

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
SPECIAL MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 2011**

APPROVED 12-16-2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

The special meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Ms. Katharine Popenuk, Vice Chair, at approximately 8:30 a.m., Monday, November 7, 2011, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Island of Maui.

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

Ms. Katharine Popenuk: Okay, I'd like to call to order the special meeting of the MRA, November 7th, 2011. And thank you everybody for coming. Katharine Popenuk, Vice-Chair, Bill Mitchell, Warren Suzuki, Mark Walker, and staff. Public testimony will be taken at the start of the meeting on any agenda item. In fact, we have only one agenda item today and will be limited to three minutes per testifier. So if you could please plan to contain your testimony within that three minutes. Is there anyone who wishes to testify at this time? Seeing none, we move on. Communications, Erin?

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

C. COMMUNICATIONS

- 1. MR. DAVID GOODE, Director, COUNTY OF MAUI DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS requesting comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Wailuku Municipal Parking Structure at TMK (2) 3-4-013:075, Wailuku, Island of Maui. (E. Wade)**

Ms. Erin Wade: Thank you. As you folks are aware, we received the draft environmental assessment for the Wailuku Municipal Parking Structure. The draft was distributed last week, and I gave you guys copies which is why today we have the special meeting to get comments because it's only a 30-days comment period. I passed – you received the draft EA in the form of a CD because it's over 1,000 pages long. But I provided you the table of contents but perhaps as a format to discuss the different chapters in the environmental assessment. I had expected Mr. Gerdel to be here to do sort of a brief overview but I was out the last three days, the last week, so we could have missed each other and didn't – mis-communication of some sort.

So, anyway, just as a way of introduction, the EA for the Municipal Parking Structure does have the valuation of alternatives as required, and it had, essentially, only about 70-pages as the initial EA, and the rest are all appendices which are supporting documents. I have reviewed the document. But because we had just barely a week turn around to get the agenda posted we weren't able get you folks the staff report. I am prepared to make staff comments if you're interested, but I'll leave that up to the Chair.

And also we should note, I did see the police officer out right at 8:25 a.m., so for folks who parked, you want to make sure within two hours you're out there again to move your car.

Mr. Mark Walker: I thought those little passes give us –.

Ms. Wade: Oh, yeah.

Mr. William Mitchell: We have passes.

Ms. Wade: Okay, so folks in the audience. So you can start the discussion with the group about kind of maybe see if the group would like to take the document in the order of the table of contents. If you'd like my comments, at the front end, I can do that too.

Ms. Popenuk: Why don't we have your comments.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Popenuk: Thank you.

Ms. Wade: Sure. Overall I think, in reviewing the document, I think the assessment of alternatives was very helpful. It, even for me, someone who has read all of the documents, further solidified the importance of the parking structure. There has been a lot of back and forth about whether or not it is necessary, or whether if a structure was provided in the government center. If that would alleviate concerns, I think the document did an excellent job of combining all the studies that we've done, both in the past and in the really recent past, to identify the fact that we have to have more parking right in the core of downtown. It is the most fundamental economic development component for us to focus on.

There were a couple of things that I think needed to be adjusted. One was just maybe a statement that was made that is no longer accurate. At the time, perhaps when this was started, the MRA – it said the MRA no longer grants parking waivers. There was a period of time when the development of the parking structure was occurring where we had decided, or the MRA's position was to not grant parking waivers. I know since I have been staffing the MRA, however you have been granting parking waivers. So we want to just clean that up and make sure it's accurate.

In the discussion of alternatives, it's mentioned again. It talks about alternative site locations for a parking structure. This was helpful to me because I've heard several people who say should we do parking? Should we work with Maui Medical to do a parking structure? Should we consider the old post office as a parking structure site for the development? But it really did bring home in the analysis that regardless of what we do no site is big enough short of going with an eight story deck to supply all the parking that would be demanded.

And then I thought maybe it would be worthwhile to identify the locations that had been sort of floated out there in the public for additional parking capacity just to sort of dissuade or further

clarify the fact that there just really isn't the ground space to build a parking structure the capacity that is required right now.

The section for me, I guess, that had the, raised the biggest flags in terms of the assessment was the traffic study by far. The traffic study showed levels of service F at the intersection of Vineyard and Market Street which we had anticipated congestion problems at that intersection, that we experienced congestion problems today. Level of service F, I, you know, from a staff perspective and from an economic development perspective would be more than I think a community would like to bear. And we should probably, in this document, have an assessment of alternatives for either additional access out of the parking structure facility site. It mentioned signalization, in fact, at the intersection, and I don't think that would be in character with the community. I think alternatives should be evaluated for the intersection treatments. And then just maybe a better, along with this, a better assessment of both walking and turning conditions at broader areas within the downtown core. It evaluates the intersections right immediately adjacent to the parking structure, but I think I would like – I personally would like to see a broader comparison to understand how traffic flow is occurring. The traffic report was very good though. I did get a lot out of that, and I actually could start designing some tools based on the counts that were in there thinking that we might be able to evaluate that. There was though when the parking structure master plan was done, originally, there was an access point out onto Main Street, and this has come up several times. So I pulled that out of the master plan. This was in the appendices also by the way. I think perhaps evaluating and a discussion about why that wasn't included and how that would change the parking, or the traffic flow if it were included would be a good thing to include in the EA.

And then I guess the final conclusion, you know, for staff was just I felt like – well there were two – that the aesthetic component maybe wasn't addressed to the extent that I would have liked to see it. There, from the community, we recently gotten a lot of input about the aesthetic of the structure and the fact that it's just a one note piece of architecture, contributing anything more than parking. And it doesn't add to the architectural integrity of the community, nor does it add a sense of place through either green space or public art or anything to that extent is the most bare minimum structure. And frankly that was the direction of the County to the consultant, so that is of no fault to the consultants. However, I think recent public testimony has really highlighted the potential benefits, both to the community and the economic base for further considering something beyond PC-1. You know, at this point, we have, the direction to the consultant was only to consider this option PC-1, which was a really bare bones. You know, but based on public testimony, I personally think it might be revisiting whether or not we'd want to expand that a little bit.

And then finally, there was no discussion on the impact to the community regarding the management and maintenance of the structure. And normally in an EA, you know, you do just deal with okay what is the environmental impact to the actual construction. But there is going to be ongoing impacts to the community of having a parking structure beyond just what the traffic is going to be. And the way that it gets managed and maintained, I think, is a really important thing to include.

So that was staff's overview and some general comments on the EA.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Thank you. Comments? Questions?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes, I'm glad you mentioned that about the parking – or not the parking, but the traffic because I went to the findings and conclusions and it says that the project itself will not generate additional traffic. Well, I don't think that's true. It's going to generate additional traffic, which is fine, but understanding that what, 200 more, plus more cars on the surface out there. So I think Erin's comment related to having them look at that access back on the Main Street is important as a potential for mitigating some of those traffic issues. Now, I don't recall what the issue was with DOT or was it the cost that they couldn't make that, or didn't feel like that was appropriate at this time. But I can't imagine that even a right in, right out, on the Main Street wouldn't work in some form. And that would take a bulk of traffic off of, coming and going off of Vineyard, and Vineyard and Market Streets. So, yeah, I'd like to see something, some comment from the MRA about that.

