to take a little longer for us to get the proposals, and really bet those options.

Mr. Suzuki: So do that in 2011?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: Do that in 2011. Get more information.

Mr. Suzuki: So what are you suggesting we do to encumber the 2010?

Mr. Horcajo: As Erin had suggested, we could take – well, again, we still have to vet it further but we know roughly based on what we have in contract now and based on a proposal we had from Teens On Call, let's say, that we can roughly allocate \$18,000 plus of our \$23,000 from 2010 for 2011 expenses. So out of the 2011 expenses, we're not spending \$18,000 out of the \$81,000 budget. We've already taken it out of 2010. It is what was suggested. That's what why we're talking about it now.

Ms. Popenuk: So essentially pre-pay?

Mr. Horcajo: Just setting it aside. Exactly.

Ms. Popenuk: Right. And not an expansion of what we expect for our services. But just prepaying our usual yearly expenses from Teens On Call or the web?

Mr. Horcajo: Right. But we still need to meet the procurement laws of getting probably three minimum proposals.

Mr. Suzuki: Do we?

Ms. Wade: For an existing contract, you can just extend the contract. So for the litter pick up and the curb and gutter, we can just extend the contract. If we wanted to add the parking lot maintenance, we would probably want to get three bids.

Mr. Suzuki: Do we have time to do it?

Mr. Horcajo: Or the trees.

Ms. Wade: Or the trees. And those two I have existing bids which I could just call and ask them to update. They were from last year.

Mr. Suzuki: I tend to agree with Bob. Go ahead.

Ms. Popenuk: My opinion or my view on this would be because of the time is so short and I'm not opposed to having a manager. There's some of these things here they've got two star that I want to have happen, and I can see that person doing it. But in the interest of time and because it is kind of a little pile of money is like what I would like, you know, it would be in my personal life, is I prepay all my bills for next year, the ones that I was going to be stuck with anyway, and get that taken cared of and then that frees up that amount of

APPROVED 06-18-2010

money for a manager or whomever or whatever we want to do in 2011. That's that much more money that's available.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I actually Chair don't have – I don't have like a deadline. I think this meeting with all of us here gives us a chance to vet this through. And what I'm hearing and what I would like to ask Chair is I'm hearing a reluctance to take this big step of showing that we're along enough to realize that we need someone to help us to get this work done. And for all the time that we've been discussing it, and for all the time that we've lived it and saying that we need this person's help, whoever it is, I'm now getting a sense that you're feeling Chair that we need someone's permission or support. And I would like you to clarify that because I don't think we need permission. It's just the will of this body. And if the will of this body today is going to be different than it is going to be in three months, then I'll no longer talk about the need for a manager that every member of the MRA has talked about for 10 years. Every Chair has talked about for 10-years. When we had the one chance to do, it was a huge mistake, but we can't be in fear that, you know, well, we're not going to do that mistake again. That's for sure we're not because we know exactly what the mistake was. So I guess I'm just wanting a sense from the body if this is a dead issue.

Mr. Horcajo: What I said was that I don't think we're ready, you know. And it's something we can discuss for the 2011 budget, whether it be next month, or two months, or three months.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And we're not ready because?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, all the things that I said.

Ms. Betts Basinger: The short time?

Mr. Horcajo: No, not the short time. I feel like we should be focusing on – I would rather the priority be – not even thinking about the maintenance issues here of getting the jobs done that we went through on the strategic plan. And I feel that in five volunteer members throughout the years have done quite a bit, with five volunteer members, and whatever.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Tremendous support from Planning Department.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. And I feel that can continue. And I'm not saying that we need the approval of the administration or the Planning Department.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Because you know we don't.

Mr. Horcajo: No, but, you would think it would be important for us to be working together.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

That is what my point being.

Mr. Phillips: Okay, we have a great list here. I think, I see our board as like a Board of Directors. Board of Directors has a Chief Executive Officer that they direct or oversee the activities thereof. We're taking the job on as not only a Board of Directors but also the board that actually does the implementation. It's a bit much. And I believe that as the Board of Directors, we're suppose to be the insightful, strategic planners and assistance for what goes on in Wailuku. This is our job for people to bring us things that they think are important, for us to able to take a look at them, discuss them, oversee them, and then direct people to do it for us. So I think, and I do, you know I can see what Katharine has to say, it's great to prepay things, but we know our budget is going to be for next year. Is there a reason necessarily to prepay when we in actuality –?

Ms. Wade: We don't know that either.

Mr. Phillips: Okay. Well we don't. But, I think that we're just not doing what it is that we're suppose to do. We are doing the implementation, strategic as well as the tactical plan and implementation, and I think it's – I think we could be doing so much more.

