

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 15, 2010**

APPROVED 11-19-2010

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Mr. Robert Horcajo, at 1:05 p.m., Friday, October 15, 2010, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Island of Maui.

A quorum of the Commission was present (See Record of Attendance.)

Mr. Robert Horcajo: Thank you for waiting. The Chair will call the October 15, 2010 Maui Redevelopment Agency meeting to order please at 1:05 p.m. Thank you very much. We do have a full quorum today, so I would like to recognize Katharine Popenuk, our Vice Chair; Warren Suzuki; Alexa Basinger; and Ray Phillips. Especially to Ray who has had a couple of issues, months of back, and surgery. Thanks for being here. Also staff, we have Erin Wade and Leilani Ramoran.

The Chair will open up the hearing to public testimony at this point in time. You will have an opportunity to either speak at this point in time or when an agenda item does come up. You have three minutes. Leilani will let you know at two minutes and thirty second, and I will ask you to conclude at three minutes. There is also a sign up sheet somewhere for public testimony so if you want to provide public testimony, please sign up.

First item on the agenda is a public hearing, and I'm going to have Erin Wade start the discussion. I'm sorry, is there any general testimony at this point in time? Thank you.

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. MR. STEVEN SUNG, CASCADIA PM LLC, HONOLULU, requesting an MRA Use Permit for a cellular communication facility with six (6) panel antennas located at 1997 Main Street, Wailuku, HI TMK (2) 3-4-011:008, (MRA 2010/0005). (E. Wade)**

Ms. Erin Wade: Good afternoon Commissioners. My name is Erin Wade. I work for the Planning Department.

Mr. Horcajo: Leilani, can you hear that?

Ms. Wade: Again, I need to project. Okay, today, our public hearing is Mr. Steve Sung, from Cascadia PM LLC, Honolulu, requesting an MRA Use Permit for a cellular communication facility with six panel antennas located at 1997 Main Street. You asked last meeting for a little bit of a primer at the beginning about different types of permits because it's been a long time since this board has seen an MRA Use Permit.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Essentially, there are four types of permits that the MRA reviews. One is an administrative review permit, an MRA Use Permit, Variances and Design Review. The ones you generally see reoccurringly are Variances and the Design Reviews. The MRA Use Permit has to meet design standards, and in this case, it's 30.16.070 which is part of the commercial mixed use district, design standards for telecommunication towers. With the lights, it's a difficult. Oh, thanks Leilani.

This particular project is located at the corner of Main and Market Street to the rear, the furthest back portion of the lot. Verizon Wireless is requesting an MRA Use Permit behind the building which is the Old Maui Dry Goods building, and you can see that in the top picture. The elevation, that's the Maui Dry Goods building. Below is the Old Maui Bookstore. The facility is to the rear of that.

The performance standard states that it shall be assessed for its mauka and makai visual impacts with special consideration given to the visual impacts towards Iao Valley. And this is an after-the-fact use permit, and I'll explain a little bit. When I received this, it could have been administratively approved if it had an original building permit. However, during the time a lot of these telecommunication facilities were getting put up, most of them didn't get building permits because there wasn't a requirement for that at that time. So now as the expand or add to the facilities, we realize, we dig in the records and can't find any documentation of the original permit. So we require them to come back and get the use permit and comply with whatever performance standards might be required. So that's the case for this facility.

The Chair called me after the staff report went out and noted that this particular staff report didn't include the development standards I normally include in the staff reports and an analysis of whether or not the criteria had been met. In this case, all the minimum requirements are met. The minimum lot size is 4,500 square feet. This is a 13,500 square foot lot. The minimum lot width is 45 feet. The lot width 135 feet. The minimum setback in the front is zero, and they have a 62 foot setback to the deck that accesses the antenna, and a 68 foot setback to the antenna itself. The side setback has no requirements, but they have nine foot setback between the point of the antenna. There is no setback to the deck. To the rear, there is no requirement, but they have a six-foot four-inch set back. The maximum height in this location is four-stories and 60 feet. The antenna itself will be about 52-feet tall. And the height of the actual frame is not increasing in height, just the addition of an antenna. The maximum floor area ratio doesn't apply, nor does parking or loading. There's not requirements for any of those in this section as they relate to telecommunication. So we do have the applicant, Steve Sung, in the audience. He will make a brief presentation to you and then you will be welcomed to ask him questions and open the floor for the public hearing.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you Erin. Mr. Sung? So could you identify yourself, of course, and who

you representation, first?

Mr. Steven Sung: Certainly. My name is Steve Sung, with Cascadia PM LLC. We represent Verizon Wireless. I wouldn't have much to add. Erin did a great job in pretty much going over the project. I just want to state the importance of our site modification. We do have the 4G network. I don't know if everyone has seen the commercials and what have you. And also the importance of this site, we certainly provide the E911 service to the Police. So having an existing site, we just feel that the additional antennas should not have any – well, I would say visual effects being that this is an existing site and people have been seeing this site for quite a while. So, once again, we meet all the minimum requirements that is stated in the MRA Use and we humbly ask for the approval for the MRA Use Permit.

Mr. Horcajo: Mr. Sung, I'm going to open the floor to public testimony first, so if you don't mind and then we will call you back up.

Mr. Sung: Certainly. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to provide public testimony on this agenda item?

Ms. Jocelyn Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association/Tri-Isle Main Street Resource Center. We did not receive this for review until last week Thursday. As a result, we didn't get a chance to – an opportunity to provide that review. That is an important review because we've had antennas come up in the past and there has been concerns. Fortunately, for this particular project, it is fortunate that we do not have any real concerns because – but we do have a lot of questions like what triggered an after-the-fact permit? Did somebody turn this project in or whatever that somehow they got cited? It's an existing site. It would be interesting to have on record how long this has been up prior to getting cited. And I would like to say that we would be supporting the recommendations. As I look back at our MOBI antenna and our other Verizon application that occurred in Wailuku, and we've had similar comments that we had rendered before such as the panel antennas and the support structure – regarding the panels and support structure. And of course, that the cables be painted that light paint, that light color, and we had that. It was actually a lot more visible, and taller buildings when it was placed in taller buildings. And I have something to share that maybe of interest for the MRA members that they might want to avail themselves so they can get real expertise and good information regarding this kind of project. The County Council empowered an ad hoc committee, a telecommunications ad hoc community and they extensively studied a telecommunications including these kind of cables and multi-cables going in one location and so on and so forth. It was thoroughly looked at, thoroughly discussed, and they came up with not only standards, but they also alleviated a lot of the concerns and fears that some people had

APPROVED 11-19-2010

relative to these kinds of support that's going to be necessary in a lot of the buildings. So I would highly recommend that you get a copy of that. And I know about that because I was privileged to be appointed by the Council to serve on that telecommunications committee. If you are unable to get a copy from the County Council which empowered that committee, I'd be happy to share what I have in my file with you.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you very much. Any questions for the Jocelyn? For the testifier? Okay, thank you. Any other public testimony on this agenda item? Okay, seeing none, the Chair will close public testimony. Mr. Sung, if you could come back up please. So members, any questions for the Verizon representative?

Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger: Thank you very much for being here. I have one question. In the future, if there is build up of the surrounding building, will those affect the antenna being in any way?

Mr. Sung: Well I think as long as it does not go above what the height of the building. The answer is no. Once again, as long as the building, they're not building a five or six story building, there shouldn't be a problem at all. As you can see, the existing building is basically, I would say 10 feet below where the antenna ends, the lowest point part of the antenna. I think it was 12 or some odd feet. And that's under – we're fully under FCC guidelines.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Because I know the Old Maui Bookstore is one story, and the other building to the right is two?

Mr. Sung: Two. Correct.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And the maximum building allowable is four, so even at three stories, that won't affect your –?

Mr. Sung: Correct. Now anything higher, then obviously, then you know, we would have to –. I mean, if it comes back, some zoning code changes, and you know, they come back allowing height of six-story buildings, we would obviously try to get a variance. And if the zoning code changes, you know along with allowing the building to get taller, then we'll obviously want to build a taller tower to obviously eliminate any health hazard or what have you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. Chair, just only final question.

Mr. Horcajo: Sure.

Ms. Betts Basinger: When was this change tower –

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Mr. Sung: I was just about to answer that. To my knowledge, looking at the existing license agreement, it was renewed I think two times. So I'm assuming this is probably a little bit over 10 years old, the existing tower.

Ms. Betts Basinger: The existing one?

Mr. Sung: Yes. And what we're doing, we're not changing out anything. We're basically putting on some brackets to support the structure to hold three more antennas, and that's all we're doing. But, yeah, to answer your question, I would say, it's about a little bit over 10 years.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. Thank you Chair.

Mr. Sung: Sure.

Mr. Horcajo: Members, any other questions? Warren?

Mr. Warren Suzuki: Mr. Sung?

Mr. Sung: Yes sir.

Mr. Suzuki: Are there any line of site requirements?

Mr. Sung: No. Unless —. Any kind of line of site is basically we have a dish. If we have a dish, then it has a line of site. As far as radio frequencies, no, it's not line of site. But, we would prefer to have line of site. The clearer the path, then better the coverage. But, it's not necessary.

Mr. Suzuki: So the line of site would be just the surrounding area?

Mr. Sung: Well, it covers — basically, it covers, in this case, it covers maybe three-quarter miles. The output is so low. That's the problem. The output that's allowed, it's only really to have good coverage. No, you know, building disturbance or anything, you're looking at maybe a quarter mile. Really, a quarter, no, half or three-quarter miles. So that's why you have all these sites that's so close now because everybody is trying to have all these drop calls and complaints and what have you. So that's why they have to kind of put a capacity site and kind of help hand off these sites that only cover so far.

Mr. Suzuki: So do you have any additional sites in the Wailuku area?

Mr. Sung: Yes, we do. I think it's about a mile away, the closest one.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Ms. Wade: There is a tower on the top of the One Main Plaza building which received a similar permit.

Mr. Suzuki: Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions? Katharine? Mr. Sung, I have a question. I guess I would have like to see an actual picture showing how it would look with the six panels. But if you look at the bottom picture and what I just heard from Erin Wade, what I saw from your plans, the top of that frame is 49 feet.

Mr. Sung: Correct.

Mr. Horcajo: But now with the eight-foot panels, it's going to be 52-feet, so it's going to extend higher than that?

Mr. Sung: Let me bring the plans real quick. Erin, do you happen to have the plan listed on there?

Ms. Wade: The plan?

Mr. Sung: Yeah, the plans that I've provided?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Sung: Would it be on the –

Mr. Raymond Phillips: It's 4910

Mr. Sung: 4910. Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: That's to the top of the frame.

Mr. Sung: So the height of the tower will not increase. You have enough room there. As you can see, those are six-foot antennas. So even with the space, from top to bottom, it will be able to accommodate eight-foot panels.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So the top of the panels will not extend beyond the top of the existing frame?

Mr. Sung: No, they're not. Correct.

Mr. Horcajo: All right. I think my asking my question, I think I'm fine asking you a question.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

I was going to ask Erin maybe to clarify the statement about the after-the-fact permit. But it really was not based on the violation, so I think we're fine.

Mr. Sung: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Erin?

Ms. Wade: Sure. There is no violation involved with the site whatsoever. The applicant, when they applied for an expansion of use, which is happening here – it's an intensification – we go back and we determine what's already been approved. In the file, there was nothing that had been approved for this particular site. So I called the zoning division because this is the first case that the MRA had dealt with this. The zoning division, they said that their procedure is, for a telecommunication towers – and they say this happens very regularly – when they come in for an intensification, that there wasn't an existing permit, so they make them go through as if it was a new tower. That's why the use permit is required.

Mr. Sung: And I can concur. I've been doing a lot of work in Big Island as well, and a lot of tower that was built before the, you know, ordinance was drafted. So you have a lot of towers that up that was without permit. So any kind of modification work such as this, adding more antennas or we getting more heights or, you know, whatever the situation might be, any kind of modification, what we're experiencing is the County is coming back to have us, you know, property zone that tower, to make sure, you know, it's up to date on the code.

Mr. Horcajo: Excuse me, I actually do have one more question.

Mr. Sung: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: There was a comment made by Jocelyn from WMSA and the staff report which you might have already seen, suggest that cables be painted a lighter color. What's your comment about that?

Mr. Sung: I will put that as a –. In fact, if you folks can put it as a condition, then I will have Verizon honor that condition. We'll honor any condition that's required from MRA.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions, members, to Mr. Sung? Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Sung: Thank you for your time.

Mr. Horcajo: All right members, maybe I'm going to have Erin – you want to read your staff recommendations, I guess, for this action?

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Ms. Wade: Sure. Staff recommends approval of the MRA Use Permit subject to the following conditions. We have our five standard conditions. The first deals with the construction timing. The second with the liability insurance. The third, with full compliance with applicable governmental requirements. The fourth that they shall develop the property in substantially the same manner as represented at the MRA meeting. And that the subject MRA approval shall not be transferred without prior written approval. The specific conditions included in the staff recommendations are: (6), that full compliance with the development standards of the commercial mixed use district shall be rendered. (7), that the panel antenna support structure and co-axil cables be painted a light colored. And I would just offer that because I heard some questions regarding the height that we could add a third condition regarding that the height allowance should be no more than the 49-foot, 10-inches, if you wanted to include that.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay members, you heard the staff's recommendation. Do I have a motion?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I move to accept staff's recommendations.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, is there a second?

Mr. Suzuki: Second.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, discussion, please?

Mr. Suzuki: Discussion. I guess, the question that comes up to my mind, Erin, is when you say to paint it a light color, that's so general that, you know, who is the one that's going to make the interpretation? So I'm not too sure if we can be a little bit more specific. You know, I don't think we can make reference to a specific color, but maybe a light color as approved by the Planning Department or yourself, whatever. So we don't get into a situation where it becomes a matter interpretation and you have a disagreement.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's a good point Warren. It looks like the existing color is light. Maybe the wording could be consistent with the existing color. Would that be okay Warren?

Mr. Horcajo: Is that okay with the rest of you? Let's have any other questions before we add that as an amendment then. Any other discussion, members? Are we fine with how that wording is? Can you repeat what it's going to say for condition (7)?

Ms. Wade: Sure. That the panel antennas, support structure, and co-axil cables be painted a light color as consistent with the existing structure.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Do we have a motion to – do we need to amend your motion?

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'll move again. I will move to approve staff report as amended.

Mr. Horcajo: Second?

Ms. Katharine Popenuk: Second.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any further discussion? Okay, the Chair would like to take a vote. All in favor signify by saying aye.

Agency Members: "Aye."

Mr. Horcajo: All opposed? Okay, it has been approved. Thank you very much Mr. Sung.