Ms. Popenuk: Erin, can you recall why the Main Street was not considered?

Ms. Wade: Actually, you know, we've asked that question directly a couple of times, and we've been told they would get back to us. So, and I've never gotten anything in writing that explained it. The only thing that I have heard from DOT themselves is they're concerned of traffic trying to turn in off of Main, backing up to the light at Market. But with the amount of lead space there's at least 75 feet of cuing capacity it looks like in the driveway. So, I can't –. I mean, it could be managed. The garage could be managed in a way that could account for that I would think.

Ms. Popenuk: Thank you.

Mr. Warren Suzuki: I've got a couple of questions and points. First of all, you referenced, you know, PC-1 as being the ultimate alternative that the consultant was directed to design the parking structure, you know, based upon. And my recollection is that it was made real clear to us, you know, by the County's representatives that when they were commencing with the design phase that that was the alternative they're going to be following and there was no opportunity for us to comment on that report or revise amend that because a decision had been made, you know, back when, by prior the MRA or whoever the members were at that time that, this is the alternative that was going to be followed. You made the comment that, you know, we may, you know, given the input that's been received by the community that we may consider revisiting that and maybe making a request, I'm assuming a request to the County to look at the possibility of including some architectural features that, you know, might be appropriate for the parking structure. So my question is what is the situation? You know, is it, as the County had told us three years ago that you made a decision, and this is how we're going to move forward. Or do we have an opportunity at this time to provide comments, you know, with the hope that they'll consider that of putting some additional architecture features?

Ms. Wade: You know, and I know you folks know that it's the Public Works Department that's

driving the project at this point, and the MRA is the commenting board. And at this point I have not been informed that this project will make the FY13 budget. So what that tells me is there is some time for a comment period and some adjustment. Whether there's money is a different question. You know, whether going back to the drawing board with some additional features as something that could be funded would be something we would have to look into. So I think at this point the question is, you know, are we willing to live with this really bare bones utilitarian structure or did we want to get more out of that property? And if the answer is we want to get more out of the property, I mean, I think, the political will would be there to – and actually the political will to build a really utilitarian structure I don't know if that's there. I don't know if we have the support just to throw that in the CIP budget without there being something more compelling about the structure itself. So we might actually have a better, a more buildable project in terms of political will if it had something beyond just the parking structure.

Mr. Suzuki: My only concern to that Erin – I'm not arguing against you – you know, my only concern to that is, again, the project is currently in design phase, and I'm not too sure where they are in terms of percentage complete. But, you know, as you get closer to percentage complete, I mean, even exterior architectural features could potentially have a huge impact on the design and also on the cost. So my sense is that, you know, even if, you know, it's not going to be funded for FY13, depending upon where they are in the design process, you know, we provide comments now, and let's say they were 75% complete, I don't know if the project is going to be in the position where those features can be incorporated. So I'm just kind of struggling right now. You know, I don't know if I personally or members of the MRA, you know, would like to, you know, fortunately have architect, as far as, you know, on the body. We'd want to look at the project and say, well let add an architecture feature then, and the time, the effort and the discussion, when really the probability of it amounting to anything is zero. I mean, I for one prefer not just spinning the wheel. I mean, I'm just providing my comments.

Ms. Popenuk: My understanding is that – and correct me if I'm wrong – is that PC-1 was selected by the charrette team and by this group, and that group, and the next group, and that it's our purpose to honor that selection. At the same time, I would hope that we still have an opportunity to work with the design as it is, but work with the design and have our comments taken into consideration. For instance, I noticed that the glass roofs over the stairwells are gone and now we have standing metal which I think is a good change. And it seems like the roofs are a little lower which is a good change. But there were other items that I was hoping to see I don't see yet. So my understanding was that we had to stay with the general idea of PC-1 but also that we still and my knowledge as an architect is that we still have an opportunity to do some kinds of tweaking, if you will, or development, a greater development, of the design of that design to make it more an acceptable design for Wailuku town.

Mr. Walker: Well, I think what this process is about. I mean, we could certainly get back to our comments and our feelings about the architecture. Am I correct and that sort of what this is about? The other, not question, but comment I had is, I mean, this is, yeah, this is utilitarian. Could it be better? Of course it could. It comes with at cost. We already heard the. . . (inaudible) . . . It was \$15 million just for this. I saw, I think I looked, it was \$7 million. In 2004 or 2005, you know, it's doubled. And so it all comes to a cost. It seems like we have another,

an opportunity later on to do maybe something fancier, better, more than just a utilitarian structure down the road, with the other part of the parking lot. Aren't we going to –? Isn't there a fuse burning here on some federal funds that we've used? And wouldn't that somehow plan to our decision here?

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Walker: Maybe you can explain that.

Ms. Wade: That's a good point. So we have the \$1.2 million grant for construction, design and construction documents. And basically the path that was laid out succinctly to via Public Works, you know, with the schedule and everything does match up with the grant expectations. So that's part of the – that's certainly is part of our criteria is trying to achieve compliance with that.

Mr. Walker: Because your worry is if we don't that potentially is a bridge we burn.

Ms. Wade: Well my worry would – I have two worries.

Mr. Walker: Okay.

Ms. Wade: The first worry is not complying with their expectations for this particular plan. You know, and you can ask for extensions of grants if that was something that we want to do or we said we want to incorporate these additional features. The second worry would be to actually use all the money that we've been given and then not build anything. You know, if you take the money and you design something and then you don't build it that would be a real waste of the Federal dollars and they wouldn't look favorably on that at all. So to Warren's – that actually speaks to Warren's point is you want to identify. You want to stay on the track that's going to get something that you're actually going to build, and you're going to build it in a timely fashion as well. So that's where our editing has to come in. You know, we can't like just dream big. That's certainly the case.

Back to analysis in the master plan. You're right in that the alternatives that were evaluated was a structure that covered the entire lot; a structure that covered one portion of the lot, not the portion that was reviewed in PC-1; and incorporated mixed use around sort of the perimeter of the building. And then the PC-1 alternative which ended up being mixed use on the remnant parcel, and the parking structure and the back. And there were design elements that were recommended, I guess, as part of the master plan process. But the overall structure itself, I mean, I think, you're right in the sense that there's some flexibility for that. But they are at 60% design right now. So if the things that –. I mean, one of the great comments that even a member of the audience today brought up was the roof top garden concept. And the use of the space as public park has been something that has come up a lot, you know. And if we could do both, what a great thing that would be. It does have, if you did the garden at the top, it does have a structural ramifications and we've got to account for it now. So whether or not –. Where that puts us at 60% design, are they at where we really got to de-construct and reconstruct in terms of the construction drawings. I don't know the answer to that question. So I think it

depends on where you folks wanted to go with the recommendations. You know, if it was like the banners idea, I'm sure that's one we can incorporate immediately. But some of them will have certainly structural ramifications.