Mr. Horcajo: Warren, and then Katharine.

Mr. Suzuki: Having said that though, you know, my concern is that – and we're finding a time deadline – and my concern is that, let's say we go out and we get three proposals from someone, individuals, that are willing to take on that contract. We got the three. Meet on the 21st. We're going to have to make a decision at that particular time as to whether or not we select the three. And I don't know if in one meeting, you'll develop the level of comfort enough to hire someone or make that selection and say let's go. And that's my biggest concern is that you're not going to have enough time to really talk to that person, feel comfortable and make a decision on which one you want to select.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: That's my point exactly. A manager is absolutely not a dead issue. I think it's totally appropriate. I'm just looking at the time frame. It's like, spend it or lose it, and it all got like sucked out of the budget by surprise last year, so I just feel like we need to nail it down asap and in one month's time, or whatever, two month's time will be in 2011 budget. And then, yeah, let's talk about getting –

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. I want to say two more things. Go ahead first.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's good. Thanks for that encouraging word. Prepaying is great. I view this as a one time opportunity where we've got some money to actually put it into

APPROVED 06-18-2010

work in getting us some help. The second thing is that over three or four months of meetings, many people have been listening to our discussions about this – I hate to call it a manager because it really isn't a manager. It's our administrative face to the community and all of the tasks that we give this person. But the community has heard this discussion, and I know that there have been people that have – we've already received at least one or more letters of intent. So I believe that it would be the same amount of effort to get a landscaping, three landscaping numbers for example, as it would be to do this.

Secondly, Warren, you're really right. I mean, if it's someone, if these are people that we know of in the community, which likely they will be if they're interested in something like this. But even if not, I think something this important would warrant another special meeting like this one, where that would be the only thing on the agenda. And it could be well before the May 21st, it could be before the May 21st regular meeting. So I think that there are ways to do if this body, you know, wants to really make a statement about we've rolled our sleeves up and we want to work, and we know what we want to do and we're getting the help to do it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, I'm going to make two comments. One is I think the comments made presently in the past that our money was taken in 2009, I think that's wrong. When the Mayor – when we had the stakeholder's group, it was after the issue with the previous manager, and nobody seemed to want to –. Anyway, she proposed putting in \$100,000 budget for 2009. \$50,000 of that was for the parking structure. And at the same time, she went out for the EDA money. That is the reason we had that budget. It was because half of that money was suppose to be for the parking structure. That was our contribution to the parking structure manager job. And from my standpoint, I would rather the money be used to show we're doing something. But for me, the main reason was that was part of her thing when we got the 2009 budget that came out of the stakeholder's meeting. Secondly is –

Ms. Betts Basinger: That was the year before, Chair. Just a correction.

Ms. Horcajo: It wasn't –

Ms. Betts Basinger: We did lose –. We did lose the rest of our money last budget because we didn't encumber it quickly enough. We tried.

Mr. Horcajo: But that went for the parking manager. Yeah, but look. And the second point is, you know, what is a manager and what is not a manager. You know, we keep talking about a face. For me, we're saying that, yes, we all agree we need help. We will need help at some point in time, or we do need help now. I'm again saying we're not ready yet, no. 1. And no. 2, you know, I would rather see our whole re-org study done to say, hey, that Finance and administration and whoever else, Planning agrees, yeah, if this is the path you're going to take to self sustainability, you know, so then really when we hire the

APPROVED 06-18-2010

manager, it is a manager because we are an entity with the Board of Directors. We're not a county agency. You know, so that the face we hire is a face forever. It's not a temporary consultant just to get some processes through the County which we just said we didn't want to do yet, you know, that just so we have a face. You know, I'd rather have a face there, and hired when we have, let's say, the big picture of re-org, you know looking at sustainability in five years, autonomy, semi-autonomy, whatever it may be. You know, I'm just not the only one confused, I know that. Whoever I talked at the administration, and even our Counsel here, it's all different answers, so they don't know. We really don't know as much as we think we know. We don't. So that's my point of the manager. We're kind of premature.

Mr. Suzuki: We need to make a decision one way or the other.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. So –

Mr. Suzuki: Because we're going to go around, around and around.

Mr. Horcajo: You can have one more and that's it. Go ahead. Did you want to say something?

Ms. Perreira: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Go head. Please.