It was moved by Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger and seconded by Ms. Katharine Popenuk, then unanimously

VOTED: to approve the Planning Department's report and recommendations with the amendment as discussed.

C. MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BUSINESS

1. COUNTY COUNCIL REQUESTING COMMENT ON A BILL TO PROHIBIT PARKING ON WAILANI STREET, WAILUKU.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, #(2) on our agenda is MRA Business. I see Mr. Milton Arakawa is here, Director of Public Works. So, Erin, you want to start this agenda item?

Ms. Wade: Sure. Thank you. There is a Council County bill at this time to prohibit parking on Wailani Street. The County Council Committee on Infrastructure referred this back to the MRA because Wailani Street is in the Maui Redevelopment Area. So the bill was proposed by the Director of Public Works, so he's here to explain sort of the genesis of the request.

Mr. Horcajo: Good afternoon Mr. Arakawa.

Mr. Milton Arakawa: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to be here. You know, as Erin mentioned –

Mr. Horcajo: Excuse me, Milton, if you don't mind, I have to be fair to everybody. Can you identify yourself?

Mr. Arakawa: Sure. I'm Milton Arakawa, I'm the County Director of Public Works. And the

APPROVED 11-19-2010

item that you have before you is a proposed bill to prohibit parking on both sides of Wailani Street between east Vineyard Street and Nani Street. And as you all probably know Wailani is located between the Community Clinic and Wailuku Hongwanji Mission. And as Erin mentioned the proposed bill is before the Council's Infrastructure Management Committee, and the Council basically asked for comment from the MRA and that's why the bill is here. So properties along that street, Wailani Street, are largely residential in nature, and the proposed bill was initiated by our department because of calls from several residents concerned that delivery and refuse services would not be able to accomplish, be accomplished, due to the insufficient traveling width for vehicles when cars are parked on one or, of course, both sides of the street.

I would mention that the County standard for local roadway – and Wailani is a local roadway – the County's standard for local roadway is a 44-foot right-of-way with a 28-foot pavement width. And the right-of-way along Wailani Street varies from 12 to 20 feet. And the pavement width also varies with the widest portion of pavement being 16 feet. So it's a very narrow street. We had the Traffic Safety Council which is under the Department of Public Works, review the bill. They reviewed it at its December 9th, 2008 meeting. Because of the narrow roadway, the Traffic Safety Council also found that emergency vehicles could not get easy access to the homes abutting the lot, abutting the road, I'm sorry. They concurred that parking should not be allowed on both sides of the street. Pursuant to the infrastructure management committee's request, we have also sent letters to the property owners who may be affected by the ban on parking, to submit their comments to us. And there are 17 properties with frontage along Wailani Street. Five of the property owners were in favor of the parking ban, and three were against the ban. We also then sent a second letter to those owners who did not respond to the first letter informing them that should no response be received, it will be assumed that they would be in favor of a parking ban. And the remaining nine properties did not respond. So you can calculate the numbers various ways. So if we include those properties which did not respond as being in favor, then it would 82% in favor of the ban, and 18% against. But if you calculate as there's 17 properties, five in favor, that's 29% of the total being in favor; three against is 18% in favor; and nine who did not respond was basically 53%. So those are the numbers.

Two of the owners submitted suggestions such as prohibiting parking in front specific properties, or converting Wailani to a one-way street, or prohibiting parking on one side of the roadway. Our feeling is that since the roadway is already very narrow, these suggestions do not really fully address the concern of the impeded movement of traffic. So our recommendation to you and to the Council is to approve the proposed bill to prohibit parking on Wailani Street.

The letter that we got from the Planning Department also looks or is suggesting that we prohibit parking on the east side of Church Street between Waikahi Place and Vineyard

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Street. This is by that old Yokouchi Bakery property. I just wanted to note that we would prefer that this be considered a separate matter from the Wailani Street proposal. And from the MRA standpoint, you can choose one of two options, you may opt to send your request directly to the Council. And what the Council normally does in cases like these is they would ask for comment from the Department of Public Works, and also the Traffic Safety Council. So they probably refer it back to us. We'd have to give our comments and get some comments from the Traffic Safety Council. Or the MRA can directly send a letter to Public Works, and we'll basically do the same thing, re-evaluate it and get comments from Traffic Safety Council, before it goes up to the County Council for final action. So anyway, that's my comments on the matter, and if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer.

Mr. Horcajo: Mr. Arakawa, I think we're going to open it for public testimony first, and then we'll call you back up if you don't mind. Thank you. Is there anyone out there who wants to testify on this agenda item, please step forward?

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association Inc. I have a question. I remember when the Lokelani project came before the MRA and the crux of what kept that project from getting a speedy approval from the MRA was hinged on extensive concerns about sufficient parking. As a matter of fact the project which was designed a lot nicer had to be redesigned with something that is there now that is different from the original design so that they could address what is on, effectively, on record with the MRA, about having sufficient parking. So, I guess it would be interesting and informative to see what the MRA will be doing now for the amount of parking stalls that's going to be removed from that project site because I do think it's not just a question of –. Although, you know, what Milton folks sent down to the Council, and so on and so forth, may very well be what needed to be done. Unfortunately, it didn't get taken up at the same time that the project received the approvals. However, given the fact that the project did receive approvals based upon addressing the – and there was extensive testimony from residence in the area about the parking concerns, about having sufficient parking – that I would think that there has to be some kind of mitigative measure, perhaps, that can be discussed at least on what will take place in light of the fact that – how many stalls are going to be removed, excuse me?

Mr. Horcajo: Seven.

Ms. Perreira: Seven stalls. That's a lot of stalls because they redesigned only on five, a concern of five, so now we have more. So that's a concern. And I just would like to say that, you know, the people that we advocate for would be concerned about that, even though they may not have responded back. But that doesn't mean they're not going to be concerned and express concern once they realize that parking will be gone. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any questions for the testifier? Jocelyn? I have a question Jocelyn

APPROVED 11-19-2010

please. Because you had mentioned a previous design, and it got changed. Did that design include all the parked parking stalls off-site? I mean, on the property? I mean, off street, on the site?

Ms. Perreira: They had stalls on the street, like this one has. Part of the problem was that it just didn't have enough. And instead of trying to – and one of the recommendations, because I remember that very clearly. Lloyd Poelman was the Chairman at that particular time. One of the recommendations we made was to go try to talk story with Maui Clinic and see if they could, instead of change the design, try see if they could get, you know, the additional stalls that they need, rather than change the building design. But they opted, instead, to have them change the design to accommodate enough parking onsite as well as what was going to determine around the project site.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so when you say better design, that was just the building itself. It was the apartment. That's what you meant.

Ms. Perreira: The apartment building was changed, definitely.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Arakawa, if you can please come back up. Members, any question for –? Ray?

Mr. Phillips: Thank you Milton for coming and visiting with us today. I think all of us are concerned about losing more parking spaces in Wailuku, and particularly – and I know you just brought it up aside, but something happening on Church Street as well. And I know with Na Hale O Maui, and we have a lot of problem finding parking as it is. I have concerns, I really do. I'm not so sure that we really went and pounded on the doors to the 17 property owners to really ask what their response would be. People sometimes don't respond to things. They just walk it to the garbage can and pop it in, unfortunately.

Second thing is, is it all possible that we can come to a compromise where there is still parking on one side that still allows. And I know I can see through the picture right now that's there's still parking along the Maui Bake Shop side that still allows for emergency vehicles. And I know, of course, this roadway is never going to come up to standard.

Mr. Horcajo: Ray, I'm sorry. You know what, we should only be talking about agenda item whatever, on the Wailani Street.

Mr. Phillips: Yeah, I know. I'm not talking about Church Street.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Mr. Phillips: So on Wailani Street, I think there – my suggesting is we go back, speak to the

property owners, and also consider allowing parking on one side.

Mr. Horcajo: Did you have a question for Mr. Arakawa?

Mr. Phillips: My question is –. Well, I guess the question is obviously understanding there's substandard and it's much better to take the vehicles away. Is there any other way that you looked at aside from that note? I guess that's my question.

Mr. Arakawa: Actually two of these, several of these other suggestions as I mentioned, like several of the property owners said just prohibit the parking in front of my property, or prohibit parking on one side. But the roadway itself, I mean, if you took a look at it, it's so narrow. And to accommodate two-way traffic on that, and hour parking on one side, from our standpoint, it basically just wouldn't work. Because of the narrow right-of-way, it's kind of an all or nothing kind of proposition from our standpoint. I also wanted to clarify one point and I should have made it earlier in my presentation. But, the question of Wailani, between Nani and Loke Street, is actually a one-way street. And from Loke to the Hongwanji Mission is actually two-way. So, the parallel parking stalls that are on Wailani, between Nani and Loke, are actually on the housing's lot. So the bill that you have before you will not affect that parking because that is considered part of the housing's property. But it does affect the remaining portion of Wailani.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And that's the one-way portion?

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine, do you have a question?

Ms. Katharine Popenuk: Actually, that was my question because this is private property and if they want to park cars on their private property that's their prerogative, correct? And then it appears that the street is wider after from Loke that meets Vineyard Street that's on this –. It's just cropped right on the edge there but it's proof that the street is in fact wider.

Mr. Arakawa: It is a little wider, but the maximum right-of-way width is like 20-feet. And generally, if you have two-way traffic, you have 10-feet basically going in either direction. So if you put parking on one side or both sides, you're going to substantially impeded the traffic flow.

Ms. Popenuk: This, for the most part, is residential, from Loke to east Vineyard. Is that correct?

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: And is there any particular reason why one-way configuration isn't being considered?

Mr. Arakawa: We could possibly look at one-way to continue that. It may be an option.

Ms. Popenuk: I'm wondering if the folks that live there would rather have a place to park their cars close to a two-way street. Given the choice between parking on your lawn, and on a two-way street.

Mr. Arakawa: One-way, we could look at one-way, I suppose.

Mr. Suzuki: Milton, I have a question. You know I don't have a map in front of me that shows the extent of Wailani Street. Initially I thought we were just talking about the section that fronts the housing project, but it extends further, I guess, north, towards Vineyard Street. And the question that I have is that, especially in the older subdivision, you have some lots that don't even have a driveway garage. You just have a home that's on the property, a sidewalk that comes to the road, and there's no garage or no driveway on the property. So I think for those people they likely rely on parking on the street in front of their house to park their cars. So, and if you prohibit parking on Wailani, then they'd be forced to park on the street and not fronting their house. So my question is are there situation of that nature where a land owner would be forced to park on a different street from the street, Wailani, that fronts their property?

Mr. Arakawa: Well, I think this is kind of like this whole quandary that we're facing, Wailuku Town, it's pretty much a general problem. We have small lots, and many of the lots haven't been – basically have insufficient onsite parking, so they're going to park on the street. And so the streets are congested. If you do ban parking on the street, then, you know, they have to park somewhere, so I'm assuming they're going to have to park somewhere else, on some other street. Yeah, and you know, where are they going to park? That is true.

Mr. Suzuki: They would park on the street that doesn't front your house. I understand the logic or the reasons why they want to get rid of the parking. But to force the landowner to park on a street that doesn't front their lot, to me, doesn't make a whole lot of sense, too, correct?

Mr. Arakawa: Yeah, if there's insufficient parking on the site, then, yeah, he'd have to find some parking somewhere else. I think some of the properties there, on Wailani Street, because the road is so narrow itself, what some of the property owners appear to have done is they put the boundary walls right on the property line to ensure that people travel on the public right-a-way, as opposed to on their property. Some of the properties have parking on their site. Maybe not a sufficient number, but they do have some parking on their site. If they have, you know, tenants or extended family or what have you, you know,

they may end up parking on the street.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions for Milton?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I have a question Milton. What is the status of this ordinance at this time?

Mr. Arakawa: The bill is at the Council's Infrastructure Management Committee, and the Committee has not taken action on it at this point.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And Erin, all of the other streets that are associated with this ordinance, are any of them in the MRA area?

Mr. Horcajo: Many.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I'm looking at the list. Is this going to be a one by one issue that we'll be looking at?

Ms. Wade: Right. So the Director has asked that if we have recommendations for additional roadways to take a look at, that we would do that under a separate action.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So do it in one swoop, so it all goes back to Council.

Ms. Wade: Just the opposite. They would take this for Wailani only and deal that, to gauge on that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And then, just a comment, members, this was initiated by residents, and is supported by emergency and fire, etc.

Mr. Arakawa: I don't have anything in writing from Fire and Police. In fact, the Council Committee is writing to them to get their comments in writing. But, generally, for other projects, Fire has said, you know, they want two-way accesses, at least 20-feet.

Ms. Betts Basinger: No other questions Chair.

Mr. Horcajo: I have some questions Milton. I guess first a comment. I appreciate the public notification which is great. But I guess I have kind of question about a different project first, and then I'll come back to this. I remember years ago then Dain Kane was in, and they talked about blocking parking on Mokuhan Road. Because if you've been up that road, it's pretty narrow because everybody parks on the right hand side of the street. And I know that failed because I assume a lot of people came up there and said that's really the only spot to park because the lots are small or there's a lot of extended family and stuff. But

APPROVED 11-19-2010

because I have property on that side, when we had the big fire, what everybody did is that once the fire was there, they moved all of the cars off the street quickly. They knew they had to do their part so the fire trucks could drive up. And I'm not saying that's something to consider, but it could be because a lot of Wailuku undoubtedly has narrow streets. But I guess my first question on that is for Mokuhaui was that something that came from Public Works or from Fire. Do you kind of remember that, what caused that bill to be proposed? You might not have been here, come to think of it. I'm not even sure now.

Mr. Arakawa: I don't know the answer to that question.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Sorry about that. I guess I was confused by Katharine's comment. The stalls that are on private property right now, those stalls are being removed right?

Ms. Betts Basinger: No.

Ms. Wade: No.

Mr. Horcajo: No, they're still going to stay there?

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: So really, there's no issue about losing the required amount of stalls that was required when they build the project. They're still going to be there, but it's going to be private.

Mr. Arakawa: Yes, these are just the stalls that are between Nani and Loke Street.

Mr. Horcajo: And Loke right. So this idea of no parking, that's just from Loke down to east Vineyard. Is that what we're talking about here then? Not so much between Nani and Loke?

Mr. Arakawa: No, it would be from Nani to Vineyard, but the portion, the one-way portion is so narrow that if you park your car over there, you're basically blocking the whole lane.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Right. All right. So those guys will still have their stalls, except nobody can park on the right-hand side.

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: The east side going down Wailana between Loke, between Nani and Loke – that's what we talked about. And then on both sides between Loke and east Vineyard?

