

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
REGULAR MEETING  
NOVEMBER 16, 2012**

**APPROVED 12-28-2012**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Ms. Katharine Popenuk, Chair, at approximately 1:04 p.m. Friday, November 16, 2012, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Island of Maui.

Ms. Katharine Popenuk: I call to order the November 16<sup>th</sup>, Friday meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency. In attendance Katharine Popenuk, myself; Bill Mitchell; Don Fujimoto; Warren Suzuki; Mark Walker is absent; and we have staff as well.

Public testimony will be taken at the start of the meeting on any agenda items. Testimony will be limited to three minutes per testifier. And with the recommendation of the chair, additional time may be granted. First, approval of the minutes of the September 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. Do I hear a motion for approval?

**B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2012 MEETING (via e-mail)**

Mr. Warren Suzuki: Move to accept.

Mr. Don Fujimoto: Second.

Ms. Popenuk: All in favor? Aye. Approved.

**It was moved by Mr. Warren Suzuki, seconded by Mr. Don Fujimoto, then unanimously**

**VOTED: to approve the September 28, 2012 meeting minutes as presented.**

**(Assenting: D. Fujimoto, B. Mitchell, K. Popenuk, W. Suzuki**

**Excused: M. Walker)**

**C. PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Popenuk: At this time I will open the floor for public testimony. Mr. John Noble, if you would like to come forward.

Mr. John Noble: My name is John Noble. I own a business and property at 160 Market Street, and I've owned it since 1977. I'm here to comment on the reoccurring psycho babble on this parking lot. Apparently we're gonna re-do the parking lot thing again. We've already been through this. I'm glad Joe is here because we had nine different things that we were gonna do because they took out the -. Tavares admits to 24. I have a letter in that. But there's more like

60 parking spots they were gonna take out. So they've taken out about 60 parking spots. And so down through the years we were gonna have this one million – fifteen million dollar parking structure that they spent 1,551,895, and 73 cents so far on. So there are actually people that want to put in parking. There's a lot next to me, though Johnny wants it. And I talked to Wayne Murakaki, the Armstrong people, they want to put in a parking lot. The only thing you're gonna do with this parking lot, and this is the other meeting that we had several years ago, it's like the old torture device. They had one person on one side of the torture device and another person on this T on the other side. Once the person on the right side went down, the other person was tortured. So until somebody puts some money into some actual parking there's just another go around with the psycho babble. There's people that want to do parking. It could be done, but not by just re-shuffling who gets what. And that's it.

Ms. Popenuk: Thank you.

Mr. Noble: Put some money behind it.

Ms. Popenuk: The next testifier, Richard Dan.

Mr. Richard Dan: Aloha everybody. My name is Richard Dan. I'm – I'm first testifying to you on behalf of 42 North Market Street. It's a retail store that I own. Now I'm testifying primarily on this one with regards to Teens On Call, and Open, and (H), Open Projects. On your agenda for this meeting you listed Open Projects. I don't know what that is, and I think the sunshine law kind of says that you have to say what those open projects are so I want to know if I should be here to testify or say something about them or not. I think it's – you guys gotta say what open project is. That's just so I would understand it better.

Also Kat – madame chairperson, in the – all of this MRA meeting you said that you wouldn't allow testimony from myself, Jocelyn or John Noble who were here based on an item was up for discussion. And what you said was "I'm sorry, but there actually will not be public testimony on any of the rest of the items on our agenda as they are non-action items." Then the next meeting in September you brought that up again. At that meeting Michele, I believe said something about it. I'd like to know where you stand. Are you gonna allow discussion on – are you gonna allow testimony on non-discussion items?

Ms. Popenuk: I was corrected by Corporate Counsel and was advised that non-agenda items are open for testimony as well as – I mean, non-action items, excuse me, are open for testimony from the public as well as action items.

Mr. Dan: How are we gonna handle the items that were under discussion that no one was allowed to testify back in August 24<sup>th</sup>? Nobody got to testify . . . (inaudible) . . . How are we going to handle? It's a question I had you to figure out and Corporation Counsel.

And the other issue is for this meeting itself you have a listing on the agenda for open items. I think that applies really against the sunshine law because people really have to know, there has to be some sort of transparency so we know what's gonna be going on. You know it might

take, make these meetings go a little longer, but I think it's the way it should be. I could be wrong, but that's why you have a lawyer there.

As an owner of 42 North Market Street I have issues right now with the garbage cans and the planters that are on the street. The garbage can – we never had garbage issues on Market Street before there were garbage cans. The garbage cans now are on Market Street. Teens On Call does a great job. When you call, they come, they empty them it out, one, two, three. But the point of it is is they're not there all the time. Nobody is out on the street looking. They're stinky, smelly garbage cans all the time. They are an eye sore. I think they should be taken away. I don't see any reasons for the garbage cans there. Michele was – I mentioned to Michele about a week ago, and she said, well, for people to sit down and have lunch. Well, people in Wailuku don't sit down and have lunch in Market Street. And they don't want to be sitting next to the vagrance on Market Street on the benches. And – okay – they don't want to be sitting next to the vagrance on Market Street on the benches.

I understand in August there was some plans that were moved, or changed the benches around. I'd like you to go ahead when you do that, if you're not gonna remove the one in front of the 52 North Market store, could you just please turn it? Turn it around? It's loose anyway. So if you just turn it around that way the vagrance don't stand there and watch the customer's come out and ask them for handouts as they come out the door, that would be really appreciated.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay Mr. Dan, if you could bring your comments to a conclusion please.

Mr. Dan: I'm finish for 42. I do want to make comments now as Valley Isle Loans, 52 – for 42, 44, 46, 48, 58, 92, and 98 North Market Street.

Mr. Suzuki: Point of order chair.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah. I'm sorry Mr. Dan, your testimony time is up. Thank you. Next testifier I'm not sure I can actually read. Halley? Is that correct? Halley Loan? No?

Mr. Alueta: Kamaaina Loans.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Oh, I see. Okay.

Mr. Dan: Next time I'll bring some . . . (inaudible) . . .

**D. PUBLIC HEARINGS - none**

**E. MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BUSINESS**

- 1. Report on progress of Tax Increment Financing and discussion with Goodwin Consulting, Dave Freudenberger at HCPO Conference.**

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Okay. That would be fine. Okay, moving on then. Public hearings we have none today. Agenda item E, Maui Redevelopment Agency business, item no. 1, report on progress of tax increment financing and discussion with Goodwin Consulting. I think that was probably a Mark Walker item, unless anybody has comments at this time. Okay. Seeing none, moving on.

**2. Discussion on the Parking Management Plan and recommendations to adjust timing of the stalls within the municipal lot and charge for parking. Review of two scope options from Downtown Parking and Planning.**

Ms. Popenuk: Discussion on the parking management plan and recommendations to adjust timing of the stalls within the municipal parking lot and charging, and charge for parking. Review of two scope opinions from Downtown Parking and Planning. Okay. And I believe this was an item that Erin was going to bring before us. We have two sheets here. You have –

Mr. Alueta: No she didn't. She just provided these documents for your review and discussion.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. So did we want to proceed with discussion on this matter?

Mr. Suzuki: I, I guess chair, the question that I had was, you know, I glanced through the two proposals but it's not totally clear to me as far as what is the objectives in doing this. You know, because, from my perspective, you know, if a decision has been made not to move forward with the parking structure, you know, we need to accept that and take that into consideration. But, for me, the bigger issue is, you know, for the long term, you know, what are the – what the plans might be of the state and county as far as providing their own parking for their employees. Because my feeling is that the parking that's being currently used by the state and county employees have such a huge impact on the overall, you know, parking situation in Wailuku. You know, we need to understand what the long-term plans are for that. For me, I'd like to know what the plans of that first before we get into any kind of discussion on, you know, what we're gonna be doing.

Mr. Alueta: I can address a part of that. I mean, we are – we are currently out with an EA for the development of a employee parking lot at the – on the top of the – on the Bailey property. Okay. So we're out for that. And currently the Department of Public Works is handling that as far as addressing some issues with regards to Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation. And so once that gets completed and an archaeological study is done, then move forward with that. But, the administration has indicated that that is still a priority to provide some off-site parking for county –. Yeah, and it will a county employee parking lot. It will not be one open to the general public. And that should alleviate, according to a study, I mean, it should alleviate most of the on-street parking, I think, more than it will potentially the municipal parking lot. I have not seen any recently survey as to indicate how many of the county employees park at – make the municipal parking lot their primarily parking spot. Most of the parking has been, from what I can just kind of look around has been on the side streets,

near the county building, not so much at the municipal parking lot. Unless you have seen other studies that indicate how many county employees. I've seen it, the municipal parking lot used primarily for the state, maybe state employees, but also people going to the state building for/and the state courthouse for business. But, yes, there is a plan, and we are moving forward. Right now we are moving forward with the EA.

Ms. Popenuk: Any other comments? I think what I took away from this it's a proposal for a consultant, two options, looking at ways to create parking in Wailuku. And one seems to be a more thorough approach than the other one, and basically figuring out, looking at what the stakeholders meeting, soliciting ideas from the community, looking at planning and land use analysis of where, what to say, physical boundaries of a new parking management district. Looking at our existing enforcement and development codes. Research and document parking management programs that are successful elsewhere. Analyze creation of a parking enterprise funds and including projections of potential income. Looking at the pros and cons of paid parking, and providing some follow up after the fact. So this is potentially looking at something that Mr. Noble brought up which is perhaps opportunities in the community, private landowners maybe having parking and being a part of the whole picture. So hiring someone to look at the whole picture in terms of parking.

Mr. Noble: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Excuse me please? Can I have quiet please? So how would you guys like to move forward on this? You want to entertain this further or look at it our next meeting or get more information from Erin maybe? Any comments?

Mr. William Mitchell: I guess there's two scope that he's proposed. I guess I'd like to look at sort of refining those scope to just basically what we need to potentially implement the paid parking in Wailuku town. I mean, he's already done a study so we already know really what we're working with in terms of existing stalls and who the users are. So my, so my thought is that we need to refine his scope into just what we need. Not that what he's proposing isn't of value but I don't know that we need all the components he has listed on here now.

Mr. Alueta: I think also madame chair, I think, his proposal is also for Lahaina, Paia, and Makawao.

Mr. Mitchell: I saw that, yeah.

Mr. Alueta: So I'm not sure if that's – this board wanted to include that features. I think, for me and I guess from the past history – I mean, I think, in giving directions toward, I guess, Erin and potentially the consultant on the thing is, is the board supportive of having some type on-street metered parking? Is it supportive of having some offsite needed parking at the municipal parking lot that currently exists or even in the future of this parking lot? I think that in the past, we've, this board has, you know, from my past history, has been more of a back and forth on whether or not they want to have metered parking or whether the parking should be free. I mean there's two trains of thoughts here. One is you have paid parking for on-street and you keep the off site or the municipal parking lot free. And that way you encourage more people

to use that municipal parking lot.

There also can be an interim measure in which you have paid parking within the existing municipal parking lot until you build a, until you build a parking structure and then readjust the parking fees or determine. But I think we've always stumbled upon. I never – I think from a – I think Erin and potentially the consultant we needed a clear answer is what the desire is. Do you support a municipal parking lot which has, which charges? I mean, it's always been a given that we would charge, but I've also been where you haven't. So as far as how you're going finance. And this is for the ongoing maintenance. And then will the fees be charged for these parking structures? Is it gonna be staggered so that is pays for just the maintenance, the ongoing maintenance of the existing parking structure which you've had studies on? Or is it going to be to help pay for the overall construction? That, I'm not sure if that's been articulated by this board either to any of the consultants or to Erin herself. I mean, I know I've had the board tell me one thing and then changed their mind, so I think would help.

Mr. Fujimoto: I guess being the newest guy, why do we really need this?

Ms. Popenuk: That's the question in hand. If we do, what we –

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. I think this originated out of if we're going to implement paid parking, how do we execute that? And it has to be executed – Michele, correct me if I'm wrong – in the context of a change to the ordinance, the parking ordinance that Council would have to improve.

