

**LANAI PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
APRIL 16, 2014**

**APPROVED 06-18-2014**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Lana'i Planning Commission (Commission) was called to order by Chair John Ornellas at approximately 5:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 16, 2014, in the Lana'i Senior Center, Lana'i City, Hawaii.

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

**B. ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE 2014-2015 COMMISSION YEAR**

- 1. Chairperson**
- 2. Vice-Chairperson**

Mr. John Ornellas: The first up is the election for officers for the 2014-2015 commission year. I'd like to open up the floor for motions for Chair. Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Joelle Aoki: I nominate John Ornellas for Chair.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Thank you. Anybody else? Okay, so let's -- We have to do -- Can I get a second?

Mr. Stuart Marlowe: Second.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Thank you. Do we need a -- Leilani, can you turn this down a little bit? I'm loud, but I'm not that loud. It's like Ron calling a kettle black. Try it. Test, test. Is that okay guys? Alright. Thank you. Alright, we have a second. Any discussion? All in favor say aye. Alright. All against? You got that Leilani? Bev. Alright, so I'm going to open up to nominations for Vice-Chair. Can I have a motion?

**It was moved by Commissioner Joelle Aoki, seconded by Commissioner Stuart Marlowe, then**

**VOTED: Commissioner John Ornellas as Chairperson for the 2014-2015 Commission year.**

**(Assenting: J. Aoki, K. Gima, S. Koanui Nefalar, S. Marlowe, B. Oshiro**

**Dissenting: B. Zigmond**

**Excused: S. Barfield)**

Ms. Beverly Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: I nominate Stacie.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Do I have second? Or do I have anymore nominations?

Ms. Kelli Gima: I second the nomination for Stacie.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Any more nominations for Vice-Chair? Hearing none. All in favor? Or is there any discussion for Stacie? And she's done a great job this last year. How's that? So all in favor of Stacie being our Vice-Chair say aye. All against? Unanimous.

**It was moved by Commissioner Beverly Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Kelli Gima, then unanimously**

**VOTED: Commissioner Stacie Koanui Nefalar as Vice-Chairperson for the 2014-2015 Commission year.**

**(Assenting: J. Aoki, K. Gima, S. Marlowe, B. Oshiro, B. Zigmond**

**Excused: S. Barfield)**

**C. PUBLIC TESTIMONY - At the discretion of the Chair, public testimony may also be taken when each agenda item is discussed, except for contested cases under Chapter 91, HRS. Individuals who cannot be present when the agenda item is discussed may testify at the beginning of the meeting instead and will not be allowed to testify again when the agenda item is discussed unless new or additional information will be offered.**

Mr. Ornellas: I'll open it up for public testimony considering any discussion about what we just did. Anybody have any objections, additions, as far as Chair/Vice-Chair? Seeing none, we'll move on.

Mr. Clayton Yoshida: I think the public testimony is for those people who cannot stay when the agenda item comes up because they have other appointments.

Mr. Ornellas: Alrighty. So is there anyone who would like to testify on behalf of what's listed on the agenda for tonight? You'll do it now? Okay. Please come forward. Have a seat and then we'll get you a mic. We'll get you a mic. Please –. Okay, alright, so just tell us who you and who you represent if you represent anybody.

Mr. Fairfax "Pat" Reilly: Aloha. Thank you. Thank everybody for coming – Planning staff . . . (inaudible) . . . Well my name is Pat Reilly. I'm a resident, 35 years. I wanted to testify on E1, desalination agenda. I had some questions and I just got the packet. First I, I would like a clarification and you don't have to answer me as I ask the questions, but hopefully it gets clarified. The procedure – is this the final, the number of days that the Planning Commission has to consider this item? Is this the final decision or does it move to another body subsequent to the Planning Commission's recommendation or decision? So those are two questions. And the time line, if there's a second body, what would be the time line on that?

Really the Planning Commission's probably your control is in the special conditions, project

specific special conditions. And if you look at those conditions at the very end of the packet, I had some items that I'd like to see under the special conditions. I guess the third question, I don't see anything about an EIS here. Now that may come later. Maybe they don't get the permit. Maybe get the permit first before you do the EIS. But if there are certain – to me, if there were certain issues that we wouldn't know about we're not going to learn those just by having a discussion. We need some EIS. So that's a question. That would be something I would put in the project specific conditions.