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. Okay. All right, that answers one of the questions I guess that came from Ms. Jocelyn here. Excuse me a second here, so if we choose to suggest, I guess, out of this committee that we agree with that narrow one-way portion, that still doesn't help Fire if they want 20-feet. But, if we decide to address Loke to east Vineyard and suggest one-way, we have that option too I guess. Or at least allow parking on one side of the street like what is happening on North Church Street.

Mr. Arakawa: The one-way street option would make it a little more palatable, and maybe that can be a recommendation to the Council if that's the will of the body itself.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, I think that's my only questions at this point in time. Any other?

Ms. Popenuk: I'm sorry, I still need a little clarification here. So, on Wailani Street, from Nani to Loke, we have parking but it's on private property and that's not part of this consideration at this point. Is that correct?

Mr. Arakawa: Yes. It's part of the housing project.

Ms. Popenuk: But, there is currently people parking on the opposite side of the street?

Mr. Arakawa: No. There's --. Well, it's not expressly prohibited, but basically if someone parks on the other side of the street, they will block the entire travel lane.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. So we're suggesting that we say there is no parking on that opposite side of the street, for that first statement, that it's quite narrow. And then it goes from Loke to east Vineyard, and currently that is a two-way street.

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: And people are parking on both sides of that street. Is that correct?

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. And what we're suggesting -- you're suggesting that we have parking on neither side of the street in that case.

Mr. Arakawa: That is the bill that is currently before the Council. Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: All right.

Mr. Horcajo: Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: So Milton, you offered a suggestion that maybe the MRA can take a position, recommendation, that Wailani, between, I guess, Loke and east Vineyard, be changed to one-way and allow parking on one side. But, what would prohibit maintaining the two-way traffic with parking on one side. Because if you look at Kalua Road, for example, that's very narrow. And I think you see parking on both sides. And I realize that a lot of the vehicles that are parked there aren't the residents, but, you know, given the fact that they're not residents parked there, and yet parking is allowed on both sides, to require just drivers just to be courteous to each other and allow cars to pass when they do have cars coming from the opposite direction. So, the same probably could be said for Wailani where you still maintain the two-way traffic, allow parking on one side, whether it's the mauka or makai side, and rely on the drivers again to show courtesy, allow the cars to pass or when you see cars from the opposite direction. Because to force a one-way is a huge change, but to just allow parking on one side, not both sides, you know, is something that is not going to be so significant that people perceive it being a huge change. I don't know, you know, who the residents are in the area, but older people when you, make a significant change, will cause such a disruption of what they're normally use to, to cause some heartache. So my suggestion is two-way, allow parking on one side because isn't the people – aren't the people that park there just primarily the residents, and not people, employees of businesses?

Mr. Arakawa: I believe they're mostly residents.

Mr. Suzuki: See, so if it's mostly residents, then it's not as if there's people from the outside that are parking that are causing the hardship, but it's the people that live on the street themselves that, you know, use the parking because they need the parking. So my suggestion would be the two-way with parking on one side.

Mr. Arakawa: Well, I think the way it is now, it's two-way street, and parking is on two sides. What I've seen is that people will allow at least traffic to weave in and out, between the parked cars. Residents won't make it so that it would be totally be impassable. They kind of work it out so at least there's one lane. And that's how –. Otherwise, you just get complaints from your neighbors, right, I mean if you totally block it. But, the problem would come in with Fire, Police and emergency service type access, and of course, refuse service which is, you know, a problem too.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Milton, do you know off hand what the distance is between Wailani, between Loke and east Vineyard?

Mr. Arakawa: I don't know off hand.

Ms. Betts Basinger: From my own recollection, I think it's a little bit longer than the one-way section. But –

Mr. Horcajo: I would say it's twice as long.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, that's why I would like the people to know exactly.

Mr. Arakawa: I don't know. I don't know the exact.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And the second part of that question is, is there legal parking on both Loke and east Vineyard, on either side of this section between Loke and east Vineyard? Is there parking on east Vineyard and Loke currently?

Mr. Arakawa: You mean parking on Wailani, between those two streets, or on Loke?

Ms. Betts Basinger: No. On Loke and on east Vineyard – is there parking?

Mr. Arakawa: I don't believe there's any specific prohibitions on parking for those two streets. So it's kind of the same situation as Wailani. Of course, you can't park a certain distance from a person's driveway, and you can't park on a cross walk. You have to park within a certain distance from a fire hydrant, and you know those types of prohibitions. But otherwise, the County Council hasn't passed an ordinance prohibiting parking on Loke or east Vineyard or Wailani.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: I just wanted to sort of summarize and ask a question which is the current condition is parking two-way parking, it's too narrow for service vehicles and for fire trucks. So potential solutions might be parking, one-way parking or parking two ways. If we have parking one-way, and then parking, would the one-way street be wide enough to accommodate service vehicles and fire trucks?

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine, I think you need to maybe clarify more what sections of Wailani you're talking about.

Ms. Popenuk: Oh, I'm only talking about from Loke to east Vineyard.

Mr. Horcajo: Just Loke to east Vineyard.

Mr. Arakawa: Parking on both sides, one-way?

Ms. Popenuk: Right.

Mr. Arakawa: No.

Ms. Popenuk: Would a one-way street be –

Mr. Arakawa: No. There wouldn't be enough room.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. So, if you had parking on one side and a two-way street, would this be enough room for service vehicles?

Mr. Arakawa: No.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, we have a picture here by the way, members, that I can pass around.

Ms. Wade: It should be your staff report.

Mr. Horcajo: You know, and I would suggest you look at that North Church Street property too. That's about a 20-foot right-of-way, parking on one side, and people do –. You know it's about 13-feet wide of pavement left for people to service – UPS, trash pickup. So, again, Milton had mentioned earlier that the width of the street beyond Loke, I believe, was 16 to 20 feet wide, I believe, is what you said your original testimony.

Mr. Arakawa: Yeah. The right-of-way varies between 12 to 20. This is kind of simplemantic of our whole problem in the older – and Erin probably is well aware of it but we realize that parking is really important because people have used it. Then in redevelopment area like Wailuku, there is a desire for certain amenities, whether it's, you know, improve roads or sidewalks, bike lanes, and all those take space. So how are we going to deal with all of that in a cramped right-of-way and not affect a community character. So that's kind of the whole situation as to how deal with, how are we going to be dealing with all the parking. That's one symptom of what we've got to deal within Wailuku town.

Ms. Popenuk: What is the width of the street between Loke and east Vineyard, that portion of Wailani? For the whole right-of-way.

Ms. Wade: It can't be more than 16 feet.

Mr. Horcajo: I drive down those streets.

Mr. Arakawa: Nolly Yagin, who is our traffic engineer, maybe has a little bit more information, and I can call him up.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you. So Nolly if you can identify yourself for the recorder.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Mr. Nolly Yagin: Nolly Yagin with Public Works Engineering Division. Your question was regarding the width between Loke and Vineyard, was it?

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, that segment of Wailani.

Mr. Yagin: It varies. Starting at Loke at approximately 18-feet, and it slowly widens as it gets to east Vineyard at 20.

Ms. Popenuk: And that's from property line to property line?

Mr. Yagin: Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: And then what's the requirement for fire trucks?

Mr. Yagin: On new subdivisions, they require a 20-foot clear width which is why on minor streets they've been requiring 32-feet which would allow parking on one side, and two-way traffic.

Ms. Popenuk: So right now there's just no way . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Yagin: Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: And what about, as a matter of curiosity, Wailani, between Nani and Loke Streets? How wide is that from property line to property line?

Mr. Yagin: It averages at 12-feet.

Mr. Horcajo: You done Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: Question Nolly while you're here. So let's look at east Vineyard for example. I don't know what the right-of-way width is, but if you allow cars parked on both sides of the street, do you have a clear travel width of 20-feet?

Mr. Yagin: I'm not sure how wide – I'm just assuming that it looks like every other street here. But my guess is if you parking within the right-of-way, both sides, there's probably not enough.

Mr. Suzuki: See, that's why I'm kind of struggling here is that in the case of Wailani – I'm

not arguing for not allowing the parking – but in the case of Wailani, we're saying we don't have 20-feet and that's the reason we don't want the parking. And yet you have other streets where you allow parking on both sides, which then you don't have the 20-foot travel way, so that you don't have width. So there needs to be consistency in terms of what criteria are you going to use to determine when and where parking should be permitted and not permitted. So that's why I'm kind of struggling right now that in the case of Wailani, we talked about fire, and yet on other streets, where parking is okay, you don't have the widths there, so then do you prohibit parking there. So the criteria has to be fairly consistent when making a determination.

Mr. Horcajo: Sure. Well I guess I'm going to make a comment and this is, I guess, for everybody here. As you know, we've been taking about looking at the zoning code, looking at Wailuku Redevelopment Plan, and part of the discussion has been to maybe even codify the minimum size, maximum size lots required which is except what we have here, whether it be east Vineyard, Maluhia, Wailani, North Church Street. And in another vain we're talking about a parking management plan which is going to be started fairly soon, where aside from potentially building the parking structure, we're going to focus on getting satellite parking lots. For example, Vineyard and Wailana, Wayne Arakaki has that vacant lot. I mean, is that a good potential for a satellite public parking lot for the neighbors who live off of that street so that we can make it two-way traffic, no parking. And so actually, so my comment more to Milton is, I asked you earlier where did this come from and I guess I heard it was from the department. And I'm like Warren, I would rather us, and the County, take a comprehensive look at all of these substandard streets and come up with some, you know, some standard but in conjunction with the plan of creating satellite parking stalls so that we're not dealing with it one street at a time. This first, North Church second, whatever it maybe. So what's your opinion about really taking a comprehensive look at all these streets and parking and widths?

Mr. Arakawa: Mr. Chair, actually, I think it's a great idea. In fact, I talked to Erin about this informally, previously, because we have the same problem coming up in Lahaina town or Makawao, and Paia, and Kaunakakai. We have all these traditional roads that were build long ago to different standards. And when individual properties are redeveloped, we're kind of like stuck because, you know, the cookie cutter subdivision standards don't match. And so I think where we fell short the last time around when we did the community plan updates is that there were these roadway standards that were put forth in the plan, and I don't think it was done with a lot of feed back from the Public Works side, the health and safety, the level of service from the transportation side. But I think from the land use and transportation side, it would make great sense to work together to come up with an integrated set of roadway standards so that everyone is clear, you know, what needs to be done when these individual development proposals come up. And even for us, and for you, when they come up before you, you just have to look at your plan and basically enforce it as it comes up.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Mr. Horcajo: You know what, I think the timing is good. Undoubtedly, the General Plan is going to be approved soon, and I believe in the Policy Plan, it talked about acknowledging the narrow road. So when the CAC's are formed, especially in the old towns like Paia and Makawao and Wailuku, that the CAC's with the help of Wailuku Main Street and groups, will be focused on this issue we're talking about. Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: I just wanted to say something similar which is we do have to remember that these old communities, the width of the street isn't going to change. And so they're not going to turn into wide avenues and we need to recognize that and work with that. And I can see a scenario where we, you know, demand wide, clear streets. . . (inaudible) . . . parking out of all the streets of Wailuku town and that's not really a viable solution. I believe that the 20-foot right-of-way for fire vehicles with the two trucks passing, if I'm not mistaken. I mean we just need to recognize the reality and be willing to think creatively and perhaps compromise and some things that just are not appropriate for this small town.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions for Mr. Arakawa, and then we're going to just – really, we're looking – I guess they just want comments from us, so we can get some consensus. Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: Real quick question Milton. My recollection is that you kind of started off your presentation by saying that this draft bill was put together in response to, I guess, concerns raised by certain residents on the street.

Mr. Arakawa: Yes.

Mr. Suzuki: So it's not something that the Department of Public Works, County of Maui initiated, but in response to a request made by certain residents.

Mr. Arakawa: Yes. Can I also mention too, although it's out of the MRA's jurisdiction, there is also another bill at the Council to prohibit parking on both sides on Onaona Street which is right below the County building here, which is kind of similar. A very narrow street. And that also, those were initiated by resident requests as well. So we kind of have this same issues coming up. But from our stand point, it would be great if we had better guidance as far as what should be required in each of these types of situations.

Mr. Horcajo: So members, I'm assuming we have some consensus that we would not support at this point in time the bill that's at Council to restrict the parking on Wailani Street, and then hopefully work with Public Works on comprehensive plan for this area.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair? If we're done questioning, then do we have an opportunity to discuss this?

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Mr. Horcajo: Sure. Thank you very much. You know what, Chair will take a five minute recess. We will be back at 2:15 p.m. please.

(The Maui Redevelopment Agency recessed at approximately 2:10 p.m. and reconvened at approximately 2:17 p.m.)

Mr. Horcajo: Call to order at 2:17 p.m. thank you very much. Okay members, comments? Directions? Who wants to start?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'll start Chair because it looks like our job here is that the County Council is requesting us to comment on this particular bill, and first let me clarify with you Erin, have we agreed to confine our comment only to Wailana Street, and not all of the other streets that are listed in the bill?

Mr. Wade: That is their request is that you respond to just Wailani Street.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So, the first thing I'll throw out there is that we do follow the department's request and just keep our comments to Wailana Street. That would be something I would advocate. And then I'll finish just with my thoughts. You know, what's happening in Wailuku town and the parking demand, supply and demand, is getting more, and more, and more critical. It's an impetus to our roadway standards, our comprehensive parking plan that we're going to get ourselves involved with. And it just gives more meat to the argument of satellite parking, our parking structure perhaps. And so all this is a good thing. But I think delaying or putting this off especially in an area of Wailuku that is high density where emergency vehicles, to me, have to have access. If it were – if it weren't where it is, if that section of Wailana were somewhere else where there wasn't such a dense population right on the corner, you know, I might be more willing to put it off, put it off. But I think we need to look at the safety of the folks that live in that area, above the convenience of – and it looks like – well, I'm going to make an assumption that nine people who didn't respond on that street are probably tenants. And I want to share with you guys too that I'm very familiar with that section of Wailana because my sister lived there for a very long time. Most of the homes there have parking for themselves off street. There are little driveways and there are little – like the whole yard is just cement. In fact, that's how it was where she lived. The whole yard was cement, and it was a two family kind of arrangement. I don't think we relish the idea of having to make these decisions, but it's our job. It's in the MRA area. And that's why I would like to only look at Wailana, as far as our comment on the whole ordinance. But I would agree with the department that some – we have to start looking at safety and we have to push this comprehensive parking and satellite parking program. And I think issues like this help us do that in our area. That's my feelings. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other comments? Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: Well, I feel that our organization, one of our organization is to be stewards, if you will, of the small town character, and that happens one street at a time. And I would hate to see Wailuku town have all of it's little streets widen or have all the parking removed from all the little streets. I think this would significantly destroy the character of the town. And as far as, I'm thinking, if I lived on a little street somewhere and I had to go park my car two blocks away, I probably wouldn't be all that pleased about that condition. I do understand the concerns for safety. And I think that they may be looking at in terms of situation by situation, fire access. In terms of can the fire truck come down Nani Street, can it come down Loke Street, can it come down Vineyard Street. And I know in situations like on large pieces of private property, you have situations where you have a fire truck needs to be within 150-feet of the most remote portion of the building. So if the fire truck was parked on Vineyard Street or the next street over, or the next street over, would it be able to provide fire safety within that 150-foot radius without having to be on Wailani Street. But, you know, I think just the situation the road widening and taking out the parking, I think that will have a very serious impact on the character of all our small towns. And we need to find some kind of compromise on that.