Ms. Perreira: This is an important item, and it's one of the reasons why we're here for the extended meeting. Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association. We feel that some of the comments that Chair Horcajo has made, Warren Suzuki and even Katharine has made, is very legitimate because of the fact that our former Chair, John Min had expressed that concern. That until you get to do something substantial, then you qualify for the justification of doing and getting a manager. Right now, you folks are not just the Board of Directors, without anybody, you do have county staff. The other thing is eventually, of course, you're going to get a manager. We're not talking about a consultant. It just depends what you want to do. You want to do self promotion, go ahead and get a consultant. If you want to do the things that the community wants to see, the brick and mortar, showing that the work is being so and so forth. I am concerned. We are concerned that this is the wrong time at little bit because they're freezing jobs and everything, and here is a step like creating something. I think the fact that you're working in that direction, when you come to 2011, then you have a good justification. What I've heard here and the way we look at it is the natural progression of leading up to the fact that you have a good solid case to get a qualified manager.

In the HRS 53, in the rules, it says manager. It is not a promotional person. It is a

APPROVED 06-18-2010

manager that has the qualification and skill of a planner, engineer, or whatever else that needs to be determined. And Erin Wade has to be in on that scope of work to determine that as well as PUMA. So it is premature, and we would feel very concerned that there's a rush to make that happen. And the last thing I want to say that we're also concerned about is we don't see a scope of work of who you're looking for. And yet, we have heard names have been submitted, names on the street. You can ask people, they'll tell you the two names that have been submitted. That looks like that was unfair advantage over the process to go out and seek somebody that was based on a proper process of determining what is the scope of work and putting it out fairly for everyone that wants to be able to put in a bid or a proposal. But, we still would not be in favor of consultant as opposed to manager. We will support you folks wholeheartedly when you're ready to get a manager to undertake some of these things. I believe that my board would feel and that was substantiated and supported by our former Chair John Min when he did talk about it. And is a matter of record in the MRA that not all the MRA Chairs felt we were ready for it. We felt that you needed to be able to reach a certain juncture and then you would be ready to take that on. So thank you for the opportunity to put across.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you. So, it's quarter to four. So it sounds like we have at least a consensus. At least it sounded like we had two members – three to two, I guess, on allocating the maintenance stuff. So let's move on to other potential uses of 2010 fund. I don't want to belabor the point.

Mr. Phillips: One quick comment.

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Mr. Phillips: When we got into this before, we ran into a real road block with having an employee. So when we're talking about this thing as a manager, whomever it is we decided to task, it has to be somebody who's an outside consultant.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Alright.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well the comment there and maybe this is misinformation Chair, I'm not talking about that person that is going to be the official manager of the MRA. You're right, that position is down the road. What I'm talking about here was someone who, in the interim, can help us get through some of these tasks that are really important.

Mr. Horcajo: Can we just move on to budget? Let's just move on.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, no, there's a misunderstanding.

Mr. Horcajo: But, it doesn't matter. Let's just move on. We want to get with 2010.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. But I'm all for that. I'm all for what you're talking about. I just felt that maybe you didn't quite understand what I was talking about.

Mr. Horcajo: No.

Mr. Suzuki: No, I think we got it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Can I just confirm the number then? So for the maintenance program, that's \$18,762.90.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, but that – okay, so that includes the existing litter, curb and gutters and –.

Ms. Wade: Trash, curb and gutters, and the additional parking lot.

Mr. Horcajo: The parking lot. And the trees we're going to?

Ms. Wade: That's not in there.

Mr. Horcajo: And that's not in there.

Ms. Wade: I can look for bids on that if you want me to.

Mr. Suzuki: I would. I would.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I would look for landscaping. I thought we decided not to include the parking lot?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, that's what I –. I thought we decided a long time ago we didn't want to get into –

Mr. Suzuki: How much is it for the parking lot?

Mr. Horcajo: – Public Works.

Ms. Wade: \$4,800 a year.

Mr. Horcajo: A year.

Mr. Suzuki: Why don't you just limit it to just the Main Street, or Market Street

improvement?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Exactly.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: So I would say it probably wouldn't be that far off if we just changed that from parking lot to the landscape trees, the benches, that kind of stuff.

Ms. Wade: So that's \$13,960.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, and at the same time, we'll take Joe's comment as far as working with the owners, WCA.

Ms. Wade: Okay, so maintenance, landscape bids. What about the website?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, I guess, because I had here, Alexa, I put \$3,000 in 2011, does that sound reasonable?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes. I think it's – unless we're going to make huge changes, it's really just a matter of her posting new content as we give it to her.

Mr. Horcajo: So it should be less than that?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would leave it 2011 like that.

Mr. Suzuki: But she wants to encumber it now.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, we have like \$4,000 left.