Ms. Popenuk: I was thinking that we were at the maximum height as is.

Ms. Wade: We are at the maximum height.

Mr. Walker: So we'd lose a floor of parking.

Ms. Popenuk: Yes.

Mr. Walker: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: They did –. My understanding was that they could do the PV, the photo voltaic array, and that could exceed the maximum height limitation. But now without PV, then that's it, we're maxed out. So we would have to relinquish parking in order to do a roof top garden unfortunately.

Mr. Walker: How many stalls under the current plan would be –? What is a floor? Is that 60? 70? I mean, I was thinking about reading the document and parks, and you know, people losing views. But if we could actually go and get a great view, then it could be a gathering place. I mean, that would be cool, whether, you know, back to the question, is it too late in the process, you know, to –? Because that would obviously be a substantial change.

Ms. Wade: There's 30 stalls . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Walker: So that's not – that's not that many. I mean, the bottom line is we're not solving the parking problem with the structure anyway. You know, I mean, to me, the bigger picture, and I would hope we would incorporate it in our comments or it would come out of this body today is – I'm hoping we move it along with the ability to, you know, and give more comments, you know, and maybe it includes a park. But they still need to come up with a County parking management plan, a State parking management plan, and they need to buy, and they need to buy some of these pocket areas they've identified for more parking because this doesn't solve the problem. We're still what 200 short?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Walker: You know, I mean, this is just a part of a bigger parking plan anyway.

Mr. Suzuki: One more comment.

Ms. Popenuk: Yes.

Mr. Suzuki: And this goes to the comment made relative to the management plan and, you

know, maintenance program. Now that's one of the things that for me is almost as important as the impacts during construction. Because the construction term might be 18 months – let's say to two years. You know beyond that, it's 20 to 30 years as far as construction. And if you don't have an environmental assessment to definitely address the parking management plan because parking management plan is tied in somewhat to the traffic impact. Maintenance plan, to me, is always is critical because the unfortunate reality is for a lot of government facilities, a lot of money will be spent to build the structure itself. But once the money is built – I mean is used to build the structure, monies then not appropriated for the maintenance. So as time goes on, the facility or whatever improvements that's put in deteriorates to a point where, for me, I've always said, why would you spend the money in the first place? All that money to, you know, build a nice structure, or let's say, do a nice improvement when you're not going to even maintain it. So, to me, it would be a total waste. So for me it's critical that the EA does address the issue as far as the management plan and maintenance program.

Ms. Popenuk: And that sort of dovetails into do we want to collect fees for parking in the structure? You know, would that be a source of funding for the maintenance?

Mr. Suzuki: But is that something that would be addressed in the EA?

Ms. Wade: I think that the overall –. I mean, the management of the structure itself should be addressed in the EA, whether or not fees and things are collected, I think. I think in the EA you do have to provide a source of funding, ongoing funding – to identify a source of ongoing funding for management and maintenance. And ultimately that's going to get back to our question about how is this going to get managed and maintained. I guess through that what it's showing me is, you know, our time line that we have set out might be a little ambitious in a sense that we really do need to answer his question before we move forward. Is how are we going to ensure that ultimately this isn't going to do what Warren is saying and just deteriorate quickly and be a place where people don't want to park.

Mr. Suzuki: Because, you know, the reality is that all of us has spent a lot of time there at various times of the day. And you know as well as I do during the day and not so much at night, it's going to be a haven for certain, you know, parts of the community which will ultimately lead to, I think, the structure becoming not very appealing, you know, as far as for use. That's my concern. But going through the issue as far as fees and all that, you know one thought that just, you know, came in my mind is that if you read the report, though, relative to overall parking of Wailuku area, it seems like the bulk of the parking will be used by, you know, government employees. Government employees that park in County parking lots, you know, pay a certain, you know, monthly fee for the privilege to park in those stalls. I say "are privileged" because there's a long waiting list, you know, to get a parking stall. So maybe, you know, we should be looking at, you know, charging for the parking for government employees. Because I can't see, I can't see monies being put in by the general public for a parking structure to benefit from it to revitalize Wailuku town. At the same time, people from within community come to Wailuku to park in the structure and find that all the stalls are taken up by, you know, employees of the government, so that would totally defeat the purpose. If that's the case, then why even build a structure because that's the situation as it is today. If the same situation is going to occur with

the building of the parking structure, why spend the \$14 million? You know, spend the \$14 million in a different area. Maybe that's the reason why some people are expressing concerns about the parking structure. I mean, why are you spending that money for the parking structure when it may not result in the degree of benefit that, you know, everyone is kind of hoping or saying that the parking structure provide.

Ms. Popenuk: Good point.

Mr. Walker: I mean, my understanding is the County is working on a parking management plan, aren't they?

Ms. Wade: They're actually working on an entire campus plan right now which does include a parking management plan. Which would basically include creating more office, you know, which we know also is a challenge because it's just more of the same, the same time period, and things. It could though, I mean, it could be great if we actually have to provide for the additional resources that we're creating. So, you know, there's – we're sort of at this point now where County administration and management is moving forward with the plan pro-actively for their government employees. And MRA is looking at planning pro-actively for its parking structure. I think, to be really honest, it's kind of time for maybe the MRA and the administration to meet and talk about what's our bigger plan for Wailuku town? Yes, we're, you know, MRA doesn't manage government center, but they spill over in both area areas. We probably need to have a meeting of the minds and go over these realities to figure out how do we balance the equation here. Because for the – I mean, we can keep guessing at what they're going to do or what we're going to do. But I think maybe in terms of figuring out the long term management and maintenance, it's going to have to include a –

Mr. Walker: Parking fee.

Ms. Wade: – transportation demand management. It's going to have to include a component where I truly don't believe we are going to be able to create 500 parking stalls in downtown Wailuku. I just don't know how we would accomplish that, or if we would like the result if we did. So, being able to get a circulator route through downtown, having parking outside of the downtown, I think they are going to be key to solving the problem here. But it shouldn't be just MRA, or just administration doing it. It probably should be a cooperative effort. So I think, you know, in terms of solving the larger problem, I think that's my recommendation as staff is that we try to schedule a meeting with the MRA and the management – the County and perhaps even the State. Their facility's director that's here on Maui doesn't make the decisions, you know, but it could be good to have those people in the conversation either way. And certainly we could have the governor's rep participate.

Mr. Walker: You're saying in advance of a response on this EA or just in general?

Ms. Wade: I don't think we have time for that, but I think at this juncture where we have all these questions they're coming up and we're not able to answer them. And even moving forward with the design of the structure. I think in the EA we can tell them here's the things that we're

concerned about, and good luck with dealing them because we're dealing with them too, pretty much. And then as a result, you know, we can take this pro-active step to try to reach out and plan together.

Ms. Popenuk: Right. I don't think that we have time to come up with solutions, but I definitely think that it's important that we come out with what the issues are which is like we don't want this to just become yet another County parking lot, or State parking lot, employee parking lot. We want to –. We see that as a problem and it needs to be fixed. And the maintenance also, it's a problem, and we want to make sure that we address it. To talk about fees or parking, employee parking passes or something like, really I probably shouldn't even said that. That's like I solution that I see in my head. So they'll probably, hopefully, come up with similar or better solutions to these problems. So just so that we state that we don't want it be yet another employee parking lot at the expense of the general public.