Mr. Horcajo: So Katharine, excuse me, are you saying that as far as the bill that's at the Council, I mean although you had mentioned, you talked about one-way streets and partial parking, your feeling right now is to recommend denial I guess. Maybe it's not the right word.

Ms. Popenuk: Well, specifically with Wailani, I would say between Nani Street and Loke Street, no parking would be quite appropriate. It's only 12-feet wide, you don't really have enough space there for a street and parking. With regards from Loke Street to east Vineyard Street, I am not in favor of saying no parking on that street whatsoever. I think that an alternate solution needs to be explored. I personally have preference for one type of solution which is parking on one side in a one-way street. At least you still have some parking for people out in front of their houses. I think it's very important. And that's it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Warren? Your thoughts?

Mr. Suzuki: I personally would have a problem, you know, recommending that what is being suggesting by the County, you know, be approved. You know for me, I talked about the criteria and the consistency. There needs to be a more comprehensive look at the street and roadway system as far as in Wailuku, understanding what the various right-of-way widths are. Because as I questioned Public Works, you know, if you're going to prohibit parking on Wailani, but yet at the same time allow parking on east Vineyard, and with that situation vehicle, emergency vehicles, will not be able to pass. You know why then would you use that as a basis for not allowing parking on Wailani when the same situation really applies for east Vineyard. So there needs to be a more comprehensive look, and there needs to be some sort of criteria that needs to be established, you know, when we're doing

this type of situation. And the reason I asked the Director was, you know, who initiated this action, and he said it was because of a specific request made by several residents. So it's response to residents. So, from my perspective, I wouldn't be able to support what's being proposed right now, and I would recommend that there be a more comprehensive look at being the roadway situation in Wailuku, understanding what the various right-of-widths are, understanding what the criteria needs to be considered in determining where parking should and should not be allowed, what street should be one-way as compared to two-way.

Mr. Horcajo: Ray?

Mr. Phillips: Not to go over it and beat it to death, but I'm certainly in accord with Warren and Katharine to an extent. It's a cart before the horse. And to select one street out in the middle of everything that's just non-complying, I think we're incorrect in taking that.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. I guess –

Ms. Betts Basinger: I have another comment, Chair, for discussion.

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Ms. Betts Basinger: For Corporation Counsel or for Erin. In our recommendations to Council, is there a way that we can – you know because again, I don't want to change the character of our small towns at all. And I also understand that our small towns were developed when people didn't have cars. So, you know, we have this constant dilemma with a town that has cars, et cetera. But, in view again of safety, you know, many of those houses are old plantation houses. They're wood structure. Fire is an everyday fear. A lot of the residents in those neighborhoods are old. The idea that everyone will run out and move their car if there is a fire is idealistic but it's not reasonable. Is it possible to have in the recommendation the phrase "until such time as a comprehensive roadway study or roadway rules are in place?" So this would be a temporary fix for emergency. It's not going to widen the road. It's not going to change the character. And again, I had recommended before that this body have an opportunity before these kinds of hearings to do a site visit. I'm very familiar with that street, but I can tell by comments that others aren't. And I'm not so sure that the only people parking on that street are residents. There is residential parking at just about every single one of these 17 properties. So that's my question – could we make a recommendation that limits itself to a time when we do have better rules to follow? So that we're not – you know I don't want to read the paper that there was a fire there and we could have prevented it even for a temporary time.

Mr. James Giroux: Yeah, this is definitely a chance to comment. You know, you can comment on language of the bill or you can comment on what you just suggested. I think that, you know, definitely as far as consensus, it's going to be pretty difficult as far as you

APPROVED 11-19-2010

know getting one voice. And so, I think that if somebody were to structure a motion that included that language, and then to see if the body can at least get as much votes to make it come out of, you know, the agency. The idea that it needs a study or that it's a temporary fix, that's all, you know, it's all well as far as, because it is comment going to the Council because they're going to have the same discussion, and they're going to want to know what if people who have a special vested interest in that area think about that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, then I guess it would be my responsibility on behalf of the residents that live there, to move that this body in not agreeing with the ordinance as it reads. Or, I don't know how to say what I just said. That this body recommends the Wailana Street, no-parking, as a temporary measure until such time as a comprehensive roadway and parking study has been completed.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, do I have second?

Ms. Betts Basinger: For emergency. For emergency purposes.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Is there a second? Okay, no second, the motion fails.

**It was moved, as stated, by Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger. No second.
Motion failed.**

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine?

Ms. Popenuk: Well, because "temporary" might be forever. I was thinking maybe there are some things that we do agree upon which is one that I heard is that just looking at one street by one street. We want a comprehensive approach. Could that be something?

Mr. Horcajo: You know what, it's better, we need to move. If somebody wants to make an actual motion, whatever, how you feel, whether it's, you know. You had mentioned earlier, maybe the short section of Wailana no parking. Or as Warren says, you know, just really, not really accept what is at Council now and just leave it at that. I guess we need a motion from somebody to move this on.

Mr. Phillips: A simple motion would be simply to not approve, and that would be a motion that I put forth.

Mr. Horcajo: Is that motion?

Mr. Phillips: Is it a motion? It is. I'll make it.

Mr. Giroux: I guess it's a motion to not recommend.

Mr. Phillips: The way it stands.

Mr. Horcajo: Is there a second?

Ms. Betts Basinger: We need a second first.

Mr. Horcajo: Or not. That motion dies too then.

**It was moved by Mr. Raymond Phillips to disapprove. No second.
Motion failed.**

Ms. Popenuk: It says here they're asking for our comments.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: Or comments. It's not really we approve or disapprove, right?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, that's true. I was asking Counsel at our break whether we need to take a vote or just get a consensus, and basically what I heard was that, you know, your options are take a vote, get consensus or just have Public Works accept what is on the minutes, which is at this point in time, maybe three different opinions from members here. Those are our options.

Mr. Suzuki: So my question to Corporation Counsel, does it have to be in form of a recommendation, or can it be in a form of comments?

Mr. Giroux: Yeah, it's just that –. The difference is that –. Well, it's –. On your agenda you can see it says that the County Council is requesting comment on a bill to prohibit parking. And what happens is that if the comment isn't adopted by the agency then it just becomes individual comments that came out of the meeting. And, you know, it's almost like delegating yourself to public. It's like if all five of us when to the Council meeting on that day and gave five different opinions, they wouldn't really get something coming out of the MRA. They would just be getting individual comments. But, if there are comments that at least the majority of the agency can adopt, then that becomes the comment of the agency. So it becomes a stronger comment.

Mr. Suzuki: So, let me offer one comment. You know suggest that the County Council, in their review of this particular bill, look at what options there might be. You know, from the standpoint of changing the flow of traffic from two-way to one-way, and allowing parking only one side of the street, in lieu of a full prohibition of parking on the street. Then offer a comment that –

Mr. Giroux: Maybe we should break it down. Go comment by comment.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, that's one comment.

Ms. Popenuk: I can support that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I can support that as well.

Mr. Giroux: You want to vote on adopting that comment as a comment?

Mr. Suzuki: I move.

Mr. Horcajo: Does he need to repeat the comment? Do you folks understand what Warren –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Did you say also have it be one-way, with parking on one side?

Mr. Suzuki: They look at different alternatives.

Ms. Betts Basinger: As an alternative, our comment would be to look at that.

Mr. Suzuki: Right.

Mr. Betts Basinger: One-way with parking on the side.

Mr. Suzuki: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: Now just for clarification, is it the extent of Wailana?

Mr. Suzuki: No, Wailana between Loke and east Vineyard.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: And from my perspective, I would have no objections to the ordinance applying the proposed bill applying to prohibition of parking between Nani and Loke.

Mr. Horcajo: Is that your second comment?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Could you repeat that again? A prohibition of parking between Loke and Nani on Wailani.

Mr. Horcajo: So adoption of this or approval of this be restricted to Wailana between Nani and Loke.

Ms. Wade: While we're making the motion, let me just clarify the street name in question is Wailani.

Mr. Suzuki: Wailani. Right.

Ms. Wade: Don't want the motion to have the wrong street name in it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Because the seven spaces that do have parking on private property, I don't know.

Mr. Suzuki: It doesn't apply.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I don't think it applies, so I don't think we need to make it a comment.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, I only said that because the director, yeah, basically says, it's not prohibited. It would seem odd that somebody would park there, but if we're going it. But I don't care.

Ms. Wade: My concern about not having, you know from staff perspective, not having any regulation between Nani and Loke on Wailani is we have no authority to tow. There's no law that says you can't park at time. So if it was prohibiting access of vehicles, you know, I suppose we would tow them, but that wouldn't be a safe situation if they did park.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, and then that regard, I guess, the comment is just making the two sections of Wailani consistent. So, yeah, so all of Wailani, an alternative view to what they're proposing would be one-way with parking on one side. Oh no really because on that other portion they can't park there.

Ms. Popenuk: So, I think what Warren said is from Nani to Loke, it's extra narrow. The private parking is not an issue.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So parking should be excluded.

Ms. Popenuk: So, there should be no parking on that portion.

Mr. Horcajo: So that's the second comment.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's the part of the bill we agree with. And I think the first comment

APPROVED 11-19-2010

should be that we're only commenting on Wailani Street. Do we all agree with that?

Mr. Suzuki: I don't there's any question because the public hearing notice only says Wailani. So from a sunshine law perspective, we can't comment on anything else but Wailani.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Because the bill has like –

Mr. Suzuki: No, but, the public hearing notice is limited to Wailani.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Got it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so we have consensus on what I'm going to call the second comment?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any other comments from anyone else. That pretty much covers Wailani Street, right? All right, then the Chair is going to conclude that we've beat this to death.

Mr. Suzuki: We have to vote on it.

Mr. Horcajo: Do we have to vote on it? No.

Ms. Wade: Did you like me to read it?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Ms. Wade: That you are recommending to Council that they consider alternatives in lieu of a full prohibition of parking between Loke and Vineyard on Wailani Street such as considering one-way with parking on one side. And second component is that you would recommend the prohibition of parking on Wailani Street, from Nani to Loke?

Mr. Horcajo: No objections?

Mr. Suzuki: No.

By consensus, the Maui Redevelopment Agency provided two comments as discussed.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Thank you very much Milton and Nolly.

Mr. Arakawa: Thank you.

2. Wailuku Municipal Parking Structure update and discussion on the parking structure project including issues relating to design, schedule, contracts, proposals, project collaboration and funding. (Morgan Gerdel, AIA, Parking Structure Coordinator)

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, back to the agenda, C2, Morgan, Wailuku Municipal parking structure, update and discussion.

Mr. Morgan Gerdel: Good afternoon members. Morgan Gerdel with Nishikawa Architects. I have a brief update relating to the design of the municipal parking structure. Public Works is finalizing the contract negotiations with them, and they're expecting to give them the notice to proceed sometime in November. The original projection was November 1st, but they're thinking probably mid-November, but it could be sooner. But that's the latest discussion I've had with them. And we've also looked at revising our scope for phase III to include a parking management plan. We've submitted our contract amendment to the Planning Department for approval. And Public Works has asked us to include a portion of our work to do a user survey for the municipal lot to identify what percentage of users of the lot are from different groups as far as State employees, County employees and private employers. And there was a user survey conducted about 10-years ago, so we're looking at using that same format and just updating to what the way it's been used now. The parking management plan can most likely start this month once the contract amendment is approved. And just as a dimension, we're looking at an area of approximately 1,500 foot radius from the municipal lot which will include most of the MRA, and we thought that would probably be the maximum people would be walking. Yeah, that's all I have for now.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, is there any public testimony on this agenda item?

Ms. Perreira: Thank you. Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association. I don't know exactly which survey he was responding to, but, again, a matter of record with the MRA, there was a survey that was conducted that there was objections to. So if you're following the exact same survey that had objections to, I think you better look at that a little bit more closely because as I recall some of the survey had them looking and taking numbers on users like on Wednesdays and things like that, that people are like shorter days and what have you, and was not necessarily –. And there's a whole list of reasons why there was an objection. And I know we did put across from our professionals and our board a list of concerns about that particular survey. And the sitting members of the Maui Redevelopment Agency at that time, likewise, had concerns about that survey. So I would just say, let's talk stories about survey you're going to be doing. You shouldn't be following

the same one that had some problems. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Any questions for the testifier?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Jocelyn, when was that? I know he said 10-years ago.

Ms. Wade: 2001, I think. The Qmark survey. Is that the one you're talking about?

Ms. Perreira: Yeah, that was problematic, and it is on record that there was problems with that survey. And we would definitely be expressing the same concerns as I think even more people will as well.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you. Can we get a copy of that?

Ms. Wade: Certainly.

Mr. Horcajo: Sure.

Ms. Perreira: But don't just get a copy of the survey. Get the concerns that were recorded as well.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any other public testimony on this agenda item?

Mr. John Noble: John Noble. 160 Market Street since 1977. I live there, work there, have businesses there. I'm having real concerns over all this talk about this parking structure which is going to bring more people into this area, and we're not having any discussions about access. It's something that I want to harp on is that we have a way to bring people in and out of town, right under the bridge, down by the car wash down there. You can bring in a tunnel. You can take cars out to Lahaina. You can take out to Kahakaloa. You could go to Kahului. I mean, the access into this town – the person that did the study, he came up with well we only have 10,000 cars going through here everyday, you know. And I keep hearing this small town, which to me, this stuff is nonsense. We've got a nine-story building, a 13-story building. When you look at it as you're coming into town, you see nothing but large buildings. There's a lot of traffic going in and out of here. And what I keep seeing it's the same thing I saw in Kihei one time. I had a moving business, and we pulled up to this place and this guy was out there. He had built his whole structure in the dirt. All the studs were down in the dirt and he was trying to push it back because it was leaning. And I went over and asked him, what in the world are you doing? There's no slab here for this thing to sit on. And he goes, well I just didn't want to have to wait for that. And that's what I'm hearing here is we just don't want to have to deal with the problems that this is going to bring ahead of time. You know, you're putting the cart before the horse here. And I think that there needs to be a lot of discussion about access. I think there needs to

APPROVED 11-19-2010

be –. I'm not hearing any discussion who this thing for. Who are we building it for? You know, all of these little streets have the same problem, and if they can find \$30 million for non-profits, and we spent \$30 million a year on parking in this town and buying up these little lots and stuffs, there are all these vacant houses, I think we could solve a lot problems. But I'm seeing some real problems here with access. And Bob you sit right there where they're trying to get in, and it's backed up down to the bridge. So I mean, I'd like to hear some discussion about access.