Lastly, one of the questions I had was about where effluent was going to be stored, and I see there are going to be ponds or something created above those homes. I'm worried about that. As you know, what we've seen on Kauai, and I'm sure Lynn's been familiar with those issues is that we want to be sure that if there's any effluent stored uphill it doesn't go down hill. And one clear one I would put in, and, and for those old guys like me, one of the issues in the Manele golf course was trying to protect the class AA waters of the ocean. And that emerged in the Land Use Commission specifics that we would ensure that those class AA waters are protected no matter what. I would like to see some kind of a trial. I don't think we have any clue how the aquifer will be impacted by these. I would like to see a trial module. If that delays the project – and I'm – you know I'm . . . (inaudible) . . . tonight, but it's out of maybe over cautious having some experience, seeing some other projects on the island and it's not a disrespect for the corporation or for the IDE. It's just, man, we only have one shot at this baby, and, and let's do it right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Pat. Members, anybody have any questions for Pat?

Mr. Yoshida: Clayton Yoshida with the Planning Department. Regarding the decision tonight there are two permit applications, the State Special Use Permit which covers an area less than 15 acres. The Lana'i Planning Commission is the authority. They'll make the final decision. There's a Phase Two Project District approval request. The Lana'i Planning Commission is the final authority. So both decisions on the permits tonight will be made by the Lana'i Planning Commission as the final authority.

Relative to the preparation of EA/EIS, we found no trigger under the State Law Chapter 343 for the preparation of an EA or EIS. However, the application has been scrutinized, sent to many agencies, and their responses are included in the report relative to this project.

Mr. Ornellas: Pat, did that –?

Mr. Reilly: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else would like to testify early before we get started here? Yes, sir, Simon.

Mr. Simon Tajiri: Hello. I'm Simon Tajiri. I guess I had two questions and it's both about the intake and the out take so –. I'm, I'm really naive to this. I'm not an engineer. I'm not really good at math, so my understanding of it is pretty simple. But it sounds like a lot of water that's

being moved. I was told by Mr. Chun that the silver tank is about a half million gallons, so 20 silver tanks will be 10 million gallons. If that's what's being move a day I'm curious about what, what the impacts will be, the long term impacts. If we're doing 10 million of fresh gallon – 10 million fresh – 10 million gallons of fresh water that means we're taking out, like, 20 million gallons of sea water. And I just imagine, you know, the straw is sucking up all this water and there's this, there's this gap left underneath. And I'm, you know, curious, how long does it take the sea water outside to filter through the island to fill that gap? Is it possible that the fresh water that's floating on top is, is going to sink down or that there will be a mixture contaminating both.

My question regarding the output is kind of similar. As the salt is seeping back into the island in going out, is it possible that the salt will built up and get stuck underneath? Like, because it's really dense, and if it takes a long time for salt water to filter through, come in, you know, how long will it take to go out? Will it go out fast enough that it doesn't build up and again contaminate the fresh water we have above?

And it, you know, it sounds like this is fairly new technology. And if we're talking about real sustainability it would be, it would be really neat if we can look ahead more than just 10 years, more than just 50 years, but see what the long term effects of this project will be on the island. So even with a quick test in the beginning I would feel safer if there was an ongoing process to keep checking not only the quality of the water that's coming out, but what's happening under the ground where we can't see. And what's happening in the deep water, the ocean, where we can't see again because to me everything is connected. The health of the deep ocean is also the health of the reef. The health of what's underneath the ground eventually it affects what's on top. So, yeah, I just ask that we move carefully, and that if we make mistakes, we – they're mistakes that we can fix and that we have a way of knowing when we're making mistakes and that we consider the long-term impact over, over generations. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Simon. Okay, anyone else? We're going to come –. I mean, we're going to have more opportunities as, as we go through this tonight for you to weigh in so –. So we're going to go to approval of the minutes, the December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013 as it was circulated back in February. We have any...we any motions to accept the minutes of February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014? I'm sorry, yeah, December 18, 2013. Somebody gonna make a motion to accept?