Mr. Mitchell: Madame Chair, would we recommend then a percentage of the parking structure that would –?

Ms. Popenuk: I don't think that we would like get prescriptive at this point. I just think that we need to say here's a problem. This is the big problem. And, you know, in my mind I have some ideas how that would be solved. And when that time comes, I hope somebody asks me.

Mr. Walker: So how do we move forward today on addressing and creating our comments?

Ms. Wade: Well, it's really similar to how do in the pre-consultation where we'll come up with a list of what your comments are at this period of time. And we can even identify in the EA that we're seeking to collaborate with the administration to resolve some of these issues, and that we hope that, you know, they'll be involved in the process in some way as well.

Ms. Popenuk: When –. Speaking of adding items on a list, one of my things that I read there was that we had suggested that bus come by the parking. And then I –. It becomes aware, it comes to mind that just maneuvering a bus down Market Street and turning on Pili and Vineyard, and turning out on to Church and getting back on the main thoroughfare is like pretty challenging. So I actually was thinking maybe backing away from that previous recommendation that the bus come to the parking. I would like to see a bus stop closer than on High Street.

Mr. Walker: But the Maui buses aren't that big.

Mr. Mitchell: They're small than MEO buses.

Mr. Walker: Yeah. I mean, they don't have to be appropriate in size. But I don't think that doesn't mean you can't have the service. Yeah, you're not going to put a Robert's bus and send it down Market. But I mean, yeah, it's got to be size appropriate and, you know, be able to make the turning radiuses and all that stuff.

Mr. Mitchell: You've got to ride off of Main Street. They could come down, pull right up in front of the structure, and possibly get back off of Pili. I don't think the metrics are, the geometrics of Pili and Vineyard – or Church – are possible.

Ms. Popenuk: So maybe just to express a concern that the buses be appropriately sized that would not like taking out corners by American Savings Bank.

Mr. Mitchell: Right. Well, I think, I think, Public – wasn't Public Works comment that there would be bus access on Vineyard? I think is what they said. Is that correct Erin?

Ms. Wade: They said that, but then the EA it just says a stop for the Maui Bus is proposed. However, the location has not been determined. Current routes do not traverse Church, Vineyard or Market.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Wade: Because of the road widths.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: So I was even thinking if the bus stopped on Main Street, you know, maybe we create bus stops on either side of the street at Main that would be adequate. It's not that far and walk.

Ms. Wade: That's a good point.

Ms. Popenuk: And maybe that ties in with access off of Main Street as well.

Mr. Mitchell: Didn't PC-1 propose access to Main Street?

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Ms. Wade: So, should I put in –? Oh yes, you made that comment Bill that you would like a clarification about why the Main Street connection wasn't incorporated. And would you like to also hear an analysis about if it was what the level of service change would be for the marketing?

Mr. Mitchell: I think it would be huge because, I mean, the reality is that Vineyard/Market Street corner is going to be twice the impact. At certain times of the day, obviously it's going to be a function of the time of day, but when it is it's going to be ugly. So, I think not to ask that question now would be probably missing the opportunity to figure it out. If we can't build it now because of money, that's one thing, but at least we can plan for it, and they can build it in the future.

Ms. Popenuk: For Pili Street, does that help, if they have access to the structure? If you go into the structure off of Pili?

Ms. Wade: It didn't. I mean, at this point, they have planned for access off of Pili proposed in the EA. And it still was triggering the level of service F, and E's and D's at every other intersection.

Mr. Walker: Right. I mean, Church and Main, what was that?

Ms. Wade: Church and Main?

Mr. Walker: You know, to me, that's a . . . (inaudible) . . . Yeah, I can see it backing it up there without some sort of traffic control. I think we get run over in the cross walk.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. It's a mess.

Ms. Wade: I think I have to look to the study to find that one. It's not right up front in the EA.

Mr. Walker: Okay.

Ms. Wade: So far in the list of comments I have that you wanted to mention the Main Street connection, and I have enough time to draft that out. Warren had the concern about changing the direction at this point in the design, and I don't know how you would like to phrase that or if you want me to include that in the comments.

Mr. Suzuki: I guess that was just a question that I had that I wanted to bring forward, you know, what sort of impact would comments that may require changing design and have an overall project. I think that that goes to, I guess, the basic comment about what Katharine said that, you know, what some of the community members have said that they want to ensure that the architecture, the exterior architecture features or such where it's more in keeping with the character and style of Wailuku town as compared to a parking structure that might be appropriate, you know, similar to at Kaahumanu. It's fine in Kaahumanu Center, but it is something that is appropriate for, you know, Wailuku town.

Ms. Popenuk: My question is similar to Warren's. It's like where is that line where we get to ask for changes. And then suddenly now the things that we're asking to change are impeding the project.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: So we want to still make some changes but we don't want to impede the project.

Mr. Mitchell: One of the big ones that there were a lot of comments about that would seem to have maybe minimal structural issues would be sheer walls and how their treated. And that might be one of the biggest opportunities for public engagement. And I don't know whether it's

art work. I don't know whether it's temporary art. I know don't know if it's banners, but there may be a number of things that could happen there that wouldn't impact the overall design, or the cost of the structure, but they would have to bring all of those other elements in to –

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah I have totally agree with Bill that there's got to be an architectural solution to those massive sheer walls. I'm sure that there's something that they can do architecturally, be it texture or, you know, architectural elements or something. It seems to me that there should be a solution to break up that massive expanse of a sheer wall that doesn't impact the project.

Ms. Wade: You saw the original designs with the public art going up the side of that wall?

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Wade: That's how – both Bill and I were in on some of the original designs, and it was just like beautiful public art, three dimensional sort of sculpture going up the side of the building. And the one that they had were I think was dolphins or something. It's something that, you know, we wouldn't use but they said they could do. You know, something more appropriate for Wailuku. But again I think it was like at a \$750,000 cost. It was a high budget item, and so immediately, you know, of course, immediately it was one of the first things to get taken off.

But, you know, I do also just, in terms of my background, come from the capital fundraising side where we've done downtown – I've worked on downtown projects before where you seek out outside sources to fund specific elements like that. And I think that could be something that we could ask to have built in to say, you know, yes, we realize maybe the Public Works budget doesn't want to spend money on this million dollar piece of art, but we can do the fundraising campaign or something like that.

Mr. Suzuki: I have a question. I mean, you raised the question about art work, and isn't there some sort of State law that, for every new public work structure a certain percentage of the cost has to be allotted for art?

Ms. Wade: I don't know if it's – I know a lot of other metropolitan areas have that requirement.

Mr. Suzuki: My recollection that, you know, there is because when they built Maui High School, you know, they --

Mr. Mitchell: A percentage.

Mr. Suzuki: That the rolling hills or whatever. But that was because based upon the construction of the school itself a certain percentage has to be allotted for art work.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Wade: Let me look at that up.