Mr. Horcajo: Any questions for Mr. Noble? Thank you John. Any other public testimony on agenda item on the parking structure? Okay Morgan please come back up. Any questions for Morgan? Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: Thank you Mr. Chair. Morgan, it seems like I'm the only one that asks questions on this issue, but you know I see that you've added some additional information so it gives us a better sense in terms of how you are doing. Because right now I see how you're doing relative to the revised schedule, but you've got some information that gives me an idea to show how you're doing relative to the original schedule. Because I think it's important for us to understand how you're doing relative to the original schedule because if we recall, before we started the concern that I have was that as we went forward, we start to see the project fall behind what the original schedule might have indicated. And it seems like we've already fallen behind from the original schedule. In fact, we've already fallen behind from the revised scheduled. So my concern is in looking at this thing here Morgan how far are you behind from the original schedule? I'm not concerned about the revised schedule. How far are you behind from the original schedule?

Mr. Horcajo: Warren, excuse me, you were given two sheets of paper.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, I got both of them.

Mr. Horcajo: If you look at the second sheet, Morgan added the original end date just as a reference.

Mr. Suzuki: What about the original start date?

Mr. Horcajo: Is the original start date on here?

Mr. Suzuki: No.

Mr. Gerdel: Yeah, I guess I only included the original end date. But I could add the original start date also.

Mr. Suzuki: So if you were to give me an approximate number, how far are you behind from

the original schedule? How much have you slipped from the original schedule?

Mr. Gerdel: I guess we're about 10 months or nine months behind because originally we were going to contract with the architect in January of this year.

Mr. Suzuki: And how much have gone into –? So how far have we come along as far as when the project was first then notice to proceed? When did we start this project? Less than a year ago, right?

Mr. Gerdel: Right, it was, I believe, July 2009.

Mr. Suzuki: So it's been about nine months – we're already nine months behind schedule?

Mr. Gerdel: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: That's doesn't sound – I mean from my perspective – that doesn't sound real good. And that's the reason why I wanted to follow this schedule because if we didn't talk about it, we didn't realize that we're already nine months behind schedule, nine months into the project.

Ms. Wade: Well, August, so that would be a year and three-months. We're a year and three-months into the project.

Mr. Gerdel: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: So maybe my question on that issue for Morgan or for Erin, I mean, how much of it is, I guess, the consultant's fault or how much is it just the process of going to, I guess, once RFP was out, to get the Public Works to choose or Planning to choose. And then, in this case, the contract still not signed, right?

Mr. Gerdel: Right. Yeah, I think part of it was they issued a second RFQ notice because the first one they didn't have enough qualified responses, so that added several months there.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions for Morgan. Did you get your answer I guess?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah I did, but I'm still struggling in terms of how we track the progress of this project so we know where we are relative to –. I go back to the original schedule because everybody relied on the original scheduling in figuring out when the various phases would commence, and when the various phases would be completed. And we're putting revised dates already. But for me, the original schedule is what's more important because that is what, you know, we looked at. So in terms of comparison to the schedule, the original

schedule is what we should be looking at.

Mr. Gerdel: Right. And I guess one of the area we can look at for the original schedule we were going to look at getting financing for the project in March 2011. And I think, what Public Works would like to do is put this project in the fiscal year 2012 CIP budget. So in that aspect we still are on target to do that. But I think once the consultant contract is signed, then we can get a more accurate schedule from the consultant themselves when they will complete their work.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair question. Morgan, it appears that the RFP is going to be signed pretty soon. And although we are 10-months behind scheduled on that, all of the line items following that also are going to be affected unless you are planning to require the consultant to double up. Instead of having, we've got to do this, we've got to do this, we've got to do this, put them on multiple lines so that we kind of catch up some of the lost time for producing a final conceptual plan for updating probable cause or developing preliminary project schedule, et cetera. Is that doable?

Mr. Gerdel: Right. And I think they are planning on doing that. They're going to be working on the EA or EIS concurrently. And the other benefit we have, the schedule we originally set out with the second RFP to do construction documents, but Public Works is using one contract so we don't have that extra step. So it should flow more smoothly.

Mr. Suzuki: Let me rephrase my question this way if I could. So if you were to look at the original critical path mark, and you looked at the current revised critical path, how far behind schedule are we? Is that the nine months? The other thing, maybe kind of explain what I'm saying. When you talk about critical path, that gives the indication based upon actions that have to fall in a certain sequence. Then if you look at it that way because a lot of action that can be done that doesn't have to fall in certain sequence so things can be done concurrently. So when you describe it from a standpoint of critical path, I think then it gives a better idea in terms of how much we've actually slid.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Exactly. And that's what we had requested of him before to have some of these line items done consecutively.

Mr. Suzuki: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And so, did you say, Erin, two-months behind?

Ms. Wade: About two months.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Looking at that way.

Mr. Suzuki: From the critical path?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay. I agree.

Mr. Suzuki: So, again, I'm trying to understand. How can you come up with your presentation Morgan so it give us that type of information, I guess, from a critical path perspective because that's very important to us. Critical path from the standpoint of original, critical path from the standpoint of what has been revised, and where are we relative to the critical path, original versus revised.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: And I know that's a lot of information to ask, but at the same time as I've said and I've mentioned this in the very beginning, you know, my concern is that from day one we're going to start sliding which we already have. And I want to know how much we're going to slide.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And how we can mitigate that.

Mr. Suzuki: Exactly.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions? Katharine? Ray? Morgan, can you, excuse me, you had mentioned the parking management plan and the scope, well, I guess, the area for the study, you talking a 1,500 foot radius from the parking lot. Is that what we're talking about?

Mr. Gerdel: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: So can you give us some idea whether that's beyond High Street, how far down to Happy Valley, does it go beyond Central. I mean, what is 1,500 feet?

Mr. Gerdel: I guess we looked at – I think part of the redevelopment area plan, there's a, I think, a quarter mile radius and a half mile radius. And the 1,500 feet was a mid point between those two. So it was trying to encompass most of the MRA but not going to a half mile because we thought that might be a little too far.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. I guess the reason I asked is I saw, I think, maybe an RFP scope or something of the parking management plan that was, I don't know who drew it up, but it seemed like it was a pretty extensive and it almost looked like a Long Range parking management plan. That they would look more than just this particular area. So was that changed in anyway?

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Mr. Gerdel: I think that draft for the scope was sent to the consultants so they were looking at that. But I guess they were asking that we define the area. And I guess that's still open. We haven't locked in that 1,500 foot radius. That was kind of a recommendation at this point.

Ms. Wade: I could comment on that. I drew that original one. That was the suggestive scope, and I personally think that even though you and I haven't talked about this, I think that the walking distance is a much better, and not as arbitrary as where Erin thinks people park. But it's much more consistent with, you know, the walking distance from a parking structure. So, that seems fair.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any other comments? Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: So I guess my question, Chair, is do you Morgan understand what information we're looking to receive at the next meeting?

Mr. Gerdel: Right. I think what I can do is on the schedule bold the critical path item, so that's more clear.

Mr. Suzuki: Original versus revised.

Mr. Gerdel: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you very much Morgan.

Mr. Gerdel: Thank you.

3. Market Street Improvement Project, Phase II through Happy Valley Update on project progress, public relations and schedule. (Yuki Lei Sugimura, Public Relations)

Mr. Horcajo: All right. Next on the agenda is Market Street Improvements. I see Yuki is patient enough to wait for us here.

Ms. Yuki Lei Sugimura: Good afternoon everyone. Thanks for having the Market Street project on the agenda. My name is Yuki Lei Sugimura. And as you know, the project has started again on September 13th, which was a Monday. And we were on a delay from June 24th due to the Department of Water Supply doing a water line realignment. So that's been done and we're back at work, and we're working on sidewalks. If you drive through Happy Valley, you'll see that work has gone from Takamiya or the old TK Supermarket and we're up by Aki's Restaurant which is right up to Kahawai Street. And that's what we're doing right now which is the makai side. And we were working on the other, the mauka

side of the street, so we're going pretty gang busters.

The information that Erin, and which I think she passed out to, the information on the parking, this came from the County of Maui, Public Works Department, in terms of the impact, stall count, location, length and type. And it goes, the existing and then the next side of the street under the same categories what would happen with the impact once the construction is done. Any questions?

Mr. Horcajo: You know what, I'm going to ask for public testimony first if you don't mind.

Ms. Sugimura: Okay.

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association Inc. Just want to say well done. I mean, you know, you can never please everybody wholeheartedly when you're making these kinds of improvements. And every single person that wants to complain about something and come out of the wood work. So I think given the fact that everybody has tried to, you know, do their best to pull it all together and try to inform people, be responsible, and dialogue with people. We've done some with Takamiya and residents. And I know some of the members personally have family members that they've been discussing with and what not. I think it's really great, but we are moving forward. And I just want to express on behalf of our organization appreciation to those who have been trying to move this forward to try to get this done. Thank you. Well done.

Mr. Horcajo: Any questions for Jocelyn? Thank you. Yuki please. Any questions for Yuki?

Mr. Suzuki: So Yuki, I just drove the road today and I noticed that on the Makua road, that detour road, at one time there was that sign that says, I guess, "Drive slow. Residential area." I noticed the sign on the Makua Road side with Kahawai, the sign wasn't there.

Ms. Sugimura: That sign is normally on the Mokuhaul Street side is where that sign –

Mr. Suzuki: I've seen it on the Kahawai side though.

Ms. Sugimura: I can check.

Mr. Suzuki: But I didn't see it there today.

Ms. Sugimura: Normally what happens because of our detour, and our detour is we avoid having –. Well traffic comes down from Wailuku town and goes past Takamiya. And then Mokuhaul is that intersection and then people coming down from Wailuku Country Estates, everybody goes down. That's the detour basically to keep people from going up Market Street except buses can go up towards town. So normally that's where the sign is, but I'll

APPROVED 11-19-2010

check to see why it wasn't there today. But it is a sign that was asked to be put up from Goodfellows that came from the community, and Goodfellows actually had a sign made and brought it in from wherever they make signs on Oahu. But I will check. But it's normally something that they do put up.

Mr. Suzuki: And just another observation Yuki. This morning when we were driving up Kahawai towards Happy Valley, there were cars coming out from Makua onto Kahawai. In fact, I almost saw a near accident because the car coming off from Makua didn't stop and give the car going up in front of me, going up Kahawai, the right-of-way. So I saw an accident. I think people need to be – I guess there needs to be some sort of education because, you know, again it's a residential area and people need to be very careful. You know they need to observe what the right-of-ways are, and it's not something that people are use to driving all the time. But again, and I agree with Jocelyn, I mean, there's been a lot improvements as far as the work. To me, I talked about you know some concerns that I have but there still needs to be more careful attention paid because we are talking about a very old residential area and people are being impacted as the work is going on.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other comments?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I do have a comment Yuki, and I drive that twice a day. My question is this, going home from town, when there's still work going on, it kinds of backs up and you got to wait. Are cars allowed to turn left to go around the same detour that you use coming off of Mokuahau? Because I don't do that.

Ms. Sugimura: Wait. Explain that to me.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Because there's no sign that tells you you actually can.

Ms. Sugimura: So you go from Market to Mokuahau.

Ms. Betts Basinger: As I'm coming down into Happy Valley, and I want to avoid the big back up, turn left there on Kahawai, and then go –

Ms. Sugimura: Do what Warren just talked about.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, but I didn't do that because I didn't know. But I was just wondering, that's kind of – if I'm thinking that, I know other drivers are thinking, oh, I'm just going to cut short and turn. So is it a one-way from Mokuahau across and then out Kahawai? Is it only one-way?

Ms. Sugimura: So our detour is from where our construction is. Right?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Ms. Sugimura: So I think what you're talking about is Kahawai Street which is an open street. The same thing that Warren said.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So you got to turn left.

Ms. Sugimura: So it would be – you could turn left. But I think what you would do and most people who are going to Waihee or whatever is to keep on going straight, and then you would go up Wailuku Country Estates, right, I mean that road. But that is a choice.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So it's not one-way.

Ms. Sugimura: And Mokuhaul is not one-way either. But it's just that it looks like it because that's where the most traffic is diverted.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions for –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Cause maybe a sign that indicated it's still two-way traffic would eliminate people from thinking this detour is just one-way. I don't know.

Mr. Suzuki: But, I guess my concern is then you would likely to be encouraging additional traffic onto Makua Road which I think you want to try and discourage them from doing that because the amount of traffic flow on Makua, right now, is significantly more than what the residents on Makua are normally used to.

Mr. Phillips: What's the speed limit?

Ms. Betts Basinger: It's slow.

Mr. Phillips: 15? 10?

Ms. Sugimura: Residential, so it's slow.

Ms. Betts Basinger: People go slow, at least when I'm driving.

Ms. Sugimura: And on Makua, I think there's a speed bump too.

Ms. Betts Basinger: There is.

Ms. Sugimura: So I don't –

Ms. Betts Basinger: There's two speed bumps before you make the turn.

Ms. Sugimura: Yeah. Right. So people can't speed down there. And another thing about Happy Valley, you always focus on that Makua Street which is our detour. But actually – because I grew up with friends in Happy Valley so I've been there a lot my whole life – you can actually take any one of those – that's not the only alternative, you know. But it just so happened for this project, it becomes a focus because it's the closest street. But it's not the only street.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And one last comment. When I get stuck in that traffic, I get to really look at what they're doing on the curbs, and I'm really impressed of how they're making curbs that you would have thought were seemingly impossible to ever have a curb, you know, on some of that street. So, it's really good work from my point.

Ms. Sugimura: Goodfellows does a really good job. I agree.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other comments?

Mr. Suzuki: I had a question for Alexa for discussion. So Alexa, you know, if you recall when I commented, you know, the result or discussion that we had with Yuki and Public Works, we talked about the sign that's going to be placed on Kahawai and Mokuahau. We talked about the directive from Milton, director, that construction shall cease at 3:00 p.m. Have you experienced where you've driven the road after 3:00 p.m. where construction is still ongoing?