**D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2013 MEETING (Previously circulated with February 19, 2014 agenda packet. Members, please bring your copy to the meeting.)**

Ms. Gima: I'll make the motion to accept the minutes from the December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Second? Anybody going to second it? Second by Stuart Marlowe. Any discussions? Any changes or –? Hearing none, all in favor to accept say aye? Against? Accepted.

**It was moved by Commissioner Kelli Gima, seconded by Commissioner Stuart Marlowe, then unanimously**

**VOTED: to approve the December 18, 2014 Lana'i Planning Commission meeting minutes.**

**(Assenting: J. Aoki, K. Gima, S. Koanui Nefalar, S. Marlowe, B. Oshiro, B. Zigmund**

**Excused: S. Barfield)**

**E. PUBLIC HEARING (Action to be taken after public hearing.)**

- 1. PULAMA LANA'i requesting a State Land Use Commission Special Use Permit and a Phase II Project District Approval for the Reverse Osmosis Desalination Facility and Distribution System including the development of reverse osmosis desalination plant facility, administration building, water generation facility, and related improvements within the Manele Project District at TMK: 4-9-002: 001 (por.), 4-9-017: 009 (por.) and 010 (por.), Manele, Island of Lana'i. (SUP2 2013/0028) (PH2 2013/0001) (B. Sticka)**

- a. Public Hearing**
- b. Action**

Mr. Ornellas: So we're gonna go to the next item which is E1. *(Chair John Ornellas read the above project description into the record.)* I don't want to go into the TMK but . . . Ben?

Mr. Ben Sticka: Good afternoon Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. My name is Ben Sticka. I'm with the Planning Department. To get started this evening, the item before you is a request from Munekiyo & Hiraga on behalf of Pulama Lana'i, requesting a State Land Use Commission Special Use Permit and Project District Phase Two Approval for a proposed Reverse Osmosis (RO) system located in the Manele Project District.

The applications comply with the applicable standards for a State Land Use Commission Special Use Permit and Project District Phase Two Approval pursuant Title 19.45 Project District Regulations, Maui County Code 19.80, as amended, and Chapter 205-6 Hawaii Revised Statutes, Title 15 Department of Business Economic Development and Tourism, Subtitle 3 State Land Use Commission, Chapter 15 Land Use Commission Rules, SubChapter 12 Special Permits, 15-15-95 and 96 Hawaii Administrative Rules regarding Land Use Commission Special Use Permits.

The State Land Use District on this parcel is urban, agriculture, and rural. The Lana'i Community Plan is Project District, and the County zoning is Lana'i PD1, Manele Golf Course, and Lana'i PD1, Manele Residential. The proposed action includes the construction of a

Reverse Osmosis Desalination plant facility, administration building, water tanks, power generator facility, and related improvements. The applicant indicates that the facility will be located on approximately 14.95 acres of land located within the Manele Project District.

The proposed project is in conformance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Hawaii State Plan. It will provide additional opportunities for both employment and economic growth. The subject project is within the agricultural district, designation as established by the Land Use Commission HRS Chapter 205. The uses determined to be an unusual and reasonable use and therefore is in compliance with HRS 205. Regarding the Land Use Commission Special Use Permit, the proposed facility is not an outright permitted use in the state agricultural district as set forth in Section 205-2, and Section 205.4.5 of Chapter 205, Hawaii Revised Statutes relating to Land Use Commission. However, the proposed facility is located in the State Agricultural District and may be reviewed and processed as a Special Use Permit, as a special use pursuant to Section 205-6 of Chapter 205, Hawaii Revised Statutes. In particular, Section 205.6 provides that subject to this section the County Planning Commission may permit certain unusual and reasonable uses within the agricultural and rural districts other than those for which the district is classified. Accordingly a State Special Use Permit application was or is being submitted to the Lana'i Planning Commission for review and approval. The proposed action is in keeping with the Countywide Policy Plan goals, objectives and policies. The project site is designated again as agricultural within the Manele Project District One by the Community Plan. The proposed project is in compliance with these Community Plan Use designations.