Mr. Mitchell: But I guess the other thing that could make it very valuable is the community could be involved in what that art is and so there's much more of by in from maybe the general public and the community and how that looks. And it wasn't just something that was functional and that it had a sort of a community aspect to what –

Mr. Walker: It tells a story or whatever.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, it tells a story, and you know, who knows. Yeah, all those kinds of things that could, you know, build into it. So it has more value than just breaking up the architecture. It has – it could have a component of public input that everybody would feel good about it.

Ms. Popenuk: It sounds like a great idea, yeah.

Ms. Wade: Okay, so moving on with your comments. Warren, that the management and maintenance of the structure should be addressed in the EA. Katharine, that the exterior architecture should reflect appropriate functionality and features for Wailuku town and that we still don't see a change in the sheer walls. That you'd like to see –. I don't know if you want me to add the public art comment right here or if we could do it separately. But what I will do, though, in the mean time when drafting this is to look up and see if the State law is there. And I'll reference it if it is and identify that we'd like to see some public art pulled into the project.

Ms. Popenuk: I think maybe stating about the public art and the sheer walls in the same breath might be a good idea. Otherwise we end up with a little \$30 sculpture at the bottom of the elevator.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. You know, that's a good point. And then the thing about The Maui Bus access. Did you want me to say something like it should be, it should –? How did you want me to phrase it?

Ms. Popenuk: Well, I was just concerned that we had said we wanted the bus to visit. And now I'm thinking, is that – are we being unreasonable? Do we need to really look at that? Does it need to be a special bus? Maybe it should stop out on Main Street instead which actually, you know, even if there wasn't a parking structure, I think it would be nice to have a stop out on Main and Market anyway for people that ride bus. The elderly who can't really walk that far, so maybe that make good sense in a lot of different ways.

Something else that I wanted to put on our list of concerns is the interim parking plan. That that's going to have a huge impact during the time of construction. Where is everybody going to park then? And I wanted to make sure that that's something that gets ironed out. And I guess Nishikawa has worked on that, coming up with alternative parking plan?

Mr. Walker: Well, I think that ties in a little bit to my comment which this is just one part of the bigger plan. And so I think they need to – I mean, it could be interim, but it really should be long term. I mean, it can be. I mean, it can act as an interim while there's construction, but they shouldn't be turning it –. I mean, if it makes sense, they shouldn't be turning it all back, and

they should be keeping them.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, if possible. But during the construction, I can see that maybe –. Like for instance I was driving up the back street, and I went by the Hawaiian Tel parking lot this morning, and it's like half empty, and I thought, maybe we could lease half of the parking lot during the construction phase. And you know maybe they – it's always half empty Monday mornings, so maybe we need to look around at other lots. And maybe some of those folks would be willing to do that. We pick up a couple spots here, a couple spots there, a couple spots here, so we can make it through this, the construction phase when we're most heavily impacted. So I understand your comment that long term we need to look at. But I see a real crunch on the short term.

Mr. Walker: Yeah. But I mean, it's the same problem. We could solve it. Yeah, with the interim one and just keep it for long term as well hopefully. I mean, if it makes sense.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah. Right.

Mr. Suzuki: I guess the comment that I have in this place is more of what Katharine is saying, and I brought it up at one time we were discussing the parking structure and the overall parking in the Wailuku town area. That one of the concerns that I have is that, you know, during construction, you know, x number of stalls are not going to be available for employees, customers, and businesses to park in. And what sort of impact is this going to then have in the surrounding residential area as far as parking? So I think that there needs to be some sort of comment made that they look at the degree of adverse impact that taking away, during construction, when the stalls are taken away, what will it have – what type of adverse impacts will it have on the surrounding residential community and ensure that a program be put together so those impacts are –

Mr. Walker: Mitigated.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. I don't want to say minimize, but I think mitigate is more appropriate term to use.

Mr. Walker: I mean, because at the end of the day we know that there's going to be some pain. I mean, there's just no way around it. It's going to be, you know, you're going to try to do the best you can and hopefully everyone can cooperate. And we get the County and the State a really good plan, but, yeah, it's going to be – we'll be . . . (inaudible) . . . for a while. Did I hear that – did you read back about our concern about the percentage of County workers and the State workers that will be allowed to –

Ms. Wade: I didn't. I didn't put that in.

Mr. Walker: Right. I think we should. I mean, isn't that a concern?

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Walker: Yeah. I think so.

Mr. Mitchell: A percentage.

Mr. Walker: Right. And I would say that they need to be working on active parking management plans for each of them.

Ms. Wade: Yes. Thank you.

Ms. Popenuk: Good point.

Ms. Wade: I did get that part about the impact on the garage.

Mr. Walker: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: So question for Mark. So when you say that they should be working on an active parking management plan, are you saying that State and County should be looking at they also provide an additional parking area?

Mr. Walker: Yeah. Which I think they are doing, and I think they recognize that. But I think we just want to bring that home as well, yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: My concern is that they don't take the position that now that the parking structure is moving forward then there is no need for them look at the parking management plan. So irregardless whether or not the parking structure moves forward . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Walker: Right. Exactly. Yes.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: Next topic was I read a concern for open space in Wailuku town. That this is taking away the last big open space.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: And I thought that should be addressed and in my mind I'm thinking that the commitment to, you know –. If we are going to take this away which it seems that that is likely then we need to have a strategy to identify other open spaces that might be for Wailuku town. Specifically I'm thinking pocket parks.

Mr. Suzuki: So you're saying that parking lot is an open space?

Ms. Popenuk: Right. In the EA, or comment letters, I guess maybe I noticed this that there was

a concern stated that this is our last great open space in Wailuku town.

Mr. Walker: Last great expanse of asphalt.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah because I wouldn't consider parking lot to be open space.

Ms. Popenuk: Well, it would be if chipped all the asphalt.

Mr. Walker: Listen, if you were loitering you would think it would be open space, you know.

Ms. Popenuk: We're sort of turning a corner. We're saying, okay, it's going to be a parking lot instead of like okay we're going to chip all of this out and make a park, right? So it is a concern that, you know, that, you know, no longer will we have –

Mr. Suzuki: An opportunity to create –

Ms. Popenuk: – an opportunity to make a central park in downtown Wailuku. And I do think that is a valid point that you don't want to create a town that all of sudden you look around and you go oh my god did we forgot to put green space in here. So I do think it's something that we need to address.

Mr. Suzuki: But I personally think it leads to the bigger picture. I mean, I don't have any objections to open space or parks being created. But the question that I have is anybody going to use the parking open space. I mean, it's great to create them, but in Wailuku town, you know, because of the way things operate today. After four-thirty, after five o'clock, it's done. I mean, you don't have as much residential uses occurring that you would need to in order to create that vibrant active Wailuku town. So to say that I want parks in Wailuku town which is fine. But during the normal work hours people are working. I mean, they might use it for lunch, but beyond that no one is going to use the. I mean, look at the open space that you have right now. I mean, how is it being used? I mean, it's not, to me, I think, in a lot of cases it's the use is not what the majority of the public would want those spaces to be used as.