Mr. Fujimoto: To enforce it.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. So the initiation of this was getting a fee proposal in order to write the ordinance that then could be acted upon Council to put into effect and that we could generate paid parking whether it's on-street or municipal lot, I think that's still a discussion that's gone back and forth. But at least we'd have a mechanism in place – the county would have the mechanism in place to institute paid parking within the MRA, if I recall is that.

Ms. Popenuk: That sounds about right. And then also maybe utilizing a consultant helps us decide what route we want to pursue. Do we want paid parking? Where do we want paid parking? How do we – how does this makes things better in Wailuku town in the long run?

Mr. Suzuki: I guess chair the question that comes to my mind is that, you know, we could do all of this study, we could come up with a report, and submit it to the Council with a draft of an ordinance, and they have the final authority to say hey or nay to it. And we don't know how long that's going to take. I mean, even if they're willing to . . . (inaudible) . . . And for me, I personally wouldn't see an issue where a draft ordinance was created where reference would just be such where language would state that the MRA would be given the authority to institute, you know, paid parking within the MRA boundaries. And granted once it goes before the Council then questions gonna be asked in terms of, you know, they're gonna want to get into the specifics and all that. But, at that particular level, you know, it may not be necessary to have all the details. But we're looking at these particular stalls to be, you know, two-hour

parking, 25 cents per half an hour. These are going to be six hours, whatever the cost is gonna be. I think if you can just, in a general standpoint, explain to the Council, you know, why we want the paid parking, and if we can have the mechanism in place that allows us to do it, and then it would make sense for the MRA as a buyer to spend \$16,000 or \$30,000 to do, to do a study. And I don't think the Council would have any objectives. They might even put in the language that say we would come back to the Council with the recommendation as far as, you know, what we would see as being the parking.

Mr. Fujimoto: The structure.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, the parking plan, and then we can move forward from there. But to jump to that point without even knowing whether or not the Council is going to be receptive to allowing you to do that in the first place, to me is, you know, kind of jumping the gun a little bit.

Mr. Alueta: So what I'm hearing from you, Mr. Suzuki, is you want like the department to draft an ordinance, so basically grants the MRA some type of broader power for the implementation of a paid parking plan --

Mr. Suzuki: Right:

Mr. Alueta: – within the districts of the MRA.

Mr. Suzuki: Right. Right.

Mr. Alueta: Then if Council is receptive to it and they can lay out conditions, then we would come back with a more detailed plan.

Mr. Suzuki: Right. Right.

Mr. Alueta: Rather than spending the money on a detailed plan only to be . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Suzuki: I mean that's, that's how I kind of see it as making more sense.

Mr. Fujimoto: Plus, at least we moving ahead.

Mr. Suzuki: Right.

Mr. Fujimoto: You know.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. It looks like all board members are behind that idea.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, I think that makes a lot of sense to make sure they're not . . . (inaudible) . . . They got issues to float that out now and not spend a bunch of money on studies that may have no value in the long run. And I think that's what our original intent was to get something in draft form before them to say this is what we want to do. Now, you know, how we get to the

finish product is in the details. But, at least to know from them, can we move forward with it, and have the authority to implement the paid parking in some – where ever it happens?

Ms. Popenuk: Thank, thank you everybody. Shall we have a motion then that we request the department to draft something for us to that effect?

Mr. Suzuki: So move.

Mr. Fujimoto: Second.

Ms. Popenuk: All in favor? Aye. Passed.

**It was moved by Mr. Warren Suzuki, seconded by Mr. Don Fujimoto, then unanimously**

**VOTED: to request the department to draft an ordinance to grant the MRA some type of broader power for the implementation of a paid parking plan within the districts of the MRA.**  
**(Assenting: D. Fujimoto, B. Mitchell, K. Popenuk, W. Suzuki**  
**Excused: M. Walker)**

**3. Discussion on the content and format of the Maui Redevelopment Agency Website.**

Ms. Popenuk: Let's see. Discussion on the content and format of the MRA website which I hope everybody had a chance to visit. No? Okay. Is there anything that we're not seeing on the website that we want to see? Is there anything that we're seeing on the website that we don't want to see?

Mr. Mitchell: Since I haven't looked specifically, does it speak to the status of the parking, the municipal parking garage project on the website?

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. So, in other words obsolete.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: Obsolescence, that's on the website.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Alueta: I'm sorry. Sorry my ignorance here.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah?

Mr. Alueta: Is, is the website still a separate website from the County's?



Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Mr. Alueta: It is? You're still paying a contract for a separate website?

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah.

Mr. Alueta: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: I guess in line with that, my question is are we still paying a consultant to manage the website?

Mr. Mitchell: They're on the budget.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah. Mana Web Solutions, I think.

Mr. Suzuki: So are we paying them on a regular basis?

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. I don't know if it's quarterly or yearly, but they're paid on a regular basis.

Mr. Suzuki: Because, you know, as I stated early on, you know, with this issue of the website first came up in line with what Bill mentioned is that once you commit to do doing a website, at the same time you're committing to manage it, so the information that's on, is on there, is update as possible. So we made that decision to do it, so we need to make sure that we're on top of it so everything is as current as possible. And on the issue of the parking structure, the decision to put that on hold, whatever the status may be was made some time ago. So, you know, that, that type of information because it's such an important, you know, piece of the MRA, there's no question it should have been updated if it hasn't already.

Mr. Mitchell: I'm not sure that it has been. I haven't look at it in the last . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Alueta: I'll follow – I'll follow up. I'll make sure that gets – see that its been updated with Mana. As well as maybe there's – I'll find out with Erin, whether or not she has a regularly scheduled meeting with them just to touch basis on just having the agendas and the –. Again, I mean, its always been like a separate thing and because we post all of our agenda and stuff on the county's site.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Alueta: So I'll find out whether or not that there's an active link to keep that automatically up to date with our agendas.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay.

Mr. Alueta: I'll follow up on that.

Ms. Popenuk: And then in terms of the content on the website, I know Alexa did a lot writing for the website and my question is whatever is on the website should be representative of the board as a whole. And I don't know exactly what the, what this board feels those guidelines should be for how we monitor what's on there, what's appropriate, what's not, how we want to say things. I know Alexa use to do more full find of pieces that, you know, more of a story that she used to write, and I wanted to solicit from the board here what you folks wanted to see on the website. . . if anything.

Mr. Mitchell: The only, the only thing, well, would be just current projects that we're working on or trying to get accomplished. Like for parking, we've asked, you know, for a draft ordinance by the Planning Department being put together, and we're working on the mini park – just things that are probably more current, not necessarily things that are out.

Mr. Fujimoto: So basically to follow what's on the agenda?

Mr. Mitchell: Basically follow what's on the agenda. So if somebody wasn't here, they could get on the website, oh, this is what happened last week or last month, and they kind of follow where we're going. Not a lot of –. Does that make sense?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. Not a lot of editorials.

Mr. Mitchell: Right. Yeah, I don't think that's helpful for somebody who just wants to know what's happening. And since none of us are editorial writers. Got it?

Mr. Alueta: Yeah. Yeah, we just – just to update, board, yeah, it is, at least on the project on the parking structure, it should be on hold right now as far as the active projects. There is a direct link to the agendas and minutes from that website to the county's. And there is – it is out of date as far as – I guess there was a newsletter from the chair. A little newsletter from the chair, so if you want to update it, it has not been – that has not been updated since last year. So we can, you know, we can –. I'll take a better look at it and then give you, you and Erin, a recommendation as far as what should be updated or if some pages should be just removed altogether, and then I'll report back to you on that.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, from the chair, it should probably be taken off.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah, I think it's updated, but never mind, we'll make sure. I'll give you some recommendations on that.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Great. Thank you everyone.

**4. 2013 Meeting Schedule - Board may choose to adopt or modify the schedule.**

Ms. Popenuk: The 2013 meeting schedule for your approval or changes. Anything that you

folks want to change on this? Is this the fourth Friday of every month I guess. Okay. I remember at one time we had it the third Friday of the month. Does it matter?

Ms. Leilani Ramoran-Quemado: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Michele McLean: Can you hear all that? Leilani is saying that the schedule had previously been the fourth Fridays but then it was changed to the third Fridays. That's what we've been on the past -. It used to be third, and now it's changed to fourth because the Council meets on the first and third Fridays of the month so the meetings were potentially conflicting with Council meetings if the Council meetings went late.

Ms. Popenuk: I see. Okay.

Ms. McLean: So proposed for 2013 is what we've been doing for the past several months.

Ms. Popenuk: So everybody okay with the, with the schedule as shown?

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. That's fine.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. That's great. Thank you.

Mr. Alueta: Oh, can I ask, do you know if the November 22<sup>nd</sup>? Does that conflicting again with Thanksgiving? . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Ramoran-Quemado: No. . . .(inaudible) . . .

Mr. Alueta: Okay. Alright. I believe you.

## **F. REPORTS (No action)**

### **1. Discussion on the task list and members volunteering to assist with meetings and the coordination of high priority action items.**

Ms. Popenuk: Okay, moving on to (F) Reports, no. 1, discussion on the task list and members volunteering to assist with meetings and the coordination of high priority action items. So that would be this right here, our task list. Now what we've done in the past is if there was a particular area that was of interest to someone that they sort of wanted to parent, if you will, and follow through on, and make happen, or at least report on what's happening relative to that, then that person would be assigned to that. So -. And I think it was very helpful in the past because it kept important issues from falling between the cracks if someone was willing to shepherd that item and make sure it stays in the forefront. So, at this time, would anybody like to volunteer for anything?

Mr. Suzuki: You know, chair, just a question. You know prior to we getting into the discussion

as far as, you know, who wanted to chair the item, you know, my recollection is that we went through the list and update it such where, you know, we as the current body, you know, agreed on what we consider to be the priority items for this particular, I guess, term going forward. And then we decide okay, you know, would then members would be willing to assume a position in terms of guiding it, I expressed my feelings back then that, you know, I don't see it as a member of the MRA to be the one responsible to guide it through. You know, I see myself as a member of the MRA as being the oversight body that would look at these issues, and whatever is brought forward, you know, we as a body would decide, you know, what sort of action we want to take, you know, going forward, but, you know, that was just my personal feelings. So, if you look at this list, you know, this is October 2010, and it's two-years since so, you know, has, has, obvious the situation has changed as far as the parking structure. You know, what else might have changed and given the changes in what do we see as being at this point in time the priority items.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Very good. Shall we do that then? Look at priorities what we consider?

Mr. Mitchell: So basically a project short list is what we had before and that's what we kind of worked off of last year.

Mr. Alueta: Did you guys have that? Did we have a list?

Mr. Mitchell: We did have a project chore list. I don't have it with me, but we did.

Mr. Alueta: Do you recall what?

Mr. Mitchell: It was park – from memory, help me fill in the blanks – it was parking structure. It was TIFF. It was the lao Park, or the –

Ms. Popenuk: Pocket park.

Mr. Mitchell: – pocket park next to the lao Theater.

Ms. Popenuk: Parking management.

Mr. Mitchell: Parking management plan. I think there were a couple of others, but that was the four that stand out.

Mr. Alueta: I mean, I would encourage you – I mean, I think is – you have a good point as far as that. I also would encourage you to do, kind of, besides the one, because you know that the parking lot is sort of off the books at this point in time. You have – Erin has worked on getting proposals and so now based on your instructions today we'll draft an ordinance and float it up there, float it through here and then float it up to Council as soon as we can. But you may also want to look at – my – I guess I don't want to inject some of my personal opinion, but I think you really need to look at some of the pedestrian improvements that could be done within the scope of CIP projects and budgetary that are not as large.