Ms. Wade: I'm asking.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, we're just looking at options.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Oh, I see what you're saying. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: You know, banner Wailuku, I heard what you said about – Yuki left me a message today because I've been trying to get an actual number from those guys for the extra four banners, and she said if we chose to allocate up to \$600 from 2010 that would pay for the four banners between Wells and Main.

Ms. Betts Basinger: You know what? I think we might be better served to rather than

APPROVED 06-18-2010

paying for the banners, paying for the maintenance of those posts because it's a special kind of – we needed a special person that know how to work it, and un-work it, and would always be that contractor that would be called no matter who was raising or lowering the banner. So maybe a maintenance contract with someone that would be maintaining – putting up and putting down the banners would be a more important expenditure, and maybe cut the banners in half, that would bring up to our total.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, we're still –. Well, for me, I'm hoping that those collars are only going to be moved once or twice a year because it is – I mean, it's really just a wrench. You just have to be careful when they basically lower the collar over the light standard and stuff. It's not that big of a deal. I think it's more important for us to get all 17 banners up.

Ms. Popenuk: Who does put them up and down then?

Ms. Betts Basinger: We haven't designated.

Mr. Horcajo: Well that's what – we haven't designated.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's what I'm suggesting that we do.

Mr. Horcajo: Warren and I will do it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, now, see there's liability that goes with it so we want to have a bonded contracting company that will do it correctly, that will be liable if they make any mistakes, and we need to find out what that's going to cost.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, what's to stop –. Erin, what's to stop us from sweet talking Public Works to basically lower it for this purpose?

Ms. Wade: Zero.

Mr. Horcajo: Just checking.

Ms. Wade: They don't want anything to do with the banners, really.

Mr. Suzuki: Let's not try to complicate the matter than it needs to be. I mean, Yuki probably has a sense in terms of who can install it and remove it, so just kind of leave at that and just work with her. But just give Erin some guidance that we have x-number of dollars, you know, given the base work that we need to do, you know, go with that, and if there's additional monies that may be remaining, you know, what else might be one of those. It kind of falls with the overall area.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Wade: So like dedicate up to \$1,500 for, or something like that.

Mr. Suzuki: Up keeping and beautifying the Market Street improvements.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, are we saying – again, she’s saying \$600 the cost of the four banners. Are we saying up to \$1,500 of the additional banners, and installation and removal?

Ms. Wade: That would be for all banners then.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That would be for all 17.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. For all 17 banners.

Ms. Betts Basinger: They have to be put up – at least they have to be put up.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. Sure.

Ms. Wade: I mean, that would probably be for other banners if there were other events and things. That would be enough money, I would expect, to have additional programs on the banners and stuff.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so we’re potentially saying \$1,500 for banners or whatever, Malama Wailuku.

Ms. Popenuk: How much is left?

Ms. Wade: So now we have. We’ve spent \$18,400 now.

Ms. Popenuk: So one suggestion that I would like to see some landscape on Main Street. It’s so bleak.

Ms. Wade: Additional planters on Main.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, or something. Is that a far flung concept?

Mr. Suzuki: Between Market going up?

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, from Market going up.

Mr. Horcajo: We need design work, and that’s probably going to take some time. I want to mention again that Erin had suggested maybe building a storage facility in the back of the bathroom area.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Wade: Yeah, the reason I said that was when we got the two trash cans in, the replacement trash cans, we stored them in here for a few days. Then we had a big burial council meeting, and I had to find another place to relocate them quickly between the time where they could be delivered and installed. We don't have any facility and Public Works didn't want to accommodate them.

Mr. Suzuki: What about the Police Substation?

Mr. Horcajo: That's what I was going to say. In the back of that there's a lockable area. It's just vinyl fencing on one side and the building itself. And unfortunately we need to change the key, but it's a 10 by 20 foot area where we could build whatever, an actual lockable storage area in that enclosed area by itself. Because I was suggesting we can just use that area, but she's more concerned about it being separately lockable for stuff that we can store.

Mr. Suzuki: Why can't we just use the Police Substation?

Ms. Wade: They won't let us do that.

Mr. Suzuki: Who's place is that?

Ms. Wade: The Police.

Mr. Suzuki: They gave it up, though, already, right?

Ms. Wade: No.

Ms. Betts Basinger: No. They're still there. And I think again – I'll refer to James – but we need to be careful about our liability

Mr. Suzuki: I've got to get going people.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, so do I.

Mr. Horcajo: I'm sorry. So where are we at?

Ms. Wade: We've still got about \$6,000.

Mr. Horcajo: If we don't spend it, we don't spend it.

Ms. Popenuk: What about Richard Dan's re-striping project? Is that something we can undertake?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think we already have agreed to undertake that in our next year, in our 2011 budget. But I don't think we can do anything in this short. You know we're playing the game we played last year. We're racing at the last minute to try and encumber.