Ms. Popenuk: I'm not suggesting that we nix the parking structure and build a park.

Mr. Suzuki: Well, no, yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, I'm just saying that I think we need to make a conscience comment that, yes, open space is important and identify, or try to identify a strategy, you know, an inventory of existing open spaces, and a strategy to preserve certain open spaces or commitment that we realize that is an important aspect. I'm thinking like a 100 years from now, right. Is there going to be any greenery any where, you know, in a particular town or not. So as a planner and a long range planning concept I think that we need to recognize the importance of open space. And sort of as a – to recognize that that is a concern of the community and to address it some

way.

Mr. Mitchell: Madame Chair, did PC-1 also had a – in the remnant parcel at the back of the parking lot had a commercial component to it? Was that in PC-1 or still it parking back there? It was in one of the plans, but I just don't remember if that was PC-1. And it's slightly outside of the scope of the structure itself but I don't know in the EA whether they talk about it because I know it's been talked about a lot.

Ms. Wade: I don't think they talked about it in the EA itself.

Mr. Mitchell: Okay.

Ms. Wade: And on the – we have someone – on the actual site plan it doesn't show the use. It just shows the, you know, the remnant parcel be identified for a mixed use as a block.

Mr. Mitchell: Mixed use as a block. Right.

Ms. Wade: It doesn't show if the use is fronting the Main Street.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Wade: Again, you know, which leads me to say there is some room here for –

Mr. Walker: Interpretation.

Ms. Wade: – interpretation. Yeah, in the design of the project. It's just sort of identifying blocks of space and how they should be used.

Mr. Walker: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: So I guess my comment would be just that it's on our radar, preservation of open space. And that we would like to identify potential open space – other, you know. It doesn't have to be this.

Mr. Walker: The other areas of Wailuku.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, it doesn't have to be this particular parcel. It could be other pieces. I guess my list – my last comment is the aesthetics of the parking structure. I think that we still need to continue working on that. I still see some aspects of it that are one thing, the sheer walls particularly.

Mr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Mitchell: Right. I couldn't tell whether they did anything with the elevators or not. Or do we still have glass box elevators?

Ms. Popenuk: Actually, I didn't notice.

Ms. Wade: I can't tell either.

Mr. Mitchell: I couldn't tell from this elevation. The hot box with finger prints on the –

Ms. Popenuk: Right.

Mr. Walker: I'll be down there with my squeegee and my Windex, making money.

Ms. Popenuk: I was paging through this and was hoping to see like – see the elevations and particularly a little bit closer, and to be able to see some changes and know that our previous recommendations were taken into consideration. I did see the stairwells were changed . . . (inaudible) . . . I was just curious about the rest. I'd hate to like see it built and go oh my god!

Mr. Walker: We should've made that . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Popenuk: Why didn't we push that a little bit harder. Yes?

Mr. Suzuki: Can I ask a question? I don't know the EA specifically address this matter. I didn't see anything in there. You know there seems to be a lot of concern about architecturally how the parking structure is going to look. Shouldn't the EA address, you know, that whatever the architecture design is, how is it going to impact the overall views within Wailuku?

Mr. Walker: It talks about.

Ms. Wade: It does talk about it. It talks about it both like in relationship to the plans, the goals and objectives of each of the plans. And then it talks about it specifically in terms of the design character. But mass – here it is – this was on page, just for everybody's reference, page 21, visual resources. It talks about neighborhood character and then potential impacts and location measures basically. And essentially it's just saying, you know, you'll still have the view up and down Pili Street, or the mauka, makai view. And that the massing is, basically, what's allowed by zoning. That was potentially –

Mr. Walker: And I think there's big talk about the fact that they're sort of tucking it in between the two biggest buildings and that no views are guaranteed which is all true. I mean –

Mr. Suzuki: But I guess that that's a component. But you know having sat on the Urban Design Review Board, you know, for a number of terms, you know, one of the things that is charged to the Urban Design is how does the proposed new structure fits in with the existing surrounding structure? Because is it in keeping with the architectural style and design. So maybe that's where, you know, the comments can be put in. You know, granted the parking structure is a parking structure, and there's only so much that can be done to make it architecturally – more pleasing from an architecture perspective. But special – a higher degree of recognition needs to be provided to the fact that this is old Wailuku town. And in trying to preserve as best as can

the character of Wailuku town, attention – a higher level of attention needs to be given to the architectural design for the structure so it doesn't detract too much – it will – too much from the character and style of architecture for old Wailuku town.

Mr. Walker: Well, and I think, you know, just an overview, I think we're all in agreement that a structure – we need some parking. And so at the end of the day, given the budgetary constraints, the cost of everything, we want to be proud of what we create there. We don't want – you're on the MRA? You know, I mean, you want it to be the best it can be given the amount of money we have to work with. So, I mean that's the balance is yeah if money grows in trees and unlimited, we could – it would really be cool. But given the moans and groans on the 15 million. But anyway, we still need to strive for the best that it can be given –. And the fact that the administration may not even be behind us.

Ms. Popenuk: Well, I think that they cited the lao Theater as being what they're aiming at. They're trying to pick up . . . (inaudible) of the design, and put an lao Theater and incorporate it. I just see that in some cases, particularly, the sheer walls that it's like it could go farther. They could try a little harder on those particular aspects.

Mr. Walker: And you know again as mentioned I think it's maybe not be architects fault. I mean if they're following directions from Public Works who are saying you know kind of bare bones it, yeah, gutsy it up a little bit here and there. And so, but, you know, we do need to give our comments if that's the way we feel and see where it goes.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, I always like to leave the architecture to the architect.

Mr. Suzuki: You do?

Mr. Walker: You're saying Dave Goode isn't a –

Ms. Wade: I guess I have a question for the group. If they came back from our schematics with something that was no longer art deco, that was different in architecture, but that incorporated the public art, are you really attached to the art deco concept, or would you like to see us move away from that? Do you have thoughts on that at all?

Mr. Mitchell: Well, you only really have two opportunities for designs – stair towers and the sheer walls.

Ms. Wade: Exactly.

Mr. Mitchell: And that's really what it comes down to. So I would think the sheer walls may drive more value out of the overall visual of the structure than the stair towers. I mean, I'm not sure. Good question.

Ms. Wade: That's sort of how I feel because I'm thinking about the sheer walls, and if there's some extensive public art included, it's really going to clash with the art deco of the stair towers.

It's not going to be in keeping at all with the art deco.

Mr. Mitchell: Maybe the stair towers get simpler and cost less.

Ms. Wade: That was what I was wondering. I mean, would that be an option the group would be willing to consider at this juncture?

Ms. Popenuk: I actually like – I like the design except for the sheer walls. I like the stair towers. I like the elevator. I like the roof. I like the railings. It's just the sheer walls. And sheer walls are always a problem. They're huge massive elements so I just feel like when you stand next to that sheer wall you're going you're get scared because that's big.