Ms. Betts Basinger: No, they stop. I don't know if it's union or what, but they stop. But I have more freedom in my work hours now so I do find myself, you know, in that back up.

Mr. Horcajo: Yuki, I have a comment. Thank you very much. This is great. Is this being distributed? I mean, undoubtedly I assume Public Works feels very confident that this is accurate. But is this being distributed in any way whatever you discussed?

Ms. Sugimura: I guess if the information as we release it, but it's not something we go door to door.

Mr. Horcajo: Sure. Okay. Well, I think it's important because we've heard comments here before that there's going to be lost stalls down in that section of this project as much as there were in the first phase.

Ms. Sugimura: Speaking of parking, I would like to bring up an area of concern that I have on that Mokuahau. There's an empty lot or there's a parking lot that the Mokuahau Apartments, I think they own. And if you noticed and if you remember, I don't know how

APPROVED 11-19-2010

long ago, a couple of months ago there was a fire. But if you look in the lot, there's a – this is abandoned cars and I wish we could get rid of them – there's seven abandoned cars. The problem is, it's private property so the County cannot go there and tow cars, I think, because it's private. But it's a hazard and it's neglected. There's seven cars there and one of them, if you look at it, today, there's like, you can tell there was a fire and it's going up towards Wailuku Country Estate.

Mr. Horcajo: I think we can notify the homeowner right?

Ms. Wade: It would be an action of Public Works. But, yes, we can request Public Works to take action for health and safety issues and send the property owner a letter.

Ms. Sugimura: Is there anything we could do to get rid of the cars? I mean, it's been sitting there for months and nobody has done anything.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Years. It's been years. Yeah.

Ms. Wade: I think there does have to be a noticing process. Like we can't just go in and take it unless it was, like, an eminent problem. So we do have to notify them and give them the opportunity to rectify the situation. If they do not in a certain time period, then the County can go in and bill them for the clean up.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Are you sure it's owned by the apartments or it's not part of TK because I know it's Giovanni's office.

Ms. Sugimura: It is part of TK. That's –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Ms. Sugimura: That's not the apartment. That's a different owner then.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I don't know. We just would need to find out.

Ms. Sugimura: I did talk to Gio.

Ms. Wade: That's Revitalize Wailuku owns the property.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair, I have one more question.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yuki, would it be alright for us to share this updated information on our

website to people who are interested?

Ms. Sugimura: Yeah. Sure.

Mr. Horcajo: All right. Thank you very Yuki.

Ms. Sugimura: Thank you everybody.

4. Discussion on Wailuku Redevelopment Plan update and incorporation of the recommendations of the Wailuku Market Based Plan recently complete.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay members, we can keep tugging along. Item C4, discussion on Wailuku Redevelopment Plan update and et cetera, et cetera. Erin?

Ms. Wade: Okay. Last month there was a significant amount of discussion about what are we prioritizing and what's going on next and how do we update the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan? So I provided for you the expanded chart from what we worked on last year with our strategic planning. I included both – in this, I added back in the things that were completed so that you could see what is complete or partially complete and ongoing. And then added the recommended actions from our most recent study with the Progressive Urban Management Associates for your evaluation to see do you think these elements fit into the redevelopment plan, and if so, where? But, to give this as an initial point of conversation and resource.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. I guess, let me first open this to public testimony. I realized some of you might have just gotten this, but it's an ongoing process. But any public testimony?

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira. Wailuku Main Street. I did express to Erin some concern about that, that, you know, it would be really nice to introduce this to all of you and you can discuss it. But I do think it is appropriate for us to be able to take it back to our groups because you're even placing in here CDC. And the last time we talked as the MRA was each group was going to go talk story about how they felt about the CDC and what not. So the fact that now you're just placing it in here. I mean, I think there needs to be some opportunity for discussion.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you. Any questions for the testifier?

Ms. Sugimura: I'm Yuki Lei Sugimura, and I'm so encouraged just to see this list. I have to tell you that when I worked for the County, in the Office of Economic Development, and our project area or my kuleana when I was in OED was Wailuku Redevelopment, or the initiative. And it's great to see all of these check marks of projects that we worked on, like

the bathroom, and getting Lao Theater up, and all these different things that we worked on. And I just wanted to say that I'm very encouraged by the current MRA and the level of accomplishments and whatever you are, you know, have taken on and moved forward because I've been attending these meetings now for, I want to say, 10-years. It's been awhile. But I want to encourage and if there's any projects that I could help spur on, I would love to keep Wailuku going.

Mr. Horcajo: Any questions for the testifier, for Yuki? All right. Thank you. Okay, I guess no other public testifiers. Members, I guess before we – comments. Well let me back track. I guess talking with Erin after the last meeting, I mean, the thought as you can see here was this is just not for us. This is for future MRA members, everyone, past and future.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. It's the plan.

Mr. Horcajo: It's the plan. Past and future. Completed. Ongoing. Things we've changed from the last strategic plan meeting last year, and it's all in here. And if we choose to add PUMA's suggestions on this sheet here, this is just an actual start. You know, we'll have more discussion next month, but I think we all agree as Yuki was saying, and I think that this is just a good – this is the Bible, but it's everything. Okay, comments?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Just to clarify, those things that are highlighted in light orange – sherbert – are additions to contemplate. Everything in white is what we already worked on last year. Everything highlighted is what we want to discuss.

Ms. Wade: Right. And essentially everything in the communication, education and outreach action chart which is the last one came out of the strategic planning discussion. Those were new, and you see they don't have an assigned policy number. Everything that has an assigned policy number is in the currently adopted redevelopment plan. And you'll see too there's information in italics in some of those. Following the actual policy statements, the italics is just sort of a narrative to document, you know, for posterity, you know whatever purpose to see, what has occurred on this. If it does say ongoing, that we are moving on those things. It might not be something that we can check off yet, but it's in motion.

Mr. Horcajo: I also wanted to mention, I think Erin had talked about it at last month's meeting is that the WRP is 10-years old. It needs to be updated every 10-years, and it definitely needs to be updated as we plan to apply for CDBG funds. So, you know, with this as the guide again, we're going to, hopefully once the PUMA plan is done which could be next month, take a real hard look at this and update, plan to start working on updating this because we'll need to do it anyway fairly soon, you know, to include what we had discussed last year I guess.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Which study are we talking about?

Mr. Horcajo: This Wailuku Redevelopment Plan.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, it's 10-years old right now, so we need to update this now.

Ms. Wade: We need to do a formal adoption of a new – the same plan, but update it in order to qualify for block grant money.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So, how is that different than what we've been doing, updating the plan?

Ms. Wade: Well, it's not different except that the original plan went to Council for approval, so that's the exercise that we would want to go through is actually do the revisions, send up a revised document to Council and ask them to adopt it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: If I recall during the long period of time that we spent bringing it up to date and the tasks that were passed by Council, Corporation Counsel assured us that it would need not – it need not go to Council unless there was a drastic change in the kind of work we were deciding to undertake. And that most of what we've done here, didn't require further Council comments.

Ms. Wade: Right, and that's accurate for the purposes of your activities. If you want to apply for money outside of what your budget is, it does. There are qualifications by those organizations, by those entities. If we want Federal money, it does have to be basically ratified by the County Council and updated every 10-years.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So what you're saying is that if we put in a line item that says we are going after this kind of money, this kind of money, this kind of money, or we're going to explore other funding sources that that would have to go to Council?

Ms. Wade: No. I'm not being clear, I don't think. Basically when you apply – and I know that you know this because you applied for a number of grants, Federal level grants – they're going to ask you well what planned documents do you have that supports that request for money that you're asking for? And when we submit that planned document, they have to show what resolution of the County Council approved that document. If that resolution is over 10-years old, they'll say you don't qualify. You need to get a document. But your plan has to be less than 10-years old. So that's the point.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So we essentially could take this existing plan and ask Council to just

re-certify it.

Ms. Wade: We could. The one thing they do require, there's some census information in there that's outdated. Those kinds of things you do have to have up to date, and I know you know that, in terms of your application. So those bare minimum things would need to be done, but then if we're going to take anyway, I guess the thought process was well let's see if we can get the action charts correct as well.

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

Mr. Horcajo: By all means.

Ms. Perreira: Thank you very much. Under the urban design and beautification action chart this may have been a mistake. But under the PUMA and whatnot, your private partner on area design guidelines should be WMSA. So I want you to take note of that right now.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, my comment to you is take it back to your board –

Ms. Perreira: Well, I already am letting you know that that's what was in the document. So I think maybe perhaps it was an oversight and that's why I'm just making that clear so that it is clear because that's what we've been tied to for more than 25 years here, and we're likely not to be again.

Mr. Horcajo: That's fine. And there's some blank spots here.

Ms. Perreira: Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: I know you'll come back.

Ms. Perreira: No that's all. I just want to make sure because I thought, Erin, maybe that was just an oversight. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: All right. Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: So, when did this, the redevelopment plan, expire?

Ms. Wade: I think it will expire this January. January 2011.

Mr. Suzuki: In January.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, it won't expire, but –

Mr. Suzuki: No, we're talking about the 10 year validity period.

Ms. Wade: When will it become – won't be eligible for funding?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Ms. Wade: Right. It will be January.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It will never expire.

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We just want it to get funding.

Mr. Suzuki: Right. But I'm asking the question in context to what Erin just said. So, and our intent is to go for Federal block grant monies. So my concern is that recognizing that the 10 year period will end in January of 2011?

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Mr. Suzuki: What do we need to do so it can be made current, and how long does the Council normally take to adopt this. So my concern is that, I guess, between now and 2011, we likely will not get done whatever we need to get done, which includes the Council approval in order for us to apply for block grants right?

Ms. Wade: Right. That's the whole purpose of this agenda item today is basically to say, does this format work for you in terms of revising your action charts. And then to set a schedule for the update. Most of it can be done internally. You know, we have the document. I can update the numbers. All of that can be easily done.

Mr. Suzuki: Even the census numbers?

Ms. Wade: Oh yeah. Well the census numbers, I mean, they were old when the plan was adopted, and if we adopt it, propose it again, those numbers are going to be old again because they used 1990 numbers in the 2000 plan.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well now we have 2000 numbers available to us, and the census now has ACS, so we have three-year old numbers for Maui County which we can pop in.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: So to qualify what you had just said about dollars, you're right, I mean, for me,

APPROVED 11-19-2010

I'm looking at 2013 budget right because even – you know, say for example, sidewalks, we still don't have an RFP out for sidewalks, or even a design for improving Vineyard, Central. That's going to take nine months to a year right? So that's going to get us into late 2011. We have to go through approval process and then we can apply for 2013. So again this is, you know, we're looking towards the future, we just got to be ready. We're not going to get 2012 money probably or CDBG type of block grant funds. But we could probably have 2013 if we acted on this and get Council to act on this sometime next year.

Mr. Suzuki: So there's not that pressing need to get it formally adopted prior to January 2011, recognizing that there's not going to be a need for us to go into a block grant until 2013 is what you're saying?

Ms. Wade: Well, I would still say because we're going to be working towards identifying additional funding sources for the parking structure that we want this as soon as possible. Even though we have small kind of other projects we want to apply for monies for, if the parking structure applies for one of those tiger two grants or something like that, they're going to look at the WRZAD.

Mr. Suzuki: The reason that we need to get this thing taken care of sooner than later.

Ms. Wade: Correct. Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. And the other thing is, I mean, they're recommending we talk about tax incremental financing. If a lot of those things is even being suggested by Brad them, it's in our plan, that helps us for funding with Council for next year's budget. So, there's a lot of things. There's a lot of moving parts here.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I had planned, Erin, because I haven't had a chance, where is it our task to fund our project? What VPC number or UDB number or Infrastructure number? And if there isn't, is there an administrative area under the administrative guidelines that allows us to – if we're going to go to Council – change the size of our board, for example, be able to go to additional sources for funding, to fund ourselves. Is that addressed?

Ms. Wade: You know your funding strategies are addressed in different section of the plan, which I don't have with me right now, but it provides a slew of options for funding. And it doesn't say how. I think it's actually nice the way it's done because it doesn't say you have to use this for this type of project, or this for that project. It gives you a lot of – it's very liberal which might be the most effective way to keep it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It is item G, power to borrow, issue bonds and invest. And that's where it gives us the power to go after grants.

Ms. Wade: That one doesn't.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But we entered a task.

Ms. Wade: If – yes. I mean, if that's – if you feel that it's necessary to – that it's not enough implied in the fact that we said we were doing to do this, and that's going to require money and therefore we've got to get it, you know, that's up to you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Ms. Popenuk: Sort of acknowledge them that there's some work that involves to be coming up with money.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: So I guess my suggestion is take this home, and study it, and look at all of your notes that you have written for the past, whatever year, and then come back next months with your thoughts. Is there any other comments or questions to Erin?

Ms. Popenuk: I do, Chair, one more comment I guess. On the infrastructure action chart, and then in the back, the PUMA recommendations, I just wanted to weigh in on that. To develop program for public to bear the responsibility in the infrastructure inadequacy, et cetera, et cetera. That's a rather difficult burden for private individuals will have to bear like to purchase their own fire hydrants. It could be a project killer.

Mr. Horcajo: I thought that more meant the government myself.

Ms. Wade: Correct. It says for the public to bear the responsibility, so that would be the County. For the County. And I can rephrase that as County if that's more palatable.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, we don't want to limit our funding resources, however, though by just saying County.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Because if we can get grants from the Federal government or elsewhere or the state to do these things. I mean, PUMA is just suggesting that we capture that as one our tasks.

Ms. Popenuk: I misunderstood it. I thought it meant the private property owners got to put their fire hydrants.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Individuals have to buy their fire hydrants.

Ms. Wade: They do now. She's right. They do, and it is totally project breaking.

Mr. Horcajo: You know what just as a side comment about that issue because I think, I don't know if I brought it up at this meeting, but I was talking with Erin about that, capture the Vineyard Street waterline improvement project. Because I walk or drive up and down that street and I noticed that there weren't enough hydrants to meet the current code. Because my thought is if you're doing a CIP project, why doesn't the County add more fire hydrants down the street? And you know it kind of bothered me. In fact, I brought it up before but I happened to talk with Wendy whatever.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Kobashigawa.

Mr. Horcajo: No Takaoka I guess. And what she basically told me is that they did try, but because of the width of east Vineyard and parts, they could not, you know, do it within the County's right-of-way so they tried to get easements from private property owners, and two in particular said no way. So I felt pretty comfortable to hear that, that they really made an attempt to add additional fire hydrants that would comply with the current water and fire code, but were stopped and didn't want to stop the whole project and go through condemnation to get those areas for the purpose of adding fire hydrants. So, I thought I would pass that on because I was kind of happy to hear that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's good to know Bob, and I wonder if we would have ever known that. I mean, it's worthy, I think, to write from this body a mahalo just to build those bridges, and then maybe be able to find out more stuff like that as time goes on in our MRA area.