So I know that – I'm not sure where – I know that the Vineyard Street drainage and waterline improvements have been completed. And you know, an improvement on the pedestrian access between Market Street and High Street on that, along that corridor has been talked about as to whether you've made it your priority. I think we've all talked about that pedestrian access is going to be a key especially if we're gonna connect non-governmental parking lots to the center business core. And so, again, also maybe, and extending the Vineyard improvements down, from Market all the way down to Central that –. You have a pretty good connection right now as far as pedestrian access, I mean, obviously along Main Street. You have it going down Market Street, and now with improvements that go down to Happy Valley. But, you know, if you watch just – watch people push strollers through some either non-connected sidewalks that we kind of want to sort of now look at, okay, where can we connect the dots, or where can we connect the partial improvements that have been done. And I think we scream aloud Vineyard all the time because that is a heavily traffic area and we've also, the board has approved many projects on Vineyard near the municipal parking lot. So, I'm not sure if that is a priority.

You should also look at – I mean, again, I think, the way – my, my feeling coming from the Mayor and Council was that based on this, the parking structure was too big of a budgetary item for them to swallow at this time. At least for the administration. But, potentially, there are some other improvements that can be snuck in, you know, that can really help with pedestrian access. And you have, like I say, now that, especially now the hold up on Vineyard has always been Water Department. Water wants to get input a water line, we don't want to improve it. So that may be one of the angles you want to look at. We also have Wells Street connecting down with the – as you saw in the recent DOE you see Market going toward Kaohu Street as well as improvements coming down Wells because of the increase in school. I mean, the amount of kids that have increased in those two, they're at capacity. That could be something you should, you could potentially look at also, in that area.

Mr. Mitchell: Joe, Joe, has Public Works ever done a study on Vineyard on whether they have the right of way to create a sidewalk on one side or the other? Has anybody looked at it?

Mr. Alueta: That, that, I think is something that I – I think they have, when they did their improvements, I mean, they had to have done some kind of study as far as engineering as far as that. I do know that there are several encroachments with the building. But I think that you – and some of you went through some of the workshops with regards to creating a more pedestrian friendly community, and especially in the MRA, you don't need to hold yourself to a 12-foot travel lane anymore.

Mr. Mitchell: Right:

Mr. Alueta: And I think that's where a lot of the hang up is, that you need to look at, can we get away with a 10-foot travel lane, and then can we use that extra two-foot or four-feet to create improvements on the shoulder for pedestrians? I think that's a classic example, I mean, especially Vineyard, up, going from Wells is a classic example.

You know, like I say, there's also some encroachments. We have this – the MRA code book

allows for these encroachments. There are buildings that are encroachments that – as well as some legal liabilities where you could get away some – you can give some liability relief to the private landowner if they allow for a pedestrian access to it. I think that's the main issue. But until somebody commissions a new study or contracted somebody to do it, we're not going to get an approval. But I think, like I say, the hold up was always water needs to get in and get – and so that hurdle is done so I think . . . (inaudible) . . . look at some of the small –. They're called infrastructure –. I mean, under your (I), under the infrastructural elements of your no. 4 in your book there's a lot, and I think that's where you should probably maybe focus at this point.

Mr. Suzuki: Chair?

Ms. Popenuk: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Suzuki: I, I continue to struggle as far as this particular issue is concerned. The reason why I do is I'm going on my fourth year now, you know, as an MRA member. And it seems – and I'm not speaking of you because you don't really fall in this category – but the prior chairs that we had when they came in to their position, may have had a specific agenda that they wanted to follow, you know, with a certain goal in mind. And it was somewhat limited. It was something that maybe the chair themselves had a special feeling for, you know, a liking for. And it seemed like for that particular term, the bulk of our focus was primary on that particular issue going forward. And for that reason, you know, each year, for me it seemed like it was very different in terms of, you know, how the body functions, what we see to be the priority, and where does it fall within the scheme of MRA. And I've shared before that, you know, I've been confused, and in some ways, I guess, I continue to be confused and for myself, and I'm sure I speak for all of us, you know, because we're all, I would say, you know, design professionals, you know, landscape architects, architects, engineers, and you know, we do things in a very structured way. We physically brainwashed into thinking that we would need to do things in a very structured way, and, you know, we're very focused in terms of, you know, achieving the end result. So for me, you know, if for one year we can decide, okay, this is what we see to be as the main priority for this body going forward, and we all focus our energy on that, and we strive to somehow achieve some results on that particular priority item, that would, that would be such a huge achievement. And not to say that prior MRAs have not, but, you know, we've floundered back and forth a lot of issues, and I don't know if we ever achieved any kind of final results on anything the past, you know, three years or so.

Mr. Mitchell: The park is going to be built Warren, one day, somehow.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. So, you know, and I mean, that could be a priority. I mean, if we all saw that as being the priority, we focus all of our attention and effort that, it likely, you know, would be built, you know, sooner. But because it's part and part of, you know, I guess, a lot of the thing that we see, and, you know, we, as the body meeting, you know, once a month. You know we as a body having a certain amount of staff with their resource being limited because of huge other responsibilities that they have, you know, would we realistically achieve it? I don't know. I mean, I personally like to, you know, for one, end one year where we achieve something, you

know, we accomplish something, you know, this year, and this is what you're gonna see. And I think that's something that will lead towards the increasing the creditability of the MRA. I mean, because the reality is that I don't know if the MRA has a whole lot of creditability at this point in time. You know, we've been around, the MRA has been in existence for what? 10, 15 years? and, you know, it's kind of, it's just kind of, you know, for what I'm saying, it's kind of flounder.

Mr. Alueta: I don't want to – I'll try to pick you up because I don't, I don't think that you guys have been floundering too badly. I think that you did in the last couple of years, as well as, the department really put a lot of focus on the parking structure. And you know, the political realities at the end goal, we thought we had the political backing, but in the end, it did not. I mean, things change. And so there was a lot of capital and time put into it, and it didn't – it's on hold. It's not dead. We've done a lot. We got through it. We're getting through the – you got through the EA process and I think that's a big accomplishment.

But going back, the MRA has done a significant amount of good. I mean, primarily was, adopting your small town code. We'll start with that. Then you have your Market Street Improvements that have phase one, and then fighting to get phase two all the way down into Happy Valley. That has improved pedestrian and child safety and drainage dramatically in that whole area. Your streetscape improvement along Market Street with the furniture and the trash cans – yes, I know it's controversial – but hey, it has been a magnificent benefit. I mean, just putting up the little flags or having street trees. As they've matured, they were kind of wimpy at the beginning, but now they've kind of fully matured, and Market Street looks good, all the way down to Well Street. I mean, if you look at the Wells corridor, looking down from Wells all the way down to Vineyard, and all the way down, the corridor is dramatically improved. Putting in the – I mean getting the infrastructure, like I say, getting the Water Department to finally and put in an infrastructure along Vineyard Street has really helped a lot of those businesses and property owners either sell their property so someone else could come and revitalize it.

Again, your small town code has been the biggest helper, I think, on getting small businesses, small landowners to be able to do some of the things that they could never do. So, I mean, no, there – compared to, you know, like I say, 10 or 15, I mean, 10 years ago, or even five years ago, there's been improvement. I do believe like in the last couple of years a lot of, everything was put behind parking structure because that was seemed to be the key stone to the rest of it. And like I say, now, you got to step back, re-evaluate what we can get done with the budget that we have and the current administration and the financial straits that we are in. So I think like I say take off the ones that are doable, I think that's great, and that you can focus on. Your park, yes, it has been redesigned. Again, there has been a policy basically do no harm to existing parking. Meaning if there's parking on the street, don't take it away. So if you look at the improvements to Vineyard Street, it has to take into account that you can't lose any parking.

You know, same thing with some of the other infrastructure improvements. Try to look at where you can improve. I mean, I think you do need, Madame Chair, to go through the list and see what is the one or two things that you think you want us to focus on, especially with the coming, you know, the coming new year.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah. My reflection on it, Warren, is that, it's like such a huge thing and sometimes it feels a little frustrating, like you just, you know, throwing rocks in a pond trying to fill it, you know, and you're not getting any where. But, in fact, there are little, little changes that do take place and some movement in the right direction. So –

Mr. Suzuki: I guess, chair, the reason why I share that is that – but would the results that are achieved by a body for that particular year be carried on by the next body that comes in the following year? And that's where I'm not convinced that, you know, we see that. I mean, you know, we had certain priorities in years past that, you know, we would focus on that year. But at the end of that year, as the new chair came in, that was all out the window.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: I mean, it's all – without even achieving anything, it was put behind and said that's done, we've worked on that for that particular year, so that's, that's done now. I mean, and we're looking at a new year, so this is what we're gonna focus on this year. So I personally, you know, don't see the continuity. I think the only two things that we've had continuity on is what Bill said, the parking, the parking lot, you know, by Lao Theater, and the parking structure. But, the other ones, you know, there really haven't been that focus on continuity. So I guess my thing is that, you know, are we biting too much? You know, are we as a body trying to do many things at the same time? You know, would it be best for us to take what we see to be a top priority item and focus our attention, I guess, on that. I don't know.

Ms. Popenuk: I see a continuity in, in terms of the turn over of people that come and go out of the MRA. I mean new people start and the people that have been around a while they exit, and that gives the people that are involved sort of a longevity. I want to turn to this board, rather than to enforce my agenda. I have some ideas about what I would like to do, the year, what's most important to me. But I want that to come from the board because I'm going to be leaving the MRA in not a very – less than a year to go – so what I want to do is like going to be history. So I want whatever we pick out today to be what you guys want to do for the next, whatever. It's really Don's decision because he's going to be around the longest.

Mr. Mitchell: I was going to say, I second that motion.

Ms. Popenuk: So I just wanted to give you a little jolt there. So, yeah, I'm really looking to all of you to tell me what you think the priority is.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, I agree with Warren. I think we talked about it, I know, a couple of months ago, is it would be nice to pick two or three what seemed to be low hanging fruit and doable within a year, and focus on those things, and see if we can accomplish them. I haven't been here that long. I have not been here for year yet, so I don't have the back past. I don't have the history, really the historic knowledge, of how things have transpired, but I think it's helpful to have one or two things, three maybe at the most, to drill in on, and then everybody can spend whatever time they do have on those, and possibly have a better chance of getting them actually done.



Ms. Popenuk: I was kind of getting two, two kind of groups of things, goals, that we might approach. And one was like actual, physical things like build a parking structure, or build a park, or put in trash collection devices or whatever. Or, the other thing was approaching it for more of like a rules and regulations. What kind of rules and regulations or ordinance or political kinds of things that we can think about or write or draft, or debate, or whatever that might help Wailuku to achieve its best self. So, kind of those two camps.

Mr. Suzuki: You know, I agree because, you know – and I share this before – is that the body has been around for as long as it has. So my thought when I came in was that all the foundational work, you know, already been done, you know, within that time period. Although it seemed like, as Joe said, you know, there's certain foundational, you know, work has been done. But we talk about, you know, the – how do you finance any sort of major projects that the MRA may decide they would want to pursue? When you think about it there's nothing that's legally in place right now that allows us to take that step. You know, you talk about the TIF, and you talk about, you know, about a, not a project district, but you know – improvement district and all that. I mean, those are possibilities, but there's nothing that's being in place right now that allows us to decide this is what we're going to do to take that step. So in line what you're saying, you know, maybe we need to focus on that and take care of all of the foundational work so, you know, when the MRA decides this is what we want to do, you know, we have the mechanism in place to be able to do it. Not just go through all this planning, and all this talk and when it comes to, okay, how are we gonna pay for it, then we hit this huge obstacle. Then, okay, we can't pay for it now so put it on the shelf and let's work on something else. I mean, we want to have the foundational work in place. So once you decide this is what you want to do then you can take it through that task.

Mr. Alueta: I think you have, Madame Chair. I think that was that whole tax increment financing plan that was going on with regards to the PUMA studies and other stuff. I think that can have its life of its own. And I agree, but I think there's a, there's always a constant tug a war between the – I mean, that the board has had with Council and the administration as far as how much power is, is allowed. You had an overarching, broad power from HRS. The County Council narrowed your power down to a certain function, and we've operated primarily as more as a facilitator and working hand and hand with either the private sector, meaning to get them to either adopting a tax relief for any improvements. Meaning, rather than tax them, we, we don't tax them. That's what we did, and that helped. So if you had a building that was over \$200,000, and you put \$300,000 worth of improvements, we didn't tax you that \$500,000. We still tax, and that was it.