Mr. Walker: And you said – I mean the art thing came up, but it doesn't –. I mean, you also talked about, you know, different textures. I mean, it can be solved. It doesn't just have to be art. I mean I like the towers myself.

Mr. Mitchell: I don't mind the towers, yeah.

Mr. Walker: So yeah if the art clash, then maybe it's not art. Maybe it's just another design element or design elements that get included to make those sheer walls more attractive or less scary or whatever.

Mr. Mitchell: And I mean, I was original landscape architect on the project. The reality is there weren't planters big enough to put large trees against it. If you put large trees against it that would've help that whole sheer wall issue. But there just isn't room around the structure to maintain traffic flow and have large enough areas for big trees.

Ms. Popenuk: I see. I was wondering about that.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, there just simply isn't space.

Ms. Popenuk: How big does the MacArthur Palm get?

Mr. Mitchell: 20. 20 feet.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, so it would only go like half way up that wall.

Mr. Mitchell: The thing that isn't really accurately represented in this is the bottom perimeter landscape. I did line the bottom of the building with the MacArthur Palms. It will get 20 feet. So the bottom, two story and a half, will be relatively softened. But when you get above that, you're going to see it all.

Ms. Wade: Did you not have originally an option for like a green wall?

Mr. Mitchell: We did. We had living walls on that. It's been done. I've seen it done in Honolulu

on parking structure and it's really cool.

Mr. Walker: Ivy or no?

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. It's an ivy. There are very sophisticated living walls that use different types of ivy and they actually do designs in them. But just for a simple one here, that was proposed, but Public Works just didn't feel like it was going to –

Ms. Wade: The maintenance of it.

Mr. Mitchell: The maintenance.

Mr. Walker: It could say No Ka Oi.

Mr. Mitchell: No ka oi. There you go.

Ms. Wade: Classy.

Mr. Mitchell: But, you know, maybe on –. I mean there's a bunch of panels on this thing. Maybe a couple of them have – we go back to the living wall concept. And that's pretty straight forward.

Ms. Popenuk: Living wall sounds pretty cool.

Mr. Mitchell: They are.

Ms. Popenuk: Is the maintenance an issue?

Mr. Mitchell: The maintenance is a component to it. Sure.

Mr. Walker: Back to Warren's comment.

Mr. Mitchell: Back to Warren's comment which is the reality of it. If it doesn't look good, don't – yeah, if it's not going to be nice.

Mr. Suzuki: Well, I guess my perspective, you know, we're saying that they need to pay attention to the long term maintenance of the structure itself. So, you know, they can't come back and say, well, we have a concern about the maintenance and living wall. You know put the living wall in, and address it in the maintenance plan.

Mr. Walker: Right.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: I mean don't – if you're not going to –. If your intent is not to maintain it or anything,

then we won't put anything.

Mr. Walker: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: But if we're saying that there needs to be a maintenance plan or maintenance program, you know, then put the work into it.

Mr. Mitchell: Sure.

Mr. Walker: Because I think and as we've talked about before and continue to talk about it in our – going around to talk to different government leaders about this TIF and CFD stuff is there is an opportunity here to do it different than that has been done. And to create some parking revenue that can, you know, a good portion of which can be used for maintenance, you know. And then make it nice as opposed to like Warren has said . . . (inaudible) . . . I mean look at the courthouse. I mean classic. You know they spend all this money and they can't even keep the tiles on the ground. It's been under repair for –. Yeah, it's a classic example of not having a budget for that maintenance.

Mr. Mitchell: Government.

Mr. Walker: Government.

Ms. Wade: That's a really thing easy thing where the Council has year after year found it really easy to cut maintenance in parking areas. I mean for the last six years that's been cut out of the budget. And every time Public Works Director is left like, well, okay, well, what do I do? There's a liability associated. We've got to maintain it in some way but I'm glad we're having these talks, Mark, because we want to have the expectations and the dedicated funding, I think, in a long term maintenance of the structure. And that's what I would really like to see coming through in the EA.

Mr. Walker: Yeah, I mean, to the degree we can get it to pay for itself. It's going to be better for everybody I think.

Ms. Popenuk: Speaking of maintenance, just a side note. I hope that there's adequate drainage on each of the levels that someone could get in there and hose it. And I hope that they have provided water, a bib, for the guy who's going to hose it out.

Mr. Walker: I mean I think that's the good thing about the design is it is sort of bare bones, which, you know, depending on your perspective can be good or bad. But it's, you know, not that much lighting because it's open air. They have fire –. I mean, you can blast away. So the maintenance is suppose to be – you know, that type of maintenance is going to be pretty easy I think.

Ms. Wade: So I will put that in the maintenance comment that they should also include the identification of facilities that are incorporated to ensure the long term maintenance.

Mr. Mitchell: We did ask the question about back up generators. In the event there's a power outage would you have to maintain lighting in the structure, and I think the answer was no as I recall. Does that sound right Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: . . . (inaudible). . .

Mr. Mitchell: I remember him talking about it. I thought we asked them, the architects, at the time of the presentation would they have back up generators.

Mr. Suzuki: I was not here.

Mr. Mitchell: I mean, as we're talking about everything on the table, you know, it is a large structure. And actually Katharine and I were talking this week about disaster preparedness because someone in the public made the comment about large structures in the event of a natural disaster where do you put a lot of people that's sheltered? And this is quasi sheltered because it doesn't have walls on it. It has a roof. Should it be plumbed for a back up generator in the event that, you know, it needs to become a sustainable structure for, in case of a natural disaster? And I don't know that there's a cost that has to be put into now other than sleaze and chaises that you could put one on a pad and plug it at sometime in the future.

Mr. Walker: That's probably not a bad idea.

Ms. Popenuk: I did talk to my colleagues about the fall out shelter concept if you will. And it seems like FEMA on a couple of projects, the Maui Architectural Group has done, the MEO transportation center, and I think also the YMCA, FEMA asked about making it to a level that it could function as a shelter. They had a check list of items that they wanted to see there. Like they want to see, you know, bathrooms. And they wanted to see a kitchen and so and so forth. And it seemed like it was sort of complex, complex list of things that would need to be there.

Mr. Walker: If you want to be FEMA approved or something?

Ms. Popenuk: Right. They would step in to pay.

Mr. Mitchell: Forget FEMA. Reality.

Mr. Walker: Aren't they government?

Ms. Wade: Well, that's true. I mean, when you said FEMA, obviously, I was thinking dollar signs. Like, okay, great because that's a huge – I mean, they would pay a tremendous component of this if we were able to meet their standards. And if you're going to talk back up, generator would be an approved component. Perhaps there could be longer phase components of this, where, yeah, we need the parking today. I mean five years ago. But ultimately, I mean, even if those things were outside of the existing structure but was connected later, I mean, it could really be a great opportunity to fund a significant portion of the structure.

Ms. Popenuk: I was wondering if that would be a such a substantial change that it would knock us off the tracks in terms of moving forward on this project.

Ms. Wade: What's the –? Do you know what the criteria is for enclosing? I mean, because it is so open. Do you have to be able to hold down doors or something?