Ms. Wade: Well, if we can get Public Works to remove the planter islands, we could commit to fund whatever work Public Works execute.

Mr. Horcajo: You know what, I think the idea of getting a design for a re-striping is probably not that difficult given the fact that we have something from Waltery. We have people like – other engineers in fact – Warren had mentioned that we got the square footage. You know, we've got – the dimensions – probably wouldn't take that much time for somebody to submit a proposal on redesign options for the existing parking lot. That's what you're talking about right?

Ms. Popenuk: Well, was Richard talking about the municipal parking lot or this one over here?

Mr. Horcajo: The municipal parking lot. Yeah, he insinuated Brad suggested by re-striping you could already gain 50 stalls.

Mr. Phillips: . . . (Inaudible.)

Mr. Horcajo: I'm sorry?

Mr. Phillips: The one without the circulation, being just in one direction. Being in one-way.

Mr. Horcajo: Joe?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Diagonal one-way.

Mr. Phillips: Diagonal and then adding an extra row. You did some work.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, I thought Joe said, I mean, I kind of did this a couple of years ago where I thought you could do the one-way thing and kind of gain some stalls. I mean, I just kind of ball parked.

Mr. Phillips: Did they do something about it the Planning Department?

Mr. Horcajo: I'm not sure. I'm not sure they said something. But, again, there's something here that was brought up from Katharine with the Waltery people, a few years ago, with some diagonal. But they have parallel in the middle. It's not all diagonal. And as Joe confirmed the distance between diagonal stall is 13 feet required. The distance between

APPROVED 06-18-2010

parallel was 24 feet. I think I measured out there once, it was like 22 feet plus or something, so I thought we could gain. But my point being as Katharine had suggested, I don't think it's that difficult to get proposals for looking at redesign of this parking lot to include, of course, removing the –.

Ms. Wade: Islands.

Mr. Horcajo: And even – I've always been bothered by not having motorcycle stalls. I hate to see a motorcycle take up a whole stall. It really bothers me. And that can be done as well.

Ms. Popenuk: It does seem to be a hot topic for our community.

Mr. Horcajo: It's a big, hot topic.

Ms. Wade: Well the top two things that came up on the survey were clean and safe, and parking.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I think clean and safe is probably the best we can do to encumber this money at this meeting. So if we need to augment the clean and safe. If it could be worded in such a way to we're encumbering these dollars for maintenance, for cleanness and safety to include cleaning of the gutters, to include landscaping, to include such and such. And how defined are they? Are they going to want to see contracts for each one of those?

Ms. Wade: Yes. I can't just say this is my idea and so save the money. I have to have a contract.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: You know, keep in mind that, for example – I'm just thinking out loud here – but the way you're suggesting it could be that between now and May 15th there's some discussion and we decide that we need a trash can up on Vineyard and Church Street or something. I'm not sure. But, you know, that all adds to clean and safe and good looking.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But this is the meeting that we have to decide that, vote it, and direct Erin to do it.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It has to be in the sunshine. So, I think, as the hour is getting late, and the discussion, a lot this discussion, Chair, is brand new. This body hasn't discussed these

APPROVED 06-18-2010

ways of encumbering those funds, so I think it's asking a lot of us to finalize that at this point.

Mr. Horcajo: I guess I'm confused.

Ms. Popenuk: I do think we should spend all of our money though.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We always think that.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. Wait, but as far as those funds, it's part of our discussion right? We're talking 2010 budget.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We're talking about encumbering.

Mr. Horcajo: Right, as far as the maintenance, the street, all that stuff, that's part of what – that's sunshine law, right? Am I correct?

Mr. Phillips: We're using the rest of the money we have allocated.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, yeah. Exactly.

Mr. Phillips: Let's talk about parking for second – re-striping or whatever – before we close this up. What would we do with the remainder of the monies that have that would, could be allocated to this particular task?

Ms. Betts Basinger: It would be study.

Mr. Phillips: A study?

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Wade: Well, we could do a conceptual design. And we already know Richard hired Chris Hart. We already know the Main Street Association has hired Kirk Tanaka to look at it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So we'll be looking at all those things anyway.

Ms. Wade: We're going to have some designs.

Mr. Phillips: Like a freebie.

Ms. Wade: Right. We're kind of are going to be a freebie on the conceptual design. We

APPROVED 06-18-2010

could say, like I was saying, we could say we will dedicate \$6,000 to the removal of the islands. You know, if that's an assumption, if we're assuming that we want the islands in the parking lot removed so that, we could do that and I can get that encumbered because that's internal.