The other mechanism that this board has done is again the small town code, separate from the whole Title 19 and Title 16 to help relieve and take advantage of the nonconforming lot sizes and everything. That has been a dramatic improvement as I've said. As well as the one-stop-shop for people coming in for building permits. The next power and influence that the MRA has had is really focus with the Mayor's Office on the agency improvements. Meaning, you have the ability to lobby the Mayor to make sure, hey, Public Works do you have that improvement for Market Street in. You get that drainage done. That is has been the key component. To the Water Department, we need this water line. You need to really parlay your power where it's at.

And I think you're not – I think you have successfully in the past. I think you need – if you refocus, you can leverage your influence with the administration on departmentally. And having individual – I mean, having meetings with the department and say, hey, look, here's our implementing action, you're responsible in this in this plan that has been adopted by Council. When you go, when they go to the budget and say, hey, I need this money, you have to show. It's in this plan that Council adopted. This is your implementing action. This is your justification for it. And I think you really need to go back and look at what those infrastructure improvements and who's responsible for it.

At the same thing on you market development action, a lot of this Economic Development. I mean, you really need to have, who's reporting to you? Are you getting an update? I mean, we have been successful. I mean, we have First Fridays which has been massively successful for the businesses as well as like I say, you have organizations . . . (inaudible) . . . I think those are kind of the areas you need to really focus your energy on is like if you have an economic development to try to push that through the MD's Office. I mean, the marketing and development, it's under the Mayor's Office. I think that those are the kind of things that you need to do.

I think that the PUMA study, you know, as far as getting you guys some, some type of permanent financing. And the way you need to market it to the Council is, look, we're not gonna have to come to you and ask for a budget. We're gonna have our own funding. If you grant this, we will be funded, and therefore, we don't have to come to you for a handout every time. And you can go ahead and – but you need to come to them and say, hey, when you give us this funding, we're not just gonna pay for administrative costs, we're going to pay for, this is the plan that we have. And you need to look at what, if you do get. Otherwise you say, hey, we're gonna be coming to you at each budgetary hearing to finance this. I think that needs to be addressed.

But as far as in the past, where, you talk about like, you know, to try and implement – I call it pyramid building. You're building an organization, but you really need that organization to be effective. I think you're – this board is working with the Planning Department and, and, and lobbying the other different agencies to get your plan adopted. And then once you got the thing, maybe you need to – I mean, it's on your thing to update this plan. Is there something missing from this plan? This plan is 12 years old now. I mean, it's, you've completed many of the tasks, but are there any new tasks? Or, do you not want to add new tasks, and just keep focusing on what's the thing? And that's something that you gotta decide as far as quorum. But, I think PUMA, you know, your financing, that's one thing but I don't want to see it go where, oh, we're going to spin like we had this experiment where you spun the MRA off. I think that was not the methodology that, that worked. It was a lot of wasted effort.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. You know, I understand exactly what you're saying Joe, and, you know, I still go back are we trying to do too much because from what, from what I understand from what I heard in discussions with certain elected officials, I don't know, in their eyes, where the MRA stands in terms of credibility. If I were to kind of describe it, I don't think, you know, our credibility as far as a body is all that high. I mean I don't think they see the MRA as being a real

important body. In fact, I think, if you, if you listen to some of the discussions that have gone on, I mean, there's been even talk about, you know, dissolving the body. You know, let's just dissolve the body because in the time that it's been around, you know, have there really been, have they achieve anything? Has it been a real benefit as far as to the Wailuku area? So that's why I'm saying, you know, let's take care all of the foundational stuff to increase the credibility of the organization. And then from there, you know, I think, it's gonna be a lot easier for the body to be able to move forward. Now you talked about the Market Street Improvement, but, you know, was that an MRA project? No. It was something that administered by Public Works, right?

Mr. Alueta: No, it's an MRA project that we lobbied to get the Public Works to put on their funding, and to make sure it was a priority. It was a priority, I think, to move forward.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, it was an MRA project?

Mr. Alueta: Yeah. It's on the -. I mean, if you go through this list of all the infrastructure improvements, if you look at where it say implemented and completed, and like I say, the improvements of the infrastructure along Vineyard Street, that was, it's an MRA project on their infrastructure. It got completed. And the Council, they may say that, but let's put it this way, without the MRA - okay? - if you dissolve the MRA and eliminate the code that is, the next time somebody comes in to do an improvement to their building, they'll have to go to the BVA for one, infrastructure for another, a waiver - they would have to go to three different boards. You don't, you don't know what you've got until it's gone. I mean, that's basically what's gonna happen. If they got rid of it, you would have landowners and developers screaming because all of sudden, rather than having to comply with this code and a certain design guidelines, all of sudden, they're not going to be able to use a building, a room, that has only seven foot ceiling. They're gonna have to tear it. You're gonna have a seven -. You know, we, this board has waived so many things and said because in the name of preservation or design. We've allowed people to reverse onto the street where they never could. We've allowed smaller aisles than, you know, on roadway width. I mean like I say that's - or defer of traffic improvements, of roadway improvements. I mean, so, no project, none of the improvements that you did, none of these small architectural firm, doctor's offices that you see, I mean, . . . (inaudible) . . . office, or Anzai's office or any of these small little businesses would exist. They would all, they would never have come in because they couldn't afford it. They couldn't afford the improvement. They couldn't afford the -. You also would lose many of your characters, characteristics of some of your small building that, you know, it's not a historic district, but a lot of people like that, the vernacular that, that is there. And I think that you would lose all that because they would say, the hell with it, I'll scrape everything and start with a brand new building. But, don't give it up.

Mr. Suzuki: No, and I'm glad, I personally am glad we're having that discussion because it's given me a lot more insight in terms of, you know, some of the history and what achievements and what process have been followed that, you know, maybe I wasn't aware of. But the point that you made, in terms of the Market Street, okay, if you're looking at particular project, Joe, the MRA recognized that as being the primary and important priority for the Wailuku MRA area.

The MRA as a body then went and lobbied with the Public Works to, to try and convince, hey, this is a project you folks need to take on. The MRA then decided we're going to take on this project to design ourselves. You know we lobbied with whoever that body was to convince them they should take it on as a project. So we're more like a, not so much an advocacy group, a group that just tries to get things done. So maybe that's the position that we should take. So if the position is such let's say where, you know, we want to implement some sort of fee structure for parking within Wailuku, you know granted, you know, Planning Department, you know, could assist us in coming up with a draft language of the bill that would go before the Council. And then we can go before the council members and say this is something that's very important for, you know, for the MRA. You know, let's – we'd like you folks to consider this and all. But those are things as a body we can do, we can lobby towards, we can advocate for, rather than as a body taking on the project and say this is what we're gonna do, and take it to the process. Because I think maybe that's where the struggle for me is is that, you know, for, for a body that meets 12 times a year, if you take on a project and think you're going to take to the planning and design, it's not going to happen. You know, because we don't have – I mean, we as a body are not in place to be able to buy the time and attention we need. You know, it's not fair to rely on staff to do it because staff has a whole spill of other responsibility that they need to take care of too. So maybe we need to re-look in terms of, you know, when we say this is a priority, this is a project, you know, who are we going to work with and convince to take this on as a project and take it through the process?

Mr. Alueta: With the Market Street Improvement and with most of your other projects, we go out and you hire a consultant to do the job, to do the design.

Mr. Suzuki: But the MRA didn't do it.

Mr. Alueta: Yes. The MRA contracted, through the Planning Department, contracted out, and Chris Hart & Partners did the project. . . (inaudible) . . . they did the design. You hold the public hearings here on the design. They also did charrettes. And then it comes before this board to approve the plan as . . . (inaudible) . . . And all of the stuff –. So you contracted it. You've also used this forum to review it as a public, and approved the project, right? As well as, you know, in the background, you know, Chris and the Planning Department met with Public Works, commenting on the project, is this design gonna work for you? What problems do you have? If there's waivers that need to be done for that project, I mean, as far as the variances or anything like that. We've brought them before you. You guys had you input on what it was – was that design workable? You took into account Public Work's comments on it. What's gonna be the –? Who's gonna maintain it? All of that stuff came into – came and was discussed by this board and then it went –. Then once it got adopted as being a, you know, the thing, then it was turned over to Public Works, and say, hey, we've done the whole public hearing, we've done the design, it's now your project. And then you say to the Mayor, we just spent a lot of money on the project. They're onboard. We need the funding in the budget for this to be done by Public Works. And that's how typically you do it.

I mean, in some cases you don't need to hire a consultant. The department's staff could do it. But you look at what can be done either internally or as a consultant going outward. But the

board needs to be actively involved in it, not only to review and approve it, ultimately, but also to prod your staff, or to prod your consultant of where it is. Same thing with your design guidelines. Your design guidelines was contracted out by the MRA. You came up with designs of what it was – or for the very thing. Jim Niess did it. It took – we held probably half a dozen meetings here over it and comment, and re-did it between staff and the board. So that's where you come into play.

I mean, again, like I say, the last couple of year, you've been really focused on the parking structure. And that was the end all, be all. And we came close, but we didn't quite make it there. And now it's like they say I understand your frustration. You want to see some tangible things that you can do. And as I say, we go back, go back to square one. Here's your list of items to do. Let's pick the priorities that are doable within the next one year or two years.

Mr. Suzuki: And, you know, chair, I apologize for this discussion as far as, you know, with the two of us.

Ms. Popenuk: No, no. This is great.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, I mean, it's very, you know, very beneficial for me. So, Joe, I'm assuming that you were part of the staff when the MRA went for and decided that the Market Street Improvements was a priority and they wanted to take that on.

Mr. Alueta: It was me or John Summers.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay. So with that in mind, Joe, you know, do you recall if the MRA as a body tried to take on other projects at the same time that they wanted to drive it through? Or did they at that time decided, okay, the Market Street Improvements was for this body, the priority for us going forward, and this is where all of us would focus our attention on and then took it through the process? Because, you know, if you're taking, take for example, the issue as far as the tax increment financing and there's nothing negative as far as Mark. You know, he took on the responsibility with Erin. He's not here. You know, Erin is not here. So for this particular meeting which is one out of 12, he's not here, so it's deferred for another month. You know, all of us, all of the rest of us are here, you know, looking to him, to give us information how can we take it forward. But, you know, we as a body agreed, okay, this is an issue that's important for the whole body. We all get involved in the discussion. At every meeting when an item comes up, you know, whether or not one person is not here, you know, we can discuss it, we can take it forward, so, you know, you can achieve progress at each of the 12 meetings that you have for one given year. And that's why I'm saying, you know, maybe we shouldn't try to take on too many things. And I go back to, you know, maybe we should focus on one, two or whatever we see to be achievable, and we as a body focus our efforts and attention on that.

Ms. Popenuk: Don't?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. The expense of being the ignorant guy, I guess. But, you know, like, when I, prior to coming on the board, I always thought that the MRA was like a mini Planning

Commission, like approving, you know, all the stuff that's in the design guidelines, and that is the main function. And as far as the actual project itself would just be to like facility it to, to, per staff to carry on with, you know, whatever it is, maybe one, two, or three projects. But not get really hands on on the project. You know, we'd be there to approve it once the kinks came about, comment on it, pull the public hearings if need to. But, as far as, you know, being like a project manager for the thing, you know, I didn't see the members doing that. But still the main function of the, whatever, for the commission is to basically approve other projects that come through from other people. And I don't know if am I right or –?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: Actually, yeah, but the nature of the MRA has changed pretty radically since I've been on the board in five years. When I first came on the board there were a lot of projects that were coming before us for approval, and that pretty much took up all our time. And what's happened over the last couple of years is there haven't been that many projects. It's a very few. And so we've had a luxury of being able to start thinking about doing other things, like, the foundation work or thinking about, you know, what is our focus going to be.