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, I don't know about that. That was pretty much what everybody were saying. Everybody said, "yeah, but there's no walls." And I'm going, well, that's not true.

Mr. Walker: Well, if you want to get people out of the weather.

Mr. Mitchell: I think, yeah, and don't get me wrong. I'm not discounting it. There may be a FEMA component to it. But after that last tsunami, I was shocked. I live upcountry. There were over 8,000 people on the roads just camped out upcountry and I can't imagine what it is like in Wailuku town. All the people from Lower Beach Road and from areas that might be impacted where they go. And if it were for a period of days or weeks, where would they seek shelter. And I don't know if there's enough room at War Memorial and the other shelter shelters to do it.

Mr. Walker: I mean, I think it's just . . . (inaudible) . . . benefit to the community.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Walker: The structure itself. And whether you can work – I mean, it has a roof. Yet, it doesn't have sides so it has some shortcomings. But better than a box.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: So maybe we could bring this topic up but not suggest what is to be done about it.

Mr. Mitchell: What do you think about that Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: I don't know. I personally – I mean I like the discussion, but I think we're kind of getting too far away from where our focus needs to be.

Mr. Walker: Yeah I mean to me it's just a benefit. You're just saying an additional potential benefit of the structure is it could provide short term shelter in the event of an emergency. I mean, it's more of a comment.

Mr. Suzuki: Put it as a comment and just leave it at that.

Mr. Walker: Right.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, I don't –

Mr. Walker: And whether that could work into something more down the road and what have you, then –

Ms. Popenuk: Right. And I don't know exactly what the check list is. But I did notice like the electric room is sort of a buried chamber and I thought, well, you know, maybe bathrooms could go in there too, and a kitchen, and a generator.

Mr. Walker: A wine cellar.

Ms. Popenuk: And a wine cellar.

Ms. Wade: The bare essentials.

Ms. Popenuk: I like that. Hurricane? What hurricane.

Ms. Wade: Are there any other comments?

Mr. Suzuki: That's it.

Mr. Walker: I mean, I think –

Mr. Michael Hopper: You could move to adopt those unanimously, with unanimous consent or through a vote. You want to have those clarified as the MRA's comments. If you're all unanimously in support, the Chair could say, if there's no objections, those would be our comments.

Ms. Popenuk: I had one, I'm sorry, one last little thing.

Mr. Suzuki: It's not over yet.

Mr. Hopper: When you're done.

Ms. Popenuk: Which was, and I don't know that this is anything we can do anything about. But I did notice that when that the archaeological report is done the – what is it called? – the –

Mr. Mitchell: The monitoring?

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, after the monitoring they submit the report, and the agency has 180-days to respond to the report which actually is a half of a year.

Mr. Walker: That's SHPD or –?

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, right. And I thought, wow, that is so long. That would just grind the project

to a halt. I don't know if there's anything that – whether we can make comment on that or vote any changes in that policy.

Mr. Walker: That won't hold anything back though.

Ms. Wade: No, I'm sure they were accounted for it. Internally they do process the public projects first. But they have up to 180-days, and sometimes it's longer honestly.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay.

Ms. Wade: They generally account for it though in their construction schedule. .

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. That's it then. Any other comments anyone? So –

Ms. Wade: Do you want me to read it back or would you –?

Mr. Walker: Yeah, maybe you could just over them one final time.

Ms. Popenuk: Thank you.

Ms. Wade: Okay bear with me. I guess I wanted to clarify whether you folks wanted to state that the traffic impact is unacceptable at current state or that I have the traffic projected itself –. Oh, first you commented that the traffic – the project itself won't generate more traffic which can't really be accurate.

Mr. Mitchell: That can't be accurate. No.

Ms. Wade: And that we'd like to see them evaluate an additional access point on to Main Street, in particular, a right in, right out on Main to alleviate the stress at Vineyard and Market. Warren, concern about changing – oh, that was the concern about changing direction at this point. I guess that's for us internally. We don't want to do anything that impedes the forward movement of the design. And then regarding the State Parking Management and the County Parking Management Plan, the concern about the percentage of County and State workers currently parking in the municipal lot and how many would park there into the future all needs to be incorporated into a long term parking management plan for the larger area. That the management and maintenance of the structure needs to be addressed in the EA. And, yeah, Katharine added that the hose bibs and other facilities incorporated into the structure to accommodate the long term management and maintenance should be identified. For the exterior architectural elements still leads something to be desired. That the recommendations for the sheer wall have not been incorporated and you'd like to see that. That, and I'll look up the State law that requires a certain percentage of the project provide for dedication of public art. That we'd like to see some public art incorporated. That we still want to support access of The Maui Bus, but understand that –

Mr. Walker: Now was that just public art or are we just saying better handling of that? Because

I don't think it's just public art, you know. For instance, public art or, what you were saying, use of texture, right?

Ms. Wade: So sheer wall I have as one sentence, and then I go into public art in a second sentence. And I don't know, it certainly doesn't have to be on the sheer wall where the art would be incorporated. It may be – I don't know.

Mr. Suzuki: The comment about public art was just you're going to research to see if there's some kind of law that requires that certain percentage to use, to allocate, for the art work, right?

Ms. Wade: Why don't I make that separate.

Mr. Suzuki: But then art work could be in the sheer wall.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Wade: Why don't I make that separate then. Okay, that we still would like to encourage The Maui Bus access but would be – would like to see a stop at Main and Market evaluated on Main. The interim parking plan could have a big impact on the community and we should discuss how – or the EA should discuss how it's going to impact surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Walker: Finding of no impacts.

Ms. Wade: Concern about the parking structure taking away the last large open space and that the EA should identify a strategy for other alternatives to community gathering, parks and green space. And that maybe other potential benefit it should be identified in the EA that the structure could be used as short-term shelter in the event of a natural disaster.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay.

Mr. Walker: Great.

Ms. Popenuk: Do I hear a motion that we accept these recommendations?

Mr. Suzuki: So move.

Ms. Popenuk: Second?

Mr. Walker: Second.

Ms. Popenuk: All in favor?

Agency Members: “Aye.”

Ms. Popenuk: Motion passes.

**It was moved by Mr. Warren Suzuki, seconded by Mr. Mark Walker, then
unanimously**

VOTED: to accept the recommendations as discussed.

Mr. Walker: So do you send us a draft or how does that?

Ms. Wade: I’m going to do that in this case because there’s so much in there. And make sure you comment just back to me.

Mr. Walker: Right.

Ms. Wade: And I can revise and edit it as long as it’s in what we agreed to. If you add anything new, obviously, it has to come back.

Mr. Walker: Right. Okay.

D. NEXT MEETING DATE: November 18, 2011

E. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Thank you everybody. Great ideas. Next meeting November 18th, 2011. We are adjourned.

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

LEILANI A. RAMORAN-QUEMADO
Secretary to Boards and Commissions I

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Katharine Popenuk, Vice-Chair
William Mitchell
Warren Suzuki
Mark Walker

Excused:

Alexa Betts Basinger, Chair

Others:

Erin Wade, Small Town Planner
Michael Hopper, Deputy Corporation Counsel