Mr. Phillips: We hate islands.

Ms. Wade: Good.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'm reluctant, Chair, to make these kind of quick assumptions because we haven't discussed in full everything that has to do with when construction starts, how much do we actually want to spend before a construction of the —. So, I would rather on the things we agreed to, which are cleanness, safety and maintenance. We have some of those contracts that would simply be extended. The decision we have to make and direct Erin is on what new contracts do we need to get three proposals for? And that would be landscaping.

Mr. Horcajo: Just the tree and the —

Ms. Betts Basinger: Sidewalk cleaning.

Ms. Popenuk: Are we going to clean sidewalks or the shop owners are suppose to maintain their own sidewalks?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Public Works is suppose to be maintaining Market Street and everything, period, and they don't. And they probably won't. And I believe they don't have their budget right?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, but at the same time, there are owners that maintain their sidewalks, which is as Joe alluded, that is their obligation.

Ms. Wade: Sidewalks are actually private entity.

Mr. Horcajo: I mean, Jenny is out there sweeping every morning, her husband —

Ms. Betts Basinger: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: The sidewalks within foot and a half of the curb are private property.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. So, for me, we shouldn't go there any way, on the sidewalks.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Horcajo: But the trees for sure because that's part of the Market Street and beautification. But just the Market Street, just the addition of Market Street beautification, we're talking using 18-grand.

Ms. Wade: Oh, yeah, \$4,600 we could easily spend on that for the landscaping.

Mr. Horcajo: So we can just stop there and we're done with our budget discussion for 2010.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. That sounds like a plan. So what is it encompassing at this point?

Ms. Wade: So right now we have \$9,162 for trash collection, \$4,800 for curb and gutters, \$3,000 for the website maintenance, \$1,500 for the banner installation and the four banner production, and about \$4,600 for landscape maintenance.

Mr. Horcajo: And what's that total, I'm sorry?

Ms. Wade: That's your total. You're at \$23,141.

Mr. Phillips: Hey.

Mr. Horcajo: Hey.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would like to have the printing of our revised – I would like to print at least about 40 copies of our updated strategic plan that we did that can be delivered to the Mayor, Council Members. It's an accomplishment that we should, you know, we should pay for an let people see. It will be posted online so other people can do it online.

Ms. Wade: I'm sorry, I'm lost. What's the updated strategic plan?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Not strategic plan. But we spent an awful lot of time last time year going page by page through our bible and re-prioritizing. We changed the language. We took things out. And that needs –

Ms. Wade: In the table? In the tables?

Mr. Horcajo: In the RFP.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes. Yes. So that it didn't change the scope or anything that required us to go to Council, but it re-prioritized what this body is going to do going forward. And it also changed some of the partnerships that this body intended to have in accomplishing some of those line item tasks. So that has not been memorialized yet anywhere and I think

APPROVED 06-18-2010

that it needs to be. So that was my suggestion Chair.

Mr. Horcajo: I think that's there on that \$400 on that last item which is what you had suggested and stuff.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes. Exactly. Yes. I estimated it would be about \$400 to have whatever number amount of copies that was printed.

Mr. Horcajo: So that would go to -. Now I guess these are not substandard changes so lets just put it on record what was done. That's what we're talking about, right?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Exactly, and we will be giving people that we want to know what we're doing - Department heads, and Deputies, and Council Members, and Mayor.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Are you fine with that?

Ms. Popenuk: Yup.

Mr. Horcajo: \$400 allocated. You can move some numbers around so we can see our budget.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, I'll just back it out of the landscaping maintenance. No problem.

Mr. Horcajo: After all that work. Okay, so we've reached consensus on 2010 budget. Thank you very much. Can I suggest we pass on 2011 budget till some future agenda?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Yes. Thank you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Defer no. 2.

Mr. Horcajo: No. 3, okay, I guess, I'll be real quick about this. We were talking about sunshine law a while back and I guess the issue here, whether it be, is when a member, a Chair or Vice-Chair, anybody of us talks to another person, what is the protocol that has to take place at a meeting? Whether we're talking on behalf of the MRA. For example, on the budget issue asking to keep or money or get more money or whatever. Or talking even with a Council Member at an office, we all, some of us know Council Members kind of well so we see them all over the place. So I guess maybe that's a question for Counsel. What is the protocol for -? Do we have to have a vote at this board to say you can talk with, you can testify or you can talk with Council Member, or you can talk with the Planning Director?