Mr. Fujimoto: Because I don't have any problems in doing, in taking on – you know I want to look at maybe the updating the standards, you know, updating the studies because that's the foundation to the operation of the MRA. And that's something that the commission on the board should be involved with. But, you know, to take on a project by itself and then champion that by one person, I think it's kind of, is kind of rough especially with what like Warren said, I mean, we only meet, like, once a month, you know. I don't know – I think – I don't know if that's the most efficient way to do it, but maybe it's, you know, to assign the three projects to Planning or somebody. Or, you know, if it's the parking structure's parking fee stuff, maybe it's a combination between Planning and Finance or something, but –. And then to check on it every month and see where they are, and what the time table is, and when we can expect the ordinance to go up to Council, and if need be, we can be there and lobby and you know whatever, but not to get really hands on on each item.

Ms. Popenuk: Just one short little comment which is that one thing that I value in this board is there's so many different types of people that are involved that are very talented in their own realm, and I –. For instance with Mark Walker being in charge of TIF and having a background in finance and banking which is something that I don't have any background in whatsoever. I really thought of that as being a real plus that we would have someone onboard who would already have a lot of that background behind them.

Mr. Fujimoto: Sure. And you know Mark would be perfect as a sounding board off of staff. I mean he can ask the hard questions because he knows all that stuff. But, to throw everything on Mark's lap, I think, is kind of rough.

Mr. Suzuki: I mean, what Don just said is something that I said, and not exactly in his words, but basically I shared that concern back then, you know, from the standpoint of what I saw the MRA, you know, being as a body. Not a body that provide oversight, guidance, but not a body

that would take on the responsibility and take, assume, the responsibility to take things through the process.

Mr. Fujimoto: So, you know, and maybe it's a bad example or whatever, but, for instance when John was up here earlier talking about parking or, you know, whatever it is, then maybe that should be an application that comes up before us and then if it meets our guidelines, if it's what we want to do, then, you know, we approve it or disapprove it or whatever. But, to just, you know, spin wheels, I mean –.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay, do we have any kind of consensus here? One thing I wanted to reiterate was something that Joe said which is we don't particularly need to be the person doing the work. We can be the board that applies pressure, use the board's power in terms of, you know, leveraging certain projects to come forward. So I don't want anybody to feel like that they have to get out there with a shovel and dig the hole themselves. That's not, that's not necessary.

Mr. Fujimoto: But, you know, I guess if we're looking at getting things done, I mean, I think the most efficient way is, you know, not to have one of us take on one project or whatever, but more than, you know, have all of us oversee staff to do the one, two or three projects that we feel, you know, is important.

Ms. Popenuk: Bill?

Mr. Mitchell: What?

Ms. Popenuk: Strangely quiet over there. Do you have any comments?

Mr. Mitchell: I'm guilty.

Mr. Fujimoto: No, I mean, if you want to do it, that's fine.

Mr. Mitchell: No, no. I didn't know what I didn't know when I started last March. And the chair came up with these, that, which projects did you want, so I said, I'll take a project. Is this how the board works, this is what I signed up for, I'll do it. So I agree with you in concept. That's the way I understood the MRA to function. And it was just something different that happened last year. So after the parking is done, you're not going to see or hear from me.

Ms. Popenuk: So, yeah, this board can be whatever you guys –

Mr. Mitchell: I'm not doing the work. We have a consultant doing the work. Yeah. Yeah, we have a consultant. Although, I was going to put a couple of brick out there myself.

Mr. Suzuki: I guess my question, I mean, just kind of focusing on their project and seeing, you know, what efforts were required to get it to where it is today. So once it's designed, who's going to pay for it?

Mr. Alueta: Normally –. It all depends on how it gets financed. Normally it gets financed either through Public Works or Parks Department as far as, as far as, and then we lobby to get it in the budget. I think there was a whole – I mean, there was already a design for it, but apparently, you know, based on, to move that park forward, again, you had to go back to do no harm to the parking. And even though it was illegal parking, it had to be – we had to make it – keep that parking, at least the same number of stalls that are there now while putting in the park. And I think that's where the design got re-evaluated and is out now for redesign.

Mr. Suzuki: Right. But once the design is done and we say okay, it can go forward now as far as the next phase of construction –

Mr. Alueta: Then you go –

Mr. Suzuki: – who's going to take it on?

Mr. Alueta: It will, it will, it will – the board will approve the design, right? And then you will send, to transmit, and then staff will then try to get, find out which department will do it, be it Public Works or Parks Department to put it in their budget. Now, and then you'll, obviously, we're going to meet with the Mayor and say, hey we want this as one of the capital improvement projects to be done. It's in the MRA plan. It's been approved. It's got the community support for it. We want this and to get it on, to convince the Mayor to have, tell his director, put this in your budget. Or, he'll add it to the Parks Department's budget and tell them that's what they got to do. And that's typically all of this, your major bricks and mortar projects get done. Obviously, you're not the one doing it.

It is unusual like I say where the MRA expanded some of its role was you know with Teens On Call, which was getting the trash improvements or trash receptacles done. And that, it's unusual. And even the street cleaning, you know, it's unusual, but it serves its function. I mean, hopefully one day we can move it. And I think, originally, at one time, it was like a contract through Parks and we sort of, you know, we got them to do. And then eventually somehow the contract eventually just said, Parks said, we don't care, put it in the MRA's budget. And so, even though the contract with Teens On Call or a non-profit to do the trash, it got shifted from Parks to MRA. And that, I mean, and that's fine. I think for what we're doing it functions better. There's a little more responsiveness than in the Parks Department. But I think Mr. Fujimoto is correct as far as, you know, what you signed up for, you know, this board is the all in one. This is the Planning Commission, Planning Department, Planning Commission, the Urban Design Review Board and the BVA all wrapped in one, and that was your primary function.

Sadly to say we've had a pretty good size recession the last two to three years, and that has really tapered off a lot the projects. So your review then freed up free time and so rightfully the board, the board did not want to waste that meeting time and said, hey, can we do something to help move along. And I think that's where your, you know, your job got expanded. But I think it's been good. I mean, I think it creates ownership of certain projects by members, and I think it's a good thing.



Mr. Suzuki: But at the same time I think we tried to bite off too much, and that's the reason why, you know, we, we've taken steps forward on maybe five or six items. But other than the park, you know, we've taken maybe one or two steps forward and then we just kind of stopped. So, having said that again, maybe, you know, we need to go back, step back a little bit, and decide, okay, what, you know, what do we see to be, you know, priority issues for the MRA area? What, in line with that, what do we see to be the one or two priority projects that would address that issue? And then decide, you know, whether or not, you know, these are things that we want to grab a hold of and move forward for that particular year. And we do it, you know, as a body. And as Don said, we as a body would agree, okay, and having said that, okay, these are the departments within the County that will be, you know, identified as being responsible for that and try to see if we can, you know, take it forward. As you said in the case of the Market Street improvements, I guess, none of the departments saw that to be a priority or the responsibility. So the MRA took on the responsibility to take it to the design process. I don't see us, you know, given our budget, you know, being able to, you know, take on that task anymore. So we, you know, gonna have to lobby with whichever departments those improvements would, you know, fall under as far as jurisdiction and try to convince them this is a priority and take it through the process.

Ms. Popenuk: Well, let me get a sense from everyone that – so would you agree that we need to narrow our scope?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Okay. And with that in mind I was thinking maybe we have, like, a list of many small things here. But it's broken down into main categories like land use, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, urban design and beautification, infrastructure, marketing, market development, communication and education. Is there – would you folks feel comfortable in just focusing in on one of those major topics as –? If we want to consolidate our efforts, would you feel comfortable identifying one of those major topics as being where we would focus the board's efforts for the next year shall we say?

Mr. Suzuki: Well, I think one would be, what we talked about, as far as a draft bill, that would talk about, you know, giving the MRA authority to establish a parking fee structure within the MRA area. I mean that's important. But that has to do with more legislative action. So in terms of, you know, harder improvements, you know, I would see if we took on a project that would result ultimately in hard physical improvements, you know, that might be another one, but I don't know what that would –

Mr. Alueta: If you look at VPC-8. And that's where we talked about the Vineyard, the Vineyard Street.

VPC-9 is a – that was the traffic – parking impact, parking impact fee, that has come before this board, like, maybe four years ago when I was doing it. I mean, I think Ron was in charge, was the head. Basically, it was not very popular because it was, again, does the board, not only –. Do you charge, and what do you charge for the use of the structure? But, do you charge or do

you not charge the surrounding business owners as they do improvements and require parking? Do you want to waive their parking if they pay a fee? So, and basically, so if ABC building comes in and they're required under your parking, your parking which is a very liberal, I mean, very loose parking requirement. It requires 10 stalls. They can only provide two onsite, or they don't want to provide any onsite, and they want to pay the County for those 10 stalls. Do you charge them? Do you charge them a proportion of that for the structure? And or do you just let them have free parking? And it was the mind set at the time of the Chair that they didn't want to charge any parking. You know, they would just get the parking for free.

And so the ordinance that I did didn't go any where. I mean, I didn't get a recommend – and I didn't bother pursuing with Council because I didn't have the back. I have the ordinance done basically, you know. I can bring it back to you if you, but I don't see it as a priority. It could be. I mean, we could do it now. But, again, that's something that you guys gotta decide. Do you want to charge business owners for their portion for parking.

Mr. Suzuki: You know my understanding, Joe, because, you know, is that based upon, I guess, discussion that we've had in the past, you know, there are certain projects that, as a condition of the approval, were required to agree to pay their fair share for, you know, x number of stalls, you know, if and when the parking structure is constructed. So that was a condition of an approval.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah. Two projects.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, and I think there were projects that were approved that didn't have that condition, you know, placed on them. I don't know if that's the case, but, you know, we don't, we don't know what the cost is gonna be at this point in time. You know, we don't know if the parking structure is, you know, ever gonna be built, you know, if it is gonna to be built. So, we could conceivably go forward without having an ordinance drafted that would continue to have the condition of any approvals that we grant, you know, when the parking requirement issue is something is that – and let's say we grant approval for not, you know, fulfilling, you know, all the parking requirements that a particular project is required to provide. You know, that could be a condition without having an ordinance with a fee structure. Because at this point we don't know what the fee structure, you know. And if there's not gonna be a parking structure, there's not gonna be a fee structure. So, you know –

Mr. Mitchell: Or could there be a fee structure for the County to buy other lots for create parking that's not a parking structure? I don't know.

Mr. Alueta: That's – that's again, that's your – that was part of the PUMA. I believe that's still part of your PUMA study is that if there are lots to be acquired to do parking on it. Then you would prorate, again, prorate that cost to the, to any improve. It's more or less. Again, I try to work from a base, and then build from that base, and so there's has to be a basic understanding that, do you support charging people. If they come in for an approval, and they need to provide parking, that they can get a parking waiver provided they pay in to a future parking lot. And it just has to do with –. That's the basic thing, do you or do you not?

Again, some philosophy, the philosophy of the previous chair, or two prior chairs was, no, we're trying to do economic development. We want to encourage anybody, the County should pay for the parking outright, and the new business owners doesn't need to provide the parking. Whereas, you know, prior to that it was, no, they're gonna pay a pro-ratio. So at the time, based on what the parking structure was going to add, we can only charge for increase capacity. Meaning, we were increasing the capacity by about 40%. So you could only charge 40% at the time when the ordinance –. So you could only charge 40% of the stall, the cost. So that's how it, that's how it was derived and that's what the, the ordinance states.

Mr. Suzuki: My recollection of that, Joe, because, you know, that was something we talked about several years ago, and my understanding is if we left it when Corporation Counsel, James Giroux at that time, needless to say that this could be potentially an impact fee. And in order to be able to pass an impact fee, you need to have some sort of needs assessment study prepared to justify the need for the impact fee, and we haven't had that study done. So I don't know if that, you know, my recollection is correct or not.

Mr. Alueta: That is state law. State law requires that you do a needs assessment. Okay. We were going to, staff at that time, were bundling together the studies that had been done, and to call that the needs assessment. And those studies had already been – so we weren't trying to reinvent the wheel. We were just trying to say, hey, here's the studies because there's three different studies that were done. Now time has obviously passed, and those studies now become dated. And so, yeah, you're right, there needs to be a needs assessment to get one. But again, why spend the money on updating that studies if there's not a philosophical understanding that if you do a development in Wailuku and you need x amount of parking to meet your code, to meet the MRA code, you can get a waiver for the MRA provided you pay for your cash in lieu. It's basically cash in lieu for your parking. If there is not a philosophical understanding of that cash in lieu, then there's no point in doing it.