Regarding the Project District Phase Two, parcel 9 and 10 are a part of the Lana'i Project District One Manele. Improvements proposed to be implemented within the proposed, within the proposed project district include the RO well number three, as well as sections of the water treatment facility transmission lines. Additionally the access road improvements fall within both parcel 9 and parcel 10. In this regard these project components are subject to Project District Phase Two approval pursuant to Chapter 19.45 of the Maui County Code relating to Project District processing regulations. The proposed RO well number three, transmission lines and access roads are located in the Project District, are considered uses according to Maui County Code Section 19.04.04, which defines accessory uses as follows. Accessory uses means a use of land or a building or a portion thereof which is customarily incidental and subordinate to the principal use of a land or building and located on the same lot as the principal use. As such pursuant to the Maui County Code, Chapter 19.45.050B, Project District Phase Two, the application is before you. The approving authority as previously indicated for the Project District Phase Two is this Commission. The project also complies with applicable zoning. The reverse osmosis well number three and portions of the water and utilities lines and access roads as stated before will be on parcel 9 and parcel 10 which are located within the boundary of the Lana'i Project District One Manele. In this regard the proposed project is subject to Project District Phase Two approval by the Commission. Regarding the agricultural lands, the project is located on lands designated as unclassified. The land stand bureau productivity rating on this land is indicated as E. Therefore the low ranking of productivity indicates that the proposed project will not detract from the island's inventory of agricultural lands, and will not present any adverse effects on agricultural production. There is no evidence that any adverse impacts to archaeological resources. Additionally best management practices utilizing mitigation measures

will be implemented for the proposed project. Potential noise impacts will be mitigated with noise dampers. Air quality impacts will be mitigated by utilizing filtration equipment and the facility will meet all air quality standards established by the EPA.

The applicant will also be required to obtain all necessary building permits, Clean Air Branch, Department of Health, Transportation and noise permits. As of April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014, the Planning Department has not received any testimony in support or against the proposed applications. At this time I'll be handing the presentation over to Mich Hirano, from Munekiyo & Hiraga, who is the consultant for the project, will be making a presentation for you. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Ben. Mich, go ahead.

Mr. Mich Hirano: Thank you Ben. Good evening Chair Ornellas and Commissioners. My name is Mich Hirano with Munekiyo & Hiraga, and our firm is the planning consultant for the RO Desalination Facility. We've prepared a power point presentation to go over the project, and to go over some of the details that Ben had provided in his description of the project.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Great. Can everybody see? Do we need to turn off the lights? Kurt? Thank you.

Mr. Hirano: I'd just like to introduce the project team for the Commissioners and for the audience. There are two parts of the project team. We have the design team and then the entitlement group. The applicant for this application before you is the Pulama Lana'i. The operator will be the Lana'i Water Company. IDE Americas is the desalination specialist, Mark Lambert is here. Representing Pulama Lana'i is Arlan Chun who's the Senior Vice-President of Development, Lynn McCrory who's the Senior Vice-President of Government Relations, John Stubbart is with the Lana'i Water Company, and Ka'iulani Sodaro is the Project Manager.

The design team is made up of IDE Americas. They're the desalination specialist. They operate over 400 desalination plants throughout the world, and they have tremendous experience in the desalination process. R. M. Towill Corporation is the civil engineer. We have the civil engineer representatives with us tonight so they're here. Tom Nance, Water Resource Engineering, Aqua Engineers, Ron Ho and Associates, R. M. Towill Engineers, and Byron Washom is the sustainable energy consultant. I just have to say . . . (inaudible) . . . is with R.M. Towill, and JB Nishikawa is the civil engineer with R. M. Towill. Entitlement consultant is TS Dye, they are the archaeologist. ICF International were the flora/fauna consultants. Marine Research Consultant is Steve Dollar. And Munekiyo & Hiraga are the planning consultants, and Bryan Esmeralda is with Munekiyo & Hiraga, and he's with us tonight as well.

In terms of the project overview, Pulama Lana'i proposes the development of a reverse osmosis desalination facility. We call it a desal facility at Manele, Lana'i, Hawaii. The desal is intended to provide 2.5 million gallons of water per day for potable use, as well as for golf course irrigation and landscape irrigation used within the Manele Project District. And as well, the water will be used to support agriculture in the Palawai Basin. This is the overview. This is just

a portion of the southern Lana'i. As you can see here is Manele Bay, Hulopoe Bay, the Manele Project District, and this is the blue line outlining the