APPROVED 06-18-2010

Mr. Giroux: Yeah, I think, I guess, in the context of the sunshine law is where this topic would go. And I think you've got to be aware of maybe three possible scenarios. One is basically just the Mayor, you know, that's the administrative side of the political structure. Then you have talking with other agencies, like testifying as somebody to another agency. And then the other one is to Council. Going in front of a legislative body and testifying. And you can also put it in the category – that category is like the State Legislature.

Depending on the nature and scope of your purpose to be speaking at, you know, to or at a meeting, or to a person, you really have to look at how you're representing yourself to that person or to that body. If you're representing to them that you're speaking for the body, then I think it's imperative that you get authority from the body first to even approach the person. I think like with Mayor, I think it's important that you, as a body, you have a consensus or at least a majority that says we want somebody to go talk to the Mayor about this issue. And that person has the authority and it has the scope of what that person needs to go and do. And the sunshine law, it gets really technical about what you can and can't do as far as where you have two or more members doing this, going and communicating with people. And you can – I believe this body could have two people go and communicate with the Mayor, Council Member or even testify at a public meeting and it would be okay. I mean, you're two people. But you still would want – you know, the idea is that if you're going to be speaking for the body, you want the body to be voting on that. You know, you don't want one person to show up at a meeting and say well the MRA is totally for this, and blah, blah, blah, and then the next person say, oh, and by the way I'm the Vice-Chair and we're actually not for that, and then that's just, you know, it's all of sudden, it's oh my goodness. We're fighting against ourselves. So I think that's really one thing you want to emphasize is that if you can strategically give people an assignment to say okay Alexa you seem to have a good relationship with the Mayor. Can you go and talk to her about this issue? And then everybody says oh yeah, okay, and then just come back and give us a report. You know, something to that extent. And hopefully it's not like an action item. Because if it's an action item, then we have to get more formal. We're using the investigative process exception to the sunshine law because then we, this board, needs to take action on something. And then we assign one member to go and can you go do a site visit or something, you know, you live next to that, so why don't you go do that. Well now, we've just created an investigative committee. Now the person, they have the assignment and the scope. They've got to come back, make a report. We can't discuss it. And then the person, we can deliberate and take action at the subsequent meeting. And sometimes the investigative process, it's not as efficient as everybody thinks. It's easier to just –.

But I think it's unique under Chapter 53 for this board is that you are a political subset which means that a lot of things that you want to do are not action items. Like we've got a bunch of stuff that we've already, the board has already said we're for this. And in fact, it's our baby and we send it to Council. I think that within your powers that you do have the ability

APPROVED 06-18-2010

to lobby. You know, at least three or four Council Members should know that it's coming their way so it's not a surprise. Make it their idea. Get a champion for it. And so I don't think it's outside of your powers to assign somebody and say –. And as long as you don't get involved this serial communication thing where you go to one Council Member and you say, okay, are you onboard? And then you go right over to the next member, and go hey so-and-so, I just had a meeting with so-and-so, and he's on board. And are you board? That is patently illegal. That's a violation of the sunshine law. You can't be going –. And so, but I don't think it's a problem to go to one member and say look we had a meeting, the MRA had a meeting, they've assigned me this job to come to you, as courtesy from agency to agency to just let you know that this is important to us, it's vital and it's important to your constituents. We believe so. And leave it at that, you know. Because you want them to know about it before somebody else gets there and is either not for it or they are offended because nobody came to talk to them. So, you know, it's part of that. And if you can do that ahead of time, give these assignments out, and do that so people are aware that, you know. And everybody has, you know, different members of the community. They're just naturally, because of their jobs or their history, have a closer tie to and it just seems natural to say, so-and-so, you know, you're part of this organization, maybe you can go and pitch this to like the Chambers of Commerce. Get this out there. Why don't we get this out there. And as long as, when you speak the Council Member or to a body that it's clear that you do have the authority from the board to speak for them. And you're not out there pushing an agenda that's not agreed on, and that's what you don't want. You don't want five members to be running around, going well, we want this and we want this, but what did we vote on? We're split. So, I think it's very important to have that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. So James just to clarify what you're saying. I did read where in our case, with the MRA, it has to be two people, but not more than quorum. And in our case, three is quorum.

Mr. Giroux: Three is quorum.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So in our case, it's always got to be two people. Not one, not three, but two. And secondly, we need to vote on it ahead of time. So similar to the way during Ron Kawahara's chairmanship, the body voted that Ron would meet regularly with the Mayor, and he had to take another person with him because of that two rule requirement.

Mr. Giroux: I don't think it's necessarily true that you have to have two.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Or just that the body knows you're going.