Ms. Popenuk: So – excuse me – so we're kind of digging down in on something here, I know that. So –

Mr. Alueta: He's saying I don't want to ask questions.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, but what it does tell me is this is an important topic. Is this – do we want this to be our focus? Parking? All things parking?

Mr. Fujimoto: My feeling is that if the primary function of the body is to look at approving projects in terms of our guidelines and stuff, then maybe our primary stuff should be updating our standards, you know, versus our development standards, our redevelopment plan. And I know these are listed under PUMA. And at another expense of being ignorant, what's PUMA?

Ms. Popenuk: PUMA was a – it's an acronym for a consultant. What was the –?

Mr. Mitchell: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Fujimoto: So, here it says it's for the next two years and next two to five years. I mean, we've contracted them for doing something for that long?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Ms. Popenuk: But by the way the PUMA study, I think, is on our website, if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay. Well –.

Mr. Mitchell: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, I think it's done.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay. So, I guess, you know, my, my personal feeling is that if the primary responsibility or action for this body is to approve things, then maybe we should take a look at what we need to update the plan. If we need to update codes or, you know, whatever, or procedures or review processes or, you know, whatever it is, then I think all the other stuff may fall in place after that. I mean, in terms of authority to charge for parking, or you know, that's – or you know, needs study or, you know, whatever. I mean, to me that's like basic. You know, we need to get that updated and solid, but I don't know, that's just me.

Mr. Suzuki: I agree that's something that, you know, we should look at. Did we – again my recollections – didn't we, didn't the PUMA study come up with recommendations as far as what sort of components of the plan we should be looking at to update?

Ms. Popenuk: They did have recommendations, you know, guidelines for how we should run things. Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: As far the updating of the plan?

Ms. Popenuk: They had recommendations for ideas of things that could possibly be written into the plan, yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: Then maybe that's what we should –

Ms. Popenuk: That you should charge for parking, or that, you know, things like the . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Fujimoto: Or even, or even, you know, a priority is not to lose any parking or, I mean, stuff like that, I mean, we can, you know, include all of that.

Mr. Suzuki: Maybe we should look at that. I mean, for me, you know, if the report is on the website, that's fine. But I always like to see the hard copy. I tend to come back and forth between pages. So even like on the parking plan –

Mr. Alueta: There was a parking – if you look at VPC-6, 7, and 8, basically, and then 9, develop – that was under the parking management plan that they had done, and they're working on. And I guess, part of their recommendations, you know, one of their recommendations on VPC-6 was to re-stripe the existing parking lot at, as it is.

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

Mr. Alueta: And then, you know, they were – their ma – I guess, from their management stand point, they're one of the few consultants that came out and they go. You know a lot of communities think they don't have enough parking, but in reality they just have more of a management plan. And they came back and said, you're the first community that you actually don't have enough parking. You can help alleviate part of it with a management plan, but a management plan will not solve your, your – all of your parking problems. And so they felt that a lot of things had to do with changing some of your long term parking in the municipal parking lot to two-hour parking to eliminate that, have, potentially having parking meters to help raise funds but as well as to discourage longer term parking in front, you know.

Mr. Fujimoto: And that's why, you know, I kind of feel that if we start from there, then things may kind of fall in place. And if they don't, then we can kind of be more specific into what we address.

Mr. Suzuki: I guess, so maybe, you know, each member of this body should get a hard copy of the PUMA study and the parking management plan so we can look at it and figure out, you know, how we might want to focus on that and updating the plan as far as maybe that component of the plan.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. Or, I mean, I'm not, I'm not in objection to even looking at everything. I mean, you know, like, here, it says, revamp development review process. I mean, Joe, you know, I mean, whatever we need to do to to –

Ms. Popenuk: You're looking at the total thing, right?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. Yeah. You know –

Mr. Alueta: There's this plan, which is your book plan.

Mr. Fujimoto: Right.

Mr. Alueta: And then there's, then there's a PUMA plan dealing primarily with your parking. And so I'm sorry that – I don't have a copy. I do remember it coming out. I'm not sure if it finalized and I assuming you guys got a copy at the time. So, again, I'll follow up and make sure that you guys get a hard copy of that. And then if that's the one that you want to go through, we can put it down on the next agenda, you know, re-review, review the PUMA parking.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. Well, I mean, it's not necessarily just PUMA, but the whole, the whole

thing, you know, the redevelopment plan. And I guess what I'm saying is that in the process of looking at the whole plan, and if we need to amend anything, then you know, we'll get the parking issue and we'll get the, you know, all the right-of-way issues, and, you know, all the 10-foot wide travel lanes versus the 12-foot wide travel lanes.

Mr. Suzuki: That's a good point.

Mr. Fujimoto: And, you know, that's something where we can base all of our future deliberations on.

Ms. Popenuk: You good with that Bill?

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, in fact I think that was one of – I think that was one of the action items that we had was to look at our – that was the one we had like five items.

Mr. Suzuki: Right, right, right.

Mr. Mitchell: That was one of the priorities to go back and look at our regulations and our rules to see what to be updated.

Mr. Fujimoto: So we kind of combine everything.

Ms. Popenuk: Warren, sounds good? Yeah?

Mr. Suzuki: I agree with Don. Exactly. I mean, I can see where he's coming from. If we go to the plan and we look at different components of the plan, the issues that, you know, we brought up as far as that, that, that parking lot, your improvements along, you know, Vineyard Street, are going to be part of discussion. And then from there, maybe we can come up.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, and it's not an implementation. I mean it's not like going and getting construction funds or doing design, but it's setting the guidelines which I think is totally within the purview of this body.

Mr. Alueta: It is, and again like say, like say I think Erin generates this to, . . . (inaudible) . . . report, to tell you, hey, this is where you're at on all your overall. It's kind of . . . (inaudible) . . . and then you guys are trying to focus down on what is the few. I think also one of the things that you guys had wanted to – when I hear code, like you want to update the thing, I'm thinking the small town code book. I'm not sure if you guys – I'm hoping you guys all have one when you got your binder. Do you see that as being updated? That was one of the recommendations, I believe, PUMA had was to update that code book and adopt amendments to it, to help . . . (inaudible) . . . so let's – we'll bring everything out, take a look at it again and then you guys can pick out the ones that you guys want me to focus on.

Mr. Fujimoto: In the past has there been any need, like, to give a variance, like, to our standards? I mean, our standards?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. Yeah.

Mr. Fujimoto: It's good enough or –

Mr. Suzuki: We have given variances.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah. Well, the one that just comes to mind straight away is the wood windows. We allowed people to not have wood windows.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, you know, maybe stuff like that, you know, we want to change, or, you know –. I mean, I've been here for, what, two meetings, whatever, but you know.

Mr. Mitchell: If memory serves me right, didn't Erin produce a draft of the parking, the MRA parking ordinance? We're looking at changes. And I don't think we actually formally adopted that because we just went through the –

Mr. Suzuki: We look through it, you know, we provided our comments, and I don't recall what the current status is, but, you know, exactly that came up in my mind. But, Joe, as far as on that list, I mean, it's not something that Erin generated to give to us. You know, she was directed to do that.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: And I think that might have been a Bob Horcajo thing, not so much a –

Ms. Popenuk: Well, I think Alexa spear headed this –

Mr. Suzuki: Alexa. Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: If I'm not – just to remind us what we're suppose to be aiming at as an organization.

Mr. Alueta: And this use to be – this started and I did this also as a regular basis. And John Summers. I mean, honestly John Summers was, you know, the starter – start – the first administrator for the MRA. I mean, he did this to keep everybody, hey, this is where we're at, this is what we're focused on, what we're doing. And it kind of – everybody – we sort of continued it and probably using the same database to show when it was completed. But, we'll provide you with a, you know, I guess the PUMA parking management plan. I'll dig up –. You said that Erin had drafted a proposed amendments to the small town code, through the small town parking code?

Mr. Mitchell: Parking, yes.

Mr. Alueta: It was just specifically to the parking districts?

Mr. Mitchell: I think it was parking. Yeah, it was just parking.

Mr. Alueta: Alright.

Mr. Mitchell: You know, we were reviewing it.

Mr. Alueta: Okay. I can –

Mr. Fujimoto: And I'm not, you know, I mean, maybe, maybe also if you can, if possible, if you can come up with some recommendations as to where or what things should be revised or at least reviewed in terms of –. You know, it could be a huge task, but at least that kind of focuses us on a – or maybe this should be changed or – you know what I mean?

Mr. Alueta: Yeah. No, I guess, because I haven't come to your meetings on a regular basis for several – for over a year or two.

Mr. Fujimoto: Right.

Mr. Alueta: And so I'm coming in kind of semi-cold as to what background you have. And so I don't want to over burden you as, like, well, did you guys look at this or did you guys –? I mean, I wanna make sure you guys are all on the same page as far as your fundamentals.

Mr. Fujimoto: I haven't looked in the book yet.

Mr. Alueta: Okay. So, like I say, I'm only filling in until she – well, she's already popped her baby, but I'm only filling in until she comes back. And so – but I will get on some of these and brief her on it. So what I've heard so far from my aspect before we get off the agenda here is draft an ordinance first with the authority for the MRA to control or change parking. Okay, that's one of the task.

Mr. Suzuki: No, implement parking fee.

Mr. Alueta: Right. Through either a control and charge for parking.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Alueta: Update the website. Make sure that's together. PUMA parking management plan, get copies of that to everybody and make sure, and see where it's at, at least find out where it's at. And then small town parking code update. Find out where that was in your realm as far as do you need to act on it? I mean, obviously, you need to act on it to make it official. But how far along is it? Okay.

Mr. Fujimoto: And I guess a general comment on development or design guidelines. You know, whatever the small town guidelines are, and whatever you think we should be looking at.



Mr. Alueta: Yeah. I think you – okay. This is your newest document. This has been –. This is your second document of it so this, of all of them –

Mr. Fujimoto: So what you were showing us? I mean, that other one was 12 years old.

Mr. Alueta: This is your foundation.

Mr. Fujimoto: Right. Right.

Mr. Alueta: That set out the priorities of what to do. And like I say a lot of them, that's where this list comes out. This is like – I'm just tabbing it here, and that's the blow up. And you've – a lot of the things have been completed. I don't –. I'm not sure what PUMA recommended or Erin, whether or not, this document needs to be updated or whatever.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay.

Mr. Alueta: Again, it's like, is the role – getting back to the role of the MRA – does the MRA, once it completes this document, are you done?

Mr. Fujimoto: Exactly.

Mr. Alueta: But I, I, I don't see that because, again, your primary role is to be that all encompassing Planning Commission, Urban Design, so you'll always have a role beyond, beyond the action items in here, I feel. It's just your role will be limited.

Mr. Fujimoto: So I'm not sure if the emphasis should change, you know, from action items on there, to overall BVA, Planning Commission.

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

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: And I think we'll discover that as we get into it.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. Of course.

## **G. BUDGET**

### **1. Cash-flow report**

- 2. A proposed expansion of the services contract with Teens on Call to increase in the number of garbage collection dates for the trash receptacles on Main Street. (For Discussion only. No action)**

Ms. Popenuk: Okay, very good. Thank you everybody, that was a great discussion. Our next item, a proposed expansion of services, of the services contracted with Teens On Call to increase the number of garbage collection dates for the trash receptacles on Main Street. So – Oh, I hopped right over that, I'm sorry. Thank you. Budget.

Mr. Alueta: Is there testimony on it?

Mr. Suzuki: No, we don't have it.

Mr. Mitchell: No, we don't have it.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, we will be skipping over that. Let's see. So back to Teens On Call. There was some complaints about stinky garbage cans, so we have, are entertaining the idea of having Teens On Call pick up the trash more often than they current do.