Ms. Wade: I will let you know that I do have a request to the Water Department for the AS built plans for Vineyard Street as soon as they are done so the contractors are completing that right now.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: Can I ask a question on the issue that Katharine just kind of raised? So if you look at the language here Erin is it saying that if there's a parcel that's properly zoned and somebody came in to develop on that property, if the infrastructure fronting the property is inadequate then it's the government's responsibility to upgrade the infrastructure and not the property owner?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: It's totally the government's responsibility?

Ms. Wade: Yes. That's very common in redevelopment areas. They will set aside a fund and that's what the tax increment financing program is usually used for. That they will establish a fund that's used for the infrastructure component because often times it's so below code, you know, that there's a tremendous investment, between \$40,000 to \$100,000.

Mr. Suzuki: But if there's not that fund because right now the position of government is that it now becomes the responsibility of the private landowner/developer to upgrade the infrastructure.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: And I've always felt that that is not fair, but at the same time, I've always felt that it shouldn't be just left for government. I think there is a certain responsibility, you know, between government and the private developer to upgrade the infrastructure. In this case, we're saying it's solely the responsibility of government, not the private landowner.

Ms. Wade: To the public's required standards, they would be responsible to do that. You know, like, I know that I have worked with development projects before where they wanted an additional curb cut or something like, they had to bear that cost. But you know, for the cost of the bare minimum, what the County would require, the County would fund that and this statement says the County would fund those improvements in the redevelopment area.

Mr. Suzuki: Because of you talked about that financing option, right?

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But that's the challenge because in a new subdivision that's easy enough to do. But in Wailuku or Paia or Makawao where the roads, the County access is already there, it might mean, then, that part of the public, the County bearing that responsibility is now have to take somebody's property. So just like the reason they don't have enough fire hydrants is because they would have to go through condemnation proceedings to get a right-of-way that belongs to the County that the County could put the infrastructure in. So by saying it this way, in small town situations, it might mean your front yard is going to be condemned because the County needs a right-of-way along where the water pipes are to give you a fire hydrant.

Mr. Suzuki: That's not how I interpreted though. The way I interpreted the language here is that if I, the landowner, if I had a zoned property and I wanted to develop the property, all the infrastructure required for that development as far as on public roadway is going to

be, all the cost for that infrastructure, is going to borne by government through that financing.

Ms. Wade: Correct. Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: Whereas right now, the County actually looks at the private developer to bear the cost of the infrastructure.

Ms. Wade: To fund it all. Right.

Mr. Suzuki: So it's going from one extreme to the other.

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But this is only in the MRA district.

Mr. Suzuki: Right. But the caveat is that the financing vehicle that you talked about.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: So is that understood in this language here?

Ms. Wade: I don't know. I mean, it doesn't sound like it is.

Mr. Horcajo: And Warren, keep in mind, this is just a suggestion by PUMA, you know. We may keep it, we may not, we may change it. It's just a suggestion. But the way I read it, it's not the main water lines. It's the "manini" stuffs. It's like the hydrant in front of Debbie Daniel's place, that when the County put in a 12-inch line, they didn't put in a hydrant.

Mr. Suzuki: But that's not how it's written though.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, then we need to change it to be comfortable. And I'm sure the County is going to have their say too as to what we want to change in the WRP.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And we can also choose not to add this to the MRA's responsibility.

Mr. Horcajo: I will tell you in also talking with Wendy, I asked her the question – I think Wendy or maybe Carol Gentz, CDBG – anyway my question was, does it make sense to do a comprehensive study of all of the water systems in Wailuku in this area, and where there's lacking in terms of hydrants to do an actual CIP project just for that purpose? And basically, Wendy, I guess it was, says no, we don't want to do that. And I forgot her reasoning was. But I was trying to figure out, just kind of talk stories about how we can put

APPROVED 11-19-2010

in the missing hydrants or sewer man holes or something as part of a CIP project for an area. And she pretty much said and gave me in so many words we can't do that.

Mr. Suzuki: On that, I don't agree because, you know, the Wailuku Redevelopment Area is a very unique area, unlike other, you know, older small town areas. And the Wailuku Redevelopment Area allows a whole lot of options.

Mr. Horcajo: Set some precedents for the other towns.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, the AS built in Wailuku Town – I mean, when we built the Pono Building, it's lot by lot, development by development, and you'll find out where the water really is and isn't.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, shall we move on folks?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, move on.

(Raymond Phillips leave at approximately 3:20 p.m.)

5. Request for proposals to update the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning and Development Code, 2002.

Mr. Horcajo: C5, did we get this RFP on the WRAZD update?

Ms. Wade: I do have it. It's a start at least.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Let's take a few minutes to read this I guess. I'm going to have Erin make a brief summary I guess. Please understand we're not going to adopt this today. This is just a start of what has been discussed by this board especially with comments from the public on projects that we have reviewed. And this will also give time for Main Street and other groups to make their comments known.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It's not our agenda today for discussion is it?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. It is.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Not for discussion correct? Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: It is.

Mr. Horcajo: It is for discussion.

Ms. Wade: Essentially the purpose or what's in this as of now is what was recommended by PUMA for amendments to the Wailuku Redevelopment Zoning and Development Code, as well as things that we just continually trip over with this ordinance. You know there's a number of things in there that just needs some clean up, and with any ordinance, that's to be expected. So, this section (A) is almost entirely from what PUMA was recommending, and similarly with section (B.) And a lot of that, actually, section (B), a lot of this actually came out of the Public Works Department's interviews so that was pretty telling. (C) the form based standards is a recommendation of PUMA. Are you folks aware with form based zoning standards?

Ms. Popenuk: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: Kind of. It basically blends the design guidelines and the zoning code into one. Where in your zoning approval it saves you a step actually where in the zoning approval you're looking at the building envelope, as Katharine said, a number of things. And I can actually give you some literature on that. But it ends up being particularly effective in downtown areas because it kind of allows more use alternatives as long as they're designed accordingly and that kind of thing. So with their recommendations for more incubator types of businesses, this could be a tremendous opportunity. But, as I said, this would be a whole different way of thinking, we'd be merging two documents. The thing that leads both me and Brad to believe that this was the intent before is we require a variance process for any design consideration anyway. If you're going vary from the design guidelines, the MRA requires a variance. None of the other towns do that. You just can go to UDRB and they can tell you okay or no. You know, we actually require you to do a public hearing process if you want to vary from the design guidelines. So there's not a whole lot of reason to keep the zoning and the design guidelines separate based on the way they operate today.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And is there a streamline efficiency that helps the developer as well?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Because then you don't actually have to go through the design review process and then through a use permit or variance process. You can do it simultaneously. (D) is to clarify the relationship between the Maui County Codes and the Zoning, and we've had this come up multiple times. And the interpretation on your agenda today is a function of this, so this definitely needs some clarification. And I didn't elaborate tremendously because I don't think we've even found all the land lines related to this yet and we can find that as we progress. And then finally Corporation Counsel has referred a couple of times to the County Charter and the importance of evaluating that with any amendments to the zoning. So I wanted to make sure that the scope of work including that. And then basically what I'm asking of you is to take this and then if there's other things that continually have come up in your mind as problematic or that you would like to see more readily allowable, we can include that in the outline. But of course, I would think when we go out to hire a

APPROVED 11-19-2010

consultant to help us with this, we are going to want to leave some room for their expertise to tell us, you know, what other things we want to adjust.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any public testimony on this agenda item at this time?

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association. Thank you for this initial review. I know we're going to have comment on this, significant comment, because again one of the concerns would be are we getting the cart before the horse. I think that PUMA has tabled their work until they come back again for further discussion. And there are a lot of people that think that there a lot things that haven't been totally and thoroughly discussed. So we would have concern, and where this is headed in the right direction and there are a lot of things on here that we could agree with. But we do express concern because everything from the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan and the assertions that you cannot get CDBG money unless you have an updated plan, and all of those things, I think need to be discussed. It maybe disputed and everybody may not agree with that even though somebody's interpretation might be that. So I would just thank you for allowing us to take this back and have some kind of total discussion. There are things on here, I might add, that are completely, totally brand new that's being introduced that apparently got discussed between Brad and Erin, that form based standards and these different things that we all know nothing about. So I think it's really important that there is a workshop or something so that people totally understands it so that it is something that's being formulated by a – with a transparency and broad base input. So thank you very much.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you Jocelyn. Any questions for Jocelyn? Any other public testimony? Thank you very much. Members, I guess, as Erin is saying, you know, we need to all go back and, I guess, add some items. One thing I did want to comment on, and I mentioned before I guess, is I would hope that we can get whoever the hired consultant is, to have them break down what we would consider or we all would consider the low hanging fruit. I mean stuff that we can change without any major issues with the County Council. You know, I mean, say for example, if you read the parking, the off street parking code, it does not even require lights. You know the County parking lot has lights, but it's not really required. You know, we've been talking sometimes about having motorcycle stalls. Why not, where there's some empty spots, because of a curb, a motorcycle can actually park there. You know, the kind of no brainer stuff. And then the stuff that's going to be more harder to change like, you know, adding a historic building code or this form based stuff. Anyway for me it makes sense that part of the RFP is kind of, you know, have them tell us what they as well feel based on our comments and what we get and what they get from the public into kind of two different categories.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: Am I assuming, correctly, that we're looking for an organization, experienced organization, that will actually be doing an analysis on what we currently have and then suggesting improvements in these specific areas and maybe others that they would identify.

Mr. Horcajo: Exactly.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Makes sense?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other comments you folks? Nope? All right. Okay, you guys fine? Can we keep on tugging or shall we take a short break? I think the budget is probably going to take the longest.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Keep on tugging so we can go home.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

D. COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS

1. Maui County Council Resolution 10-48 Recognizing Sheri Daniels and Alexis Dascoulias for being named two of Hawaii's 2010 Forty under 40, by Pacific Business News.

Mr. Horcajo: Communication and reports, I'm going to have Erin just talk about this, item (1).

Ms. Wade: Okay. Okay, transmitted to you from the County Council was resolution 10-48 recognizing Sheri Daniels and Alexis Dascoulias for being named two of Hawaii's 2010, 40 under 45 Pacific Business News. So you have that as a communication item. Congratulations to Alexis.

Mr. Horcajo: Any public testimony on this item? Any comments members?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, it's just putting Wailuku on the map again with Iao Theater and Maui On Stage. Who's Sheri Daniels?

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, thank you very much. Official zoning interpretation from the Director of Planning.

2. Official Zoning Interpretation from the Director of Planning concerning Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning and Development Code 30.15.050.

Ms. Wade: Okay. Last month there was significant conversation during the Sereno case about a specific section of the code, 30.15.050B. I've then spoke with John Summers who had extensive amount of work in writing the original document and he explained what their intent was of this statement. So I documented it for all the world. And whether we like this interpretation is or not, I think that this is the intent of the zoning and this could be something for us to look towards, you know, changing. But, it does state that the intent of this legal uses and structures existing prior to the enactment of this code is purely for zoning, and it doesn't apply to any other sections of the Maui County Code.

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

Ms. Wade: I think it's up there. It's a letter October 5, 2010.

Ms. Perreira: Oh, yes. Thank you very much.

Mr. Horcajo: Any comments? Public testimony on this item?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you for doing that.

Mr. Horcajo: Members, any comments? Okay. We are variance approval letter for Kahawai Housing.

- 3. Variance approval letter for the Kahawai Housing.**
- 4. Design review and approval letter for Community Work Day, Cigarette Litter Receptacle Pilot project.**
- 5. Variance approval letter for Sereno Law Office.**
- 6. Approval letter for the Sereno Law office sign.**

Ms. Wade: Yes, the next four, these are all approval letters that were issued by the Department of Planning to applicants. So I'm now putting all of this on your agenda for your use so you know what's going out of the department. Are there any questions on any of those four letters?

Mr. Horcajo: Any public testimony? I would like to make a comment, if you don't mind, on

the Sereno Law Office sign. That's number six. You folks understand what that means?

Mr. Suzuki: As far as the Planning Department's letter?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah I'll have Erin.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. There was basically two different interpretations that came out of the department. The original one that the variance request was based on – was relating to the sign itself being setback 10-feet from the right-of-way. That variance request was denied then. Following the meeting, I went back and asked the head of the zoning division, how is this generally interpreted? I got a different interpretation. He said, "No, it's that there has to be a front yard of 10-feet." So there is a front yard of 10-feet. But the building can't be closer than 10-feet from the property line to ground sign. So obviously there is more than a 10-foot front yard at the Sereno property, and there is no requirement for setback for the sign itself.

Mr. Horcajo: So they could turn the sign, they can move it up to the wall, and that would meet the current. It was just an interpretation. It was incorrect I guess.

Ms. Wade: So based on that interpretation, I just wrote the approval.

7. CHAIR HORCAJO - Email regarding MRA meetings and quorum.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, where are we now? Email regarding MRA meetings and quorum. Thank you for coming.

8. WEBSITE

Ms. Wade: The website has had significant additions in the last month, so please – I wanted to be able to access it today. Our internet connection is not working, but if you go to the project's page, there's extensive additional information on PUMA and on the parking structure. And at Alexa's request we will add something on the Market Street extension project with the parking information. Let's see, what else is there? There's four or five pages actually that have recently been updated. There's maps now on the website. So, anyway, please go to it. Check out all of the tabs. There's a lot of additional information and we can discuss it at the next meeting. And I'll contact MIS and make sure that I can get the internet working next time.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'd like to take a minute to make a comment. We had public testimony at our last meeting by someone who said, you know, I know whenever there's going to be a first Friday because there's posters up everywhere. But I don't know anything about what the MRA does or what's up with it. So I was going to suggest that this body takes as a task

APPROVED 11-19-2010

for outreach, that we do the same thing that Wailuku first Friday does and put posters up saying do you want to know what's happening with the MRA, go to our website. I mean, I don't it's a costly task, but I think it would go a really long way in creating good will with our community. And doing it in the same place where we do Wailuku first Friday promotions. The same stores would be, I'm sure, perfectly happy to put up the signage. I just wanted to throw that out.

Mr. Horcajo: Let me – I said it before – but any public testimony on this item?

Ms. Perreira: On what she just stated?

Mr. Horcajo: On anything in general. On the website.

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira. If you're going to be placing anything MRA, you shouldn't be having it at preferred stores and shops. There are a lot of us who are participating with the MRA, and it is highly inappropriate to be linking yourself with another organization's events that give a perception of something that is not necessarily what's going on. So I would like very much if you want to post something about the MRA and access to meetings or what have you, that you do it in numerous locations and not just where current posters are being located at. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you. Any questions for the testifier? I guess comments on Alexa's – or whatever – on the website.