Mr. Giroux: Yeah. That the body at least votes to say this member should do it. Or you could even, you know, say we've discussed this, we voted, we got a majority on board, and to say if a member, you know, can expound this position with this other body or with this

APPROVED 06-18-2010

person, to at least have a structured mission. And then have that person just report back and say, you know, I had my meeting with the Mayor. She understands our ordinance. She's in full backing. The only thing she'd like to see is probably another study. And, then, oh, that's great. Okay, well, let's not discuss that at this meeting. We'll put it on the agenda, and in a future agenda we'll discuss about this further study and why do we think it's necessary and maybe Corporation Counsel could come back with, you know, why would that be the administrative's position legally, you know. And so that's how you're going to get a cleaner interface because you really don't have that luxury of having a professional lobbyist.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, we don't have a manager that we've assigned to do that. Not yet anyway.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine any comments? Raymond? I will admit that I probably didn't do it right the last time, but let's all think about being proactive and strategic as James has used as working towards a project to remember. Anyone of you can bring up, hey by the way, we've got this on the agenda, may I suggest that we assign somebody. But what I get from James, we don't necessarily need a vote. It could just be a consensus if it's something as simple as, you know, you're going to – Council Members are going to be MEDB or something. Am I correct?

Mr. Giroux: Yeah, you know –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, except, see this is where it gets – I see those people all of the time, and they do come to MEDB. But I never talk about MRA business with them, ever, unless it's been here and I know what everybody wants to do and we voted on something. So, I at least know that what I'm saying is an action that we've already agreed to.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, that's fine. So, that's the safe route to take and that's fine. We'll just take a vote.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But is that a legal – would it be illegal if unbeknownst to the board members I'm having conversations with Council Members or Mayor about MRA issues?

Mr. Giroux: Personally, from my –. As your attorney, I don't see it as illegal. I would see it –.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Not illegal. Unethical, you mean.

Mr. Giroux: On the board's side, you're not having an illegal meeting. You're not violating Chapter 92. When you're at a social function and the Mayor just happens to be there, and she says, well how's the structure going? And you're saying, well, this is where we're at.

APPROVED 06-18-2010

That's not an illegal conversation.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. Because it's something that the whole board. It's benign information.

Mr. Giroux: It's public information, and you're moving it along. It's like putting on the website. You're moving this public information. You're not going to come back to the board, and the Mayor is not going to be here going well Alexa told me blah, blah, blah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And if I were lobbying for something.

Mr. Giroux: Yeah, something hasn't been deliberately discussed yet, I don't think it's going to help the organization much. But when we know that we've already voted on something it's on the books, it's moving along, and we just need to do public relations. I think in that sense you really want to have the freedom to have these conversations because information is key. As long as you're prommagating the correct information. So it's not a sunshine law issue. I don't see it as a sunshine law issue. But if you go to a public function and there's three Council Members there and you're lobbying all three at the same time, and you're trying to get them to commit to vote on our proposed legislation, you're going to find yourself in an awkward situation. You know, you're not violating the sunshine law on our side, you're violating it on the Council side. And that's where you don't want to cross the line either.

Ms. Wade: Respect the . . .(Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Giroux: Yeah because then they may start deliberating it on the floor, and those three people will say I was at this thing with Alexa, and she told me blah, blah, blah, blah, and you're going oh snap! There's that public person in the back going that's a violation of the sunshine law. You don't want to find yourself as a member because you, yourself, may not actually – you know, you're not going to get the misdemeanor. But those three – you're going to lose the faith and confidence of those three members, and they're going to be like, hey, I don't want to talk to you again. The last time I talked to you, I got – I was in the papers. You don't want to – that's part of the uniqueness of this body is you're so important politically that, you know, your votes and your discussions and your deliberations in your agency meeting don't just stop here. They have some influence in the policy making of the County as a whole. And that's where you have to be cautious about how you proceed in how you're disseminating that information to the County.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So the way you told it to me once, many years ago was, if it's your agenda, don't talk about it. If it's the body's agenda, then you can talk about it.

E. DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON SCOPE OF WORK AND SHORT TERM

APPROVED 06-18-2010

GOALS FOR A MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MANAGER.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, see you Ray. Alright, just finish up on the agenda. (E) is cancelled I guess for all intense purposes.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would like to defer it to the next regular meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: We can do that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: If we can.

F. NEXT MEETING DATE: May 21, 2010

Mr. Horcajo: And then item (F) is, I guess, next meeting date, May 21st, one o'clock. So we're adjourned. Thank you.

G. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

APPROVED 06-18-2010

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Robert Horcajo, Chair
Alexa Betts Basinger
Raymond Phillips
Katharine Popenuk, Vice-Chair
Warren Suzuki

Others:

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