And then my own comment which is we're not sure that perhaps maybe some of the business owners on the street are using these trash cans as their own personal trash disposal and I'm not sure what we can do about that.

Mr. Alueta: You know I – I'm a business owner on Market Street because I own Request Music, and I got a letter and saying that I put –. And I'm like, no we're not. So I don't know how they're – but I was going to talk to Brian, but it's like –

Mr. Mitchell: Who sent you a letter?

Mr. Alueta: I'm assuming it came from Brian saying you've been noticed that you've been putting trash. But I'm, like, no, I, I take all trash home and I go to the dump on Saturdays, so. I mean, I haul all out of our bags of trash, but, you know, there are a lot of people because part of the whole process of revitalizing Wailuku is you have more people coming. And people buy stuff out of the store and they take out their wrap and they will throw it in. But a lot of it is, you know, they're walking down from, they've got food from either Gianatto's or wherever, McDonald's. I mean, they're eating it, and then they're throwing it away. And, you know, employees eat their lunch from a take out place and they will sometimes will throw it in. I mean, I see it all the time. I see guys walking out of the office buildings, and that's part of the reason it stinks. They're not throwing it in their own trash. I can see that. But I don't know how you stop that. It's not like we're getting, you know, somebody taking a box and unwrapping all their materials, and instead of taking to the recycling, they throw it in the thing. No, I don't – I've never seen any of the other businesses do that. It's mostly food.

Mr. Suzuki: Can I ask a question of Joe? For me, you know, as the MRA member, the comment you made about receiving a letter, for me, I'd like to know who issued the letter because I don't know if it's within the jurisdiction of Teens On Call to be issuing a letter. I mean, you know, we have a contract with Teens On Call to go out there and remove the trash from the trash cans. But, with that contract, I don't know if it gives them the authority to issue letters. So if the letter came from the MRA, you know, then, you know, quite possibly, you know, it sits

okay with me. But for it to come from an organization that we contract to pick up the trash, to me, would be inappropriate. So I don't know. I mean, I'm not trying to pass blame, Joe, but I think it's important to make sure that, you know, proper, you know, procedures are followed. So, as a business owner, I'd be upset if someone had sent me a letter and you weren't doing anything and accusing you. Basically, you've been accused of something that you're not doing.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah, and it's more, I understand they're – I understand what they're doing. And I think also the MRA should be concerned that, you know, hey, we're paying for the trash pick up along that street, outside of the normal. Okay. It's a contract. I mean, it's govern money being used and you don't want to be the trash receptacles being used a commercial waste dump. That's totally, I think –. And I think that's where Teens On Call is coming from is that, hey, you can't – don't use the public facilities as your commercial recycle or commercial trash area, and I understand that. And I obviously have not seen that because I do –. I mean, there's a lot of people walking. I mean, I don't know if you guys noticed, Market Street is busier and there's a lot –. But it is coming from just a regular citizen. You've got state and county employees, and people coming off to work, and they're all, during their lunch hour. And they go down and get some lunch, and they eat it, and then a lot of time they'll throw it in the trash can. I think that a – it's a – I do wish we had recycling bins on that street. People come in and they give me their can, and we put it in our recycling. In our store, we have a recycling container. But –.

Or the bums. What I don't like and Brian sees it all the time. The bums will come and take the lids off and dig through the trash and make a mess. Some of them are pretty good and they'll dig through it and get the cans out. So, I think it's just a matter of like as the Market Street gets busier especially coming the holiday seasons, we just gotta have a little bit more trash pick ups.

Mr. Suzuki: So what is the contract right now? You know, how many times are they contracted to remove the –?

Ms. Popenuk: Probably once a month.

Mr. Alueta: No, no, no. It's definitely a lot more. Brian just left.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, he left so –

Mr. Alueta: I, I – it's gotta be at least once a week. I do know I see them at least that.

Mr. Fujimoto: They're not on call?

Mr. Alueta: If it's overflowing, I have called Brian. Either Erin has called Brian. You know, it's kind of dual function. Me and Erin both we walk down to Market Street and we see what's going on. If it's overflowing, we're gonna call Brian, and hey, he'll make a special trip to come and empty the trash cans. And you kind of know where the more trash cans that are full. The ones on the corner when people are walking down Main Street, you know, they're either coming up from Subway or from Minit Stop and they're throwing their trash. They're done eating it, and

they're throwing it in the trash can, or coming down, and the same thing, so.

Mr. Suzuki: Now in line with that, my recollection is that at one time we had a discussion about the possibility of putting out an RFP for a part-time contract body and I don't know if my recollection is that Michele was going to follow up on something in that language, but -. I haven't attended all the meeting, so have they come back to the body?

Ms. Popenuk: Are you talking about the clean and safe person?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. That's my recollection too. They were going to put together an RFP for this clean and safe person.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah because I don't see it as being, you know, Joe's responsibility, Erin's responsibility to be walking the street to decide you know, who, you know, whether or not the trash cans need to be cleaned or not. But I can see where this clean and safe person would be so, you know -

Mr. Alueta: I'm sorry, since I haven't been here. What was the clean and safe person suppose to do?

Mr. Suzuki: No, it was going to be, we as the MRA was going to contract with a consultant and described as a clean and safe coordinator and they will be retained on a part-time basis. And the scope of work was defined and we were going to put out an RFP for that service. And we had looked at a draft language, and we had kind of provide our input as far as, you know, potential revisions or add ons and all that. And that language was going to come back to us for our approval. But, and again, I haven't come to all of the meetings, a lot of the meetings, so I don't know, you know, if it ever came back to the body for the body to say, okay, this is what we agree on, you know, let's go ahead and issue the RFP.

Ms. Popenuk: I think maybe it was going to come back to us at our last meeting perhaps.

Mr. Alueta: I'll follow up with Michele.

Mr. Suzuki: But, you know, that - I mean, that could be in line with, you know, this issue as far as the trash removal.

Mr. Alueta: I'm - I mean, you guys would know better than me because I haven't been following up on it. His scope of contract is still just trash. It did not - you guys did not get into the cleaning of the gutters and - because I think that was part of the clean and safe. Was that part of the clean and safe RFP, cleaning out some of the -?

Mr. Suzuki: We took - the cleaning of the gutters, you know, Erin coordinated with Public Works, so they had a blow out of the gutters and all that.

Mr. Alueta: Oh, okay. Good, good, good.

Mr. Suzuki: But as far as they said they were – they were willing to do it that one particular time, and beyond that, you know, they wouldn't do it, you know, any more as part of their responsibilities. So again this is where, you know, we could rely on the clean and safe coordinator to look at it, and come back and say if it's something that needs to be done, you know, we could allocate that, that from our budget for that work to be done.

Mr. Fujimoto: And the safe side, I guess, would be trying to stop the guys from pan handling.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Mr. Alueta: Okay.

Mr. Fujimoto: You know, stuffs like that, so that's the two that I remember.

Mr. Alueta: Alright. I'll follow up on what the RFP . . . (inaudible) . . . I think that – I mean, I do know we've had discussions on it with Erin as far as, like, the cleaning of the gutters or even having, you know, Brian do it, or somebody do it. I also thought that there was a discussion on having, at one point, they was talking about having another contractor do the pick up other than Brian, than Teens On Call. And that was – I mean, but –. I know that we had gotten quotes on it, but I guess we stayed with status quo which is fine. Yeah, it's –. But, yeah, it's interesting, but you noticed that how having somebody pick up the trash, realize how much trash is generated. But also how much better the place looks compared to when you didn't have the trash cans. I mean that's – if we didn't have trash cans, they'd be all over the place. I mean, honestly, it was in the vacant lot between next to Request and Mr. Starr's building. It was in between –

Mr. Mitchell: Was it?

Mr. Alueta: It was –

Mr. Mitchell: Because some of the Market Street retailers feel like that there was no trash before those trash cans were there. I couldn't imagine where the trash went before the trash cans were there.

Mr. Alueta: Oh, it was – the trash was under buildings. It was in corners of every –

Mr. Mitchell: Well, you'd know. You'd know. . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Alueta: You just kind of have blinders. I think just people have blinders on to where the trash was. I mean, it was always like blown out. It would blow, and it would just blow down the road or blow wherever. It would gather all over the place. I mean it's kind of like people forget about –. They complain about the bottle bill, or the bag bill. But do you guys remember how many cans and bottles or how many plastic bags were blowing around this island? I mean, it's,

this is kind of the same thing.

Ms. Popenuk: I have a question. Are the trash cans, do the tops lock on them?

Mr. Mitchell: No.

Mr. Alueta: No.

Ms. Popenuk: Is there anyway to do that? Do we want to do that to keep from forging . . . (inaudible). . . ?

Mr. Mitchell: One of the complaints I heard was not only trash are filled, but they're kind of gross on the outside. They don't get wiped down. They've got, you know, stuff. And I went by a couple, or last Tuesday, and yeah they were – Tuesday morning by 8:30, they were all filled, all overflowing. I mean, I don't know what day they picked up.

Ms. Popenuk: My next question is can we do recycling? Recycling receptacles?

Mr. Alueta: There was a – I believe that Brian opposed it because he felt that you're only get the trash in, trash in the receptacles regardless of whether you have it separated.

Mr. Mitchell: You've got to sort them.

Mr. Alueta: Sort them. So the board at that time chose not to go through the extent of having a trash thing. You know, again, it was a decision. I thought at least have something so, you know, even if you have to pull it out. I think that you do need to amend the contract to potentially include hosing down the areas after a while because they do get – they rip the bag. I mean, you got to understand, Brian is doing a great job. They've been doing it. But they are teens. They are kids. So some of the kids are little better than others. Some of them drag the bag across and rip it, and it's dripping all kinds of stuff along the sidewalk, and you gotta go out and clean it. It's just that, you know, you almost have to have a sidewalk cleaner, I mean, at this rate in time, if you want it to look nice. If you want to maintain it, I mean, it's one of those things. Right now we rely on the rain. But, you know, it's – I don't want – I mean, I hate to say this, but we're gonna sort of come into this, are you a mini Public Works?

Mr. Mitchell: Right. And we've adopted it because Parks Department just doesn't do it.

Mr. Alueta: Correct. It's better than –

Mr. Mitchell: Right. It's just not getting done, so maybe we look at having the street and the things power washed once a month or something. I don't know, hose it down.

Mr. Alueta: Twice a year. Twice a year.

Mr. Mitchell: Twice a year.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah. I had a general question which is why are we paying to do this?

Mr. Suzuki: Exactly.

Ms. Popenuk: Is there someone else –

Mr. Mitchell: Because nobody else would do it.

Ms. Popenuk: – should be doing this?

Mr. Alueta: And again, I think I reiterated it earlier was that it was a contract for Teens On Call to do the trash, but it was under the Parks Department. So basically the money that was allocated for that was put into your budget. So that's why your budget got grew. Okay? And so it –

Mr. Suzuki: But it since –

Mr. Alueta: Well, you know, the history of – MRA's budget was like probably 16,000, 20,000 at one point. And it just, it wasn't very much. And then it grew when you basically hired a separate coordinator, the MRA coordinator, had office supplies and had your whole –

Mr. Mitchell: Back in the day.

Mr. Alueta: Back in the day with the . . . (inaudible) . . . And then it shrunk proportionally when you no longer had a coordinator. But it did not shrink all the way. Your budget maintained a certain level when you had –. Because, one, you had the contract with Teens On Call, and that was –. And I don't think Council has any objections to that. I think they see that as a benefit to the community and to the area. Your, your budget grew or got added too when you had legitimate contracts for a certain consulting firm. And that's where you need to again, when come budget time, pick a project. You want to hire a consultant to do this study, to do that, to come up with a design plan for Vineyard. You put it in, you tell Council, I want that, we lobby for it, we send a letter up. We normally would get it. I mean, it's normally, something, as long as it's justifiable, and we have deliverables. We actually show. I mean, this board gets contracts, they deliver a product from their consultant.

Ms. Popenuk: So back to our initial question. Do we want to have – do we want to pay Teens On Call to pick up the trash more often than they do now?

Mr. Suzuki: We don't know what the situation is to be able to make a decision.

Ms. Popenuk: We do know that it needs to be picked up more often than it does currently.

Mr. Suzuki: But I guess my question is, are they doing what they're suppose to be doing to begin with? I mean, I don't know. I don't have the contract in front of us. And to say that we want to increase it when they could potentially not be doing what they're suppose to be doing,

to me, wouldn't be responsible. So, I think it's important to know what the, you know, what the contract or requirements are.

Ms. Popenuk: So, this opens up a can of worms, like, in terms of how do we check up on people?

Mr. Mitchell: Can, can some – is that something that Joe can get the contract and communicate to us and let us know so we can – the Planning Department can take action on it before the next meeting?

Ms. Popenuk: Who's going to verify that they're actually living up to their existing contract?

Mr. Suzuki: Exactly.

Mr. Mitchell: That's the question. Yeah, once a week, or is it twice a week?

Ms. Richelle Thomson: You could ask the Teens On Call person to come and speak to you guys.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: Well, he was here, but he left.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah. I think we can, one, we can pull the contract out and find out how many times it's happening. But I think, it's like, is it an ongoing issue where you have – or is it seasonal? You know, is it a seasonal thing or is it like, to keep it going? So let me, let's start with the contract. I think, you know, Mr. Suzuki has a good point, it's like, what is it now? I think obviously whatever it is now, we're seeing trash fill up. But is that a seasonal occurrence? But regardless, maybe we do need to increase it from what it is now. But let's find out how much that's going to cost us and see whether or not your budget allows for that expansion. But I'll – I know that Erin looked at it but she didn't relay anything to me as far as that though. And I'll look into it.

Ms. Popenuk: And then the next question that I have is do we want to expand their responsibilities, for instance, to clean the sidewalk or blast out the gutters or anything else?

Mr. Mitchell: I don't know if they have the capabilities.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah. That's – I think the last time it wasn't Teens. The last time we had the sidewalk cleaned it was not Teens On Call. It was a separate contract.

Mr. Mitchell: . . .(inaudible) . . .

Mr. Alueta: And I do know that we did have it done.



Mr. Suzuki: The power wash?

Mr. Alueta: Yeah, there was a power wash. I don't know if you recall it. There was a power wash going up and down. It started at one end of the town and went to the other end.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, we won't meet again until what, December what.

Mr. Alueta: December 28<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Mitchell: Is that between Christmas and New Year, right?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. I'm not here.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, with Christmas, presumably high season, best time to put our best foot forward. I don't know, is it possible to have somebody out there to power wash that thing between now or after Thanksgiving? Do we have to do that, or is that something that we can ask the Planning Department to do?

Mr. Alueta: I would recommend –. I'm going to look at my Corp Counsel whether or not they can – I would recommend you make a motion to have the Planning Department look at it, and contract to go out, but –

Mr. Suzuki: Agenda says "no action."

Mr. Alueta: Yeah, I know, that's my problem. So I'm looking at my agenda, and I'm going, looking at my attorney here.

Ms. Thomson: Yeah, if it's a – even if it's non action item, if it's kind of within the scope of what's listed on the agenda, you can, you know, take the, at least that kind of action on it.

Mr. Alueta: But, can they, so can they authorize the Planning Department to solicit and contract out, if it's less than the, you know, the, whatever that is? There's a budget, there's a minimum that we don't have to go to get three bids? Less than a 1,000?

Ms. Thomson: I don't know what the procurement threshold is.

Mr. Alueta: Okay. Something that does not require, if we can get it for that amount, do it less than a year.

Ms. Thomson: Would it be an expenditure of First Friday or would it be a Planning Department expenditure?

Mr. Suzuki: This body.

Mr. Alueta: This body. I believe, this body.

Ms. Thomson: This body? You know, I think that you might want to take a vote to amend the agenda to add that item. And you can add an item to the agenda if it, it doesn't affect a significant number of people, and if it's kind of a minor item, I would say this qualifies. So you need a two-thirds vote to amend your agenda.

Mr. Suzuki: We have. I move to amend the agenda to include the item, or the item as far as authorizing Planning Department to look at the cost of, you know, power washing the sidewalks and to authorize that work if it falls below, you know, what is required as far as procurement, by procurement laws.

Mr. Mitchell: Second.

Ms. Popenuk: All in favor?

**It was moved by Mr. Warren Suzuki, seconded by Mr. William Mitchell, then unanimously**

**VOTED: to amend the agenda to include the item as discussed.**  
**(Assenting: D. Fujimoto, W. Mitchell, K. Popenuk, W. Suzuki**  
**Excused: M. Walker)**

Ms. Popenuk: Aye. So passed.

Mr. Alueta: So now they've added, now they –

Ms. Thomson: Right, now you added it. Now you have to actually make a motion and, and then –

Mr. Suzuki: I so move as far as on that particular item.

Mr. Mitchell: Second.

Ms. Popenuk: All in favor?

**It was moved by Mr. Warren Suzuki, seconded by Mr. William Mitchell, then unanimously**

**VOTED: to authorize the Planning Department to look at the cost of**  
**power washing the sidewalks, and to authorize that work, if**  
**it falls below, as required, by procurement laws.**  
**(Assenting: D. Fujimoto, W. Mitchell, K. Popenuk, W. Suzuki**  
**Excused: M. Walker)**

Ms. Popenuk: Aye. So passed.

Mr. Suzuki: Can I ask a question too, having said that? You know, a lot of activity that occurs

as far as on Market Street, and the primary beneficiary is First Friday. And I don't know who oversees First Friday, you know, where they get the funding, and you know, we provide police services and all that. But, you know, my feeling is that, it should potentially be part of First Friday's responsibility to at least once a year or so, you know, clean the sidewalks.

Mr. Alueta: That is a good point. But they do the, they do the trash pick up. Teens On Call is there to clean up all of them. Because obviously the cans get filled. So he empties them before First Friday and empties them at the end of First Friday.

Mr. Suzuki: But shouldn't First Friday assume some fo that responsibility?

Mr. Alueta: I'm, I'm going to assume something but, that they are actually paying him to handle that. But I will double check on whether or not they are contracted or not. And again, this is another point where I talk about leveraging your power and your cooperation with other agencies. Again, the Maui, the Economic Development is, I believe, the primary driver and funder them for the First Friday. We need to work, try or encourage work them through the Mayor's Office and through that office to get them to help fund it. So maybe just sending them a note, hey, you know, we'd like to see more trash pick up, not just on the First Friday, can you help us out. Or have them take it over.

Mr. Suzuki: Can we –? I'm not going to be here for the December meeting, but can we request – I mean, you folks can bring it up with them – request that maybe a representative from Economic Development and Yuki Lei Sugimura attend the next meeting so some discussion can be had relative to, you know, trash pick up and cleaning of the sidewalks. You know, shared responsibility between First Friday and MRA, and not being the sole responsibility of MRA?

Ms. Popenuk: And also security.

Mr. Suzuki: We do that. . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah. We have – we gave them a partial and maybe that's something that we also want to explore with them is Economic Development taking over a portion of that responsibility.

Mr. Suzuki: That's fine. That's fine. You know, because I think that, you know, as the MRA body, you know, our responsibility is with all of the stakeholders within the MRA area, and not just with the stakeholder along Market Street.

## **H. OPEN PROJECTS LIST**

Ms. Popenuk: Okay. Great. Thank you. We have item (H), open project's list, which is the Open PD Projects by TMK report which you all have. Apparently there's some confusion as what this means as an agenda item, as we heard it earlier today. Open's project list. Is there

any way to write that that's more descriptive so that members of the public aren't confused?

Mr. Alueta: Uhm.

Mr. Fujimoto: Or is that a concern, Corp Counsel?

Ms. Thomson: It could be a little bit confusing if you're talking about MRA project specifically, like, you know, going through the big task list like you did earlier. Somebody could think it was that, or they could think it's permit request. These look more like open permits.

Mr. Alueta: Yes.

Mr. Suzuki: But this is how it's always been.

Mr. Alueta: Maybe we can just say, I guess, yeah, maybe just (H) could be redescribed to say open –

Mr. Fujimoto: Permits.

Mr. Alueta: – permits. Yeah, open permits before the MRA. Or before the – yeah. Or within the MRA, I should say. Open permits within the MRA. Because they're not necessarily permits that are coming before you. They're just the ones that we're working on. It may come before you, but it's within the MRA. So open projects within the MRA list.

Mr. Fujimoto: Open permits within the MRA.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah because it's – because we do have an identifying MRA permit number.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah. And these are permits that people – are letters or requests that people are asking for approval. Either administrative approval or an approval that will eventually come before the MRA.

## **I. NEXT MEETING DATE: December 28, 2012**

Ms. Popenuk: Alright. Before we close the meeting, I wanted to ask if there are any agenda items that the people want to see on our next agenda. Joe, can you kind of review what you think we're gonna have on our next agenda?

Mr. Alueta: I will follow up on the clean and safe RFP, you know an update where that is. I'll just put update. I will update you on whether or not power washing. And let's see. I will update –

on a PUMA parking management, I'll distribute that at least in the PUMA parking management plan. Find out where that is or what the status is.

Mr. Suzuki: And I think there should be a notation for discussion on that particular item. You know, whether or not there's any discussion or not, you know, I don't know, but at least to have it on the agenda as a discussion item.

Mr. Alueta: Anything else? I have, as far as my notes for me to discuss with Erin, and you know, our office, I have, again, draft ordinance for the authority of the MRA to get your own parking. I obviously will not be able to get that done before the next meeting. And then I have small town parking code update. Was there an understanding that there was one that was done already, and I should follow up with her?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: There's a draft. She prepared a draft and we went through it.

Mr. Alueta: Okay. I will follow up on that too, and we can have that as an agenda item. I mean, more for updating of the –

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, because I don't think we can take action on it until a formal public hearing.

Mr. Alueta: Correct.

Mr. Fujimoto: Teens On Call contract.

Mr. Alueta: You still, you still want that on? Oh, yeah, update on what it is.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, what it is.

Mr. Alueta: Okay, I'll put that down.

Ms. Thomson: And then it looks like that Mark Walker item on tax increment financing, as E1, guess we put it back on the next agenda.

Mr. Alueta: Oh, okay.

Ms. Thomson: And then I had invite an OED representative and somebody from First Friday, Yuki Lei Sugimura, to the next one or some other meeting.

Ms. Popenuk: In addition to looking at the PUMA, do we want to look at the Redevelopment Plan, which we've sort of identified that as the focus, our focus? Are we ready to start?

Mr. Fujimoto: Well, I thought. . . (inaudible) . . . Joe would have head start for our review to see if anything needs to be updated.

Ms. Thomson: Get that done before Christmas.

Mr. Fujimoto: And that's why, I mean, you know, it may not be an item for next month.

Mr. Alueta: I'm hoping Erin will be back by then.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah.

Mr. Alueta: Yeah, let me just fully get all of this stuff that you guys have. I mean, we can at least, you know, again, it will be more of a revised of what – not revised – but refresher for everyone as to where we stand on a lot of these projects. I think you had a lot of projects going on, and then now, let's bring it back to the board where you, where you add on the projects and where you want to continue on it. And then, you know, at that December meeting, you can kind of set the focus on what's going to happen for the following year as far as how are we gonna take on an update?

Mr. Fujimoto: If it's completed, I think we should take it off.

Mr. Alueta: Oh, yeah, get it scheduled in one of your early meetings to get it adopted or say –

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, or whatever it is.

Mr. Alueta: Okay. I think inviting OED is something . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Popenuk: Okay, anything else? Alright then, meeting is adjourned at 3:19. Thank you very much.

## **J. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

**RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

**Members Present:**

Katharine Popenuk, Chair  
William Mitchell, Vice-Chair  
Don Fujimoto  
Warren Suzuki

**Members Excused:**

Mark Walker

**Others:**

Michele Chouteau McLean, Deputy Planning Director  
Joseph Alueta, Administrative Planning Officer  
Richelle Thomson, Deputy Corporation Counsel