Mr. Suzuki: Under communication?

Mr. Horcajo: Sure.

Mr. Suzuki: So, do you know when the Kahawai Project is going to be coming back for design approval?

Ms. Wade: They're going to – they started their EA process. So following the completion of the EA they'll be back.

Mr. Horcajo: Public hearings? Any comments? I guess we all need to look at the website. Let's move on to agenda (E), budget.

E. BUDGET

Ms. Wade: Okay, it's that time of year to do our justification for funding. So here, I passed out what Joe Alueta provided last year, and I will be doing the justification this year. So feel free to take a look, and, you know, we've gotten through a lot of what we said we were

APPROVED 11-19-2010

going to accomplish this year, so that's exciting. And I think we've got new priorities for the coming year, so that is always is a positive thing to document. So this is what I'm going to be working on for your budget.

Mr. Horcajo: Any public testimony on this agenda item? Okay, so I guess Erin you're asking us to provide input for 2012 budget.

Ms. Wade: Provide input and recognize. This is a one page thing. You don't really get to expound upon this. You have to summarize it in a paragraph per question basically.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Do we have a budget? And as spent budget now?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, we do. I'm sorry, I can get that to you from Sandi.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thanks. Because I think under budget, like how you feel about the detour, but we still haven't had a chance to really look at where we're going to allocate our current monies. And we have a lot of priorities with hiring consultants and doing RFP's, and I think we need to have an opportunity to look at that as a body before kind of, to help fill this amount of money that you're going to be –

Mr. Horcajo: I guess I was going to say, I know we've been somewhat putting it off, but I think because there's a plan. And the plan is this whatever sheet, this action plan here, which we are going to focus on next month, you know, will help guide us where we allocate. You remember this little budget sheet that we did a few months or whatever it was, when I got Chair, I guess, April or May. Was that how long it was, April/May? Because as we focus on this, whether we include any of the PUMA stuff or not, you know, then we can start, and we start getting some numbers for the RFP for the zoning code change, parking management plan, secretarial or clerical work which I don't have yet either, so that's what I'm saying.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair, it's been five months that I've been asking for a monthly budget. I mean, I just don't see how difficult that is.

Mr. Horcajo: No, I agree with you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And it ties our hands in Planning all the things that we want to plan.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. Well, I haven't gotten to budget either, so Erin said she'll get the budget.

Ms. Wade: So my question for you is, is that – are we just talking about the excel spreadsheet that Sandi does?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. Right.

Ms. Wade: I don't know why that's not coming to you all.

Mr. Horcajo: No problem there.

Ms. Wade: But I do have state –. I have to provide this on Monday. This isn't something that I have time for us to –

Mr. Suzuki: That's fine.

Ms. Wade: Okay. I have to fill in these blanks, so if you have anything that you would like to send me in terms of justification that you think should be incorporated, I'm happy to take a look at that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: This is due Monday?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay, so we'll email you before.

Ms. Wade: They don't give us much lead time.

F. APPROVAL OF THE September 17, 2010 MEETING MINUTES (via e-mail)

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Move on to item (F), approval of the September 17, 2010 meeting. Any corrections? Comments?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I move to approve the minutes of the September 17, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: Any second?

Ms. Popenuk: Second.

Mr. Horcajo: Discussion. Leilani, my only comment is on page 70, item 11 – because it was something that I said. What it says here is I was told that if I added any signing, it should be siding. S, I, D, I, N, G. This is regarding the Wakamatsu Fish Market. That is only the major change I saw. Any other discussion item?

Ms. Perreira: Are you taking public testimony?

Mr. Horcajo: I'm sorry, please.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We have a motion on the floor.

Mr. Horcajo: That's right. We have second. Okay, all in favor?

Agency Members: "Aye."

It was moved by Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger, seconded by Ms. Katharine Popenuk, then unanimously

VOTED: to approve the September 17, 2010 meeting minutes with the amendments as discussed.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you. Go ahead Jocelyn. Sorry. Public testimony. This is on the minutes, on agenda item?

Ms. Perreira: Yeah, it's on the agenda item regarding, pertaining to minutes, not necessarily the minutes that you just approved, but just the item minutes. We are of concern. We have a concern that there is no opportunity once you approve minutes and there's something in the minutes that we believe is inappropriate or we take issue with or there was some confusion or clarification that it is not allowed to be addressed at the start meeting like we'd normally have when you open a meeting minutes, approval of the minutes. I would say you need to have something pertaining to minutes that have been approved as opposed to the minutes that you folks just approved now which obviously you can approve it at the end of the day. It's no problem. But once you've approved the minutes, if there's any comments that people want to make pertaining to approved minutes, I think it should be placed on the agenda so there is a place for an opportunity to comment because there are at times concerns about what gets approved in minutes that the public has no ability to see until after you approve them.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, I think I need to answer this. It's my fault. I should ask for public testimony before we even discuss this item.

Ms. Perreira: But that's not what I'm meaning Bob because this pertaining to minutes that you folks are approving now. Now once these approved minutes get circulated to the public, there is no opportunity anywhere on the agenda for the public to voice a comment regarding approved minutes.

Mr. Horcajo: I'm confused. If I ask for public testimony before we even take action on approval of the minutes, you're saying that's not adequate?

Ms. Perreira: No. I'm saying that what you're approving in your approval of the minutes is something that we have no access, and we shouldn't have access, until you guys approve

APPROVED 11-19-2010

it, and then it gets posted. I'm talking about minutes are an item that pertains to this agency, and until we get see approved minutes, we have no opportunity to comments on minutes that have been approved. And frankly, there could be things that people have said that are a part of the minutes and what have you, that we have no opportunities to say we do not concur. You approved the minutes, but that is not reflected correctly in the minutes or what have you. You see what I mean?

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so I'm going to ask that question of Counsel, and also if in fact we approve the minutes, it's posted on the website, can it be changed?

Ms. Perreira: I didn't say for it to be changed. I said that we can make comments pertaining to approved minutes, and I think that is entirely appropriate. I believe we have our own legal counsel as well that have opinions on this.

Mr. Giroux: The Office of Information Practice requires that the board keep minutes, and that the minutes be made public within 30-days. The issue of objections to the contents of the minutes, they really would be taken up as individual agenda items, not as a matter of accuracy or inaccuracy of the minutes. Your opportunity to approve within 30-days of your own agenda just give you the opportunity to actually look at the accuracy of what is recorded. You know, like for example, changing of one word, which the speaker is saying that that's not what I said. Looking at an opportunity to review your agendas item as far as your minutes is not an opportunity to say that's not what I meant to say.

Ms. Perreira: That is not what I was meaning, referring to.

Mr. Giroux: Jocelyn, please. When you're looking at your minutes, that is merely all you're doing. The law doesn't even require you to adopt your minutes. If you do not adopt your minutes within 30-days, it's basically just a record of what happened at the meeting. Your minutes are at a minimum suppose to be who was present, what issue was discussed and what action you took to resolve that issue. So anything over and above that is merely a recording of what, you know, is happening in real time. So anything that is objectionable by the public as far as your context of your minutes would be taken up as an agenda item or a letter to the body as far as an objection to the contents of those minutes.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So James, what it sounds like is that we, as a body, have an opportunity to have an agenda item that invites comments from the public on past minutes that are public. But this body needs to weight adding that to our meetings to the time we have, if the discussed was a controversial issue, you know, it might not be –. I just kind of think that adding an opportunity for the public to talk about what happened at previous meeting would take up a lot of our limited work time already. And if it's not a legal requirement, we can receive those concerns in writing.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, that's what Counsel just said.

Ms. Perreira: I want to make it very clear though because what's –

Mr. Horcajo: This is your last opportunity.

Ms. Perreira: Thank you because what's being discussed is not what we asked for. What we are concerned about is that if there is an item that was improperly noticed, okay, and action was taken to adopt the minutes or what have you, there should be an opportunity for a section that says any concerns or questions about the posted approved minutes. And I don't think that would take more than a few minutes for somebody to have something to say. We just had a concern that these minutes were adopted and we felt something was discussed that was not properly noticed. And I want to place that on the record because that is a concern of ours. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Thank you. I guess, I was going to make a comment about that. Go ahead Warren.

Mr. Suzuki: I just had a real quick question for Corporation Counsel. Do you normally provide testimony opportunity for review and acceptance of minutes? Because in prior boards and commissions I've been on, that has not been the case.

Mr. Giroux: Your rules say that whatever is on your agenda that you have to receive testimony or written or oral testimony of. So, you know, it's foreseeable that somebody would give public testimony about your minutes. But, again, I think you have to remember what the purpose of your minutes are for and what the legal requirements are. And you know, if somebody wanted to testify and say that Bob did say sign and not siding, then, I guess, we would listen to them. They would have their opportunity to make comments. But, again, it's your document in order to keep an accurate record of the actions taken by the board. So, usually when we have contested cases where the verbatim minutes are very important to be accurate and certified, we'll have a certified court reporter here. So, it just an added opportunity that I think that, you know, for on Maui, I think you guys are really lucky to have a policy where most boards and commissions do take verbatim minutes. The State, at the State level, you see a lot of boards and commissions that you get only your bare action minutes. You know, people present, issue discussed, vote made, members said, and that's it. And so, the other boards and commissions have gone, you know, back and forth about the usefulness of verbatim minutes. But usually that's left up to the Department staffing the commission to see what extent that they want to see the minutes preserved.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I have a question James.

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Ms. Betts Basinger: For example, we just approved the September meeting minutes. And the September meeting had specific agenda items, and according to sunshine and notice, those same items may not be on our agenda today. So if we're allowing comment on older agenda items that aren't even on the agenda, I'm not understanding. You see the concept that I'm saying? We could never respond.

Mr. Giroux: Right, and that's why I'm saying that if somebody is communicating, you know, with the board, as a communication item, at your next meeting, it can be addressed as a communication item.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: And keep in mind, that at the beginning of our meeting, you know, our public testimony is fairly open to anything having to do with the MRA. It's for me as well, that's an opportunity, and we've been pretty good about that too. Okay, are we done with whatever we're we talked about, approval of the minutes?

G. NEXT MEETING DATE: November 19, 2010 (Friday)

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, the next meeting date is on the Friday because? Thanksgiving is not –.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We're back to normal.

Ms. Wade: We're back to normal.

Mr. Horcajo: That's right, we are back to normal. That's right. I don't know why I thought this was Thursday.

Mr. Suzuki: That's next year.

Mr. Horcajo: Next year. Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Are we going to plan the agenda for the next meeting?

Mr. Horcajo: Maybe.

Ms. Betts Basinger: While you have us here.

Ms. Wade: For the next meeting, I do need to bring up that the Public Works Department is in receipt of a parking lot re-stripping plan for the Wailuku Municipal Parking Lot.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Generally, this is like a design review that if it was on a private property, I would do administratively. So, I'm going to sort of leave it up to you folks, whether you want me to place this as an agenda item or whether you would like me to just do the administrative review and approval. At this time there are – it is in their schedule to get the parking done mid-November. So they would be able to accomplish that except he didn't – Milton didn't realize that I had expressed that I thought it would come before the MRA board. It doesn't have to. You know, it is a very a minor, sort of a maintenance activity even, but it's up to you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: My question Erin would have more to do with budget. Is this re-stripping project coming out of the MRA budget?

Ms. Wade: No. It's coming out of the Highways budget, of Public Works.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, I'm of the mind to let you do it administratively. You're very well aware of what this body wants, and I don't think we need to discuss it.

Mr. Horcajo: You folks agree?

Ms. Popenuk: I agree.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Great.

Mr. Horcajo: All right, so that's not on the agenda next month. We have any public hearing variance requests?

Ms. Wade: I have no public hearings. I have no public hearings scheduled for next month. We might have one design review. That would be it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so we know we're going to have the development agency business, the parking structure report, Market Street improvement, probably discussion of Wailuku Market Based Plan, hopefully more in-depth, more better improved RFP's for the zoning code, and then the zoning code. Erin go ahead.

Ms. Popenuk: Is it possible, it seems like budget is always like at the end. Is it possible to move some of those late agenda items a little forward? We never seem to get to them thoroughly.

Mr. Horcajo: You want to do budget before communication and report or –?

Ms. Popenuk: I know that's like sort – that people that come to do reports to us got to make them wait or they arrive later or something.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, for me, we should definitely do the public hearings first, right?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Shouldn't we have testimony?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, yeah, right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Public testimony somewhere?

Mr. Horcajo: But anyway, so we should do the public hearing first. Most, we have a lot of public testimony on our MRA business, so for me that makes sense to be second. But we can move budget up before we get to communications and report.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well Chair, since the budget is a huge part of our business, can't it just be a numbered item under (C)?

Mr. Horcajo: I'll ask.

Ms. Wade: My thought would be if you would like to have sort of a budget workshop, the redevelopment agency business is intended to be sort of discussion and workshop. Budget, at this time, was just like update, you know, here's where we are, and if we were going to allocate any additional funds. But if you wanted to have a workshop on the budget, I would put it up under MRA business.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I just come from a long line of business as you review your budget every month. You stay on track of it. You have an opportunity to alter it at every meeting. So wherever it's put, I guess I agree with Katharine that if it's put further up and given more priority we might actually discuss it and not have to wait six months. So wherever, if you want it to be a separate number or just a number under (C).

Mr. Horcajo: My suggestion is we'll keep it separate for now. We'll just move it up to as (D) maybe, then communications and report is (E), if that's okay with you folks. And you know again I've been –. Granted we need the budget every month, and I know we haven't been getting there. And hopefully, but for me, yeah, talking about whether to allocate, I want to look at the big picture, so hopefully by next month we can do that.

The other RFP we've been somewhat talking about was clerical help, so we'll talk about that. So if that can be added somewhere on this MRA business.

Mr. Suzuki: I think it should be under budget discussion.

APPROVED 11-19-2010

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: But it should also be an RFP if we're going to vote on it, right?

Ms. Betts Basinger: But, and also Chair, we know that we're going to be putting out other RFP's, so those should be discussed under budget as well. I mean, parking management plan.

Ms. Wade: Parking management plan will now be funded by the EDA grant. That's awesome.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Wow.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Wade: We saved ourselves a big chunk of money.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay guys, Chair is going adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much for coming.

H. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

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

Others:

Erin Wade, Small Town Planner
James Giroux, Deputy, Corporation Counsel
Milton Arakawa, Director, Department of Public Works
Nolly Yagin, Department of Public Works, Engineering Division

Morgan Gerdel, Parking Structure Coordinator
Yuki Lei Sugimura, Public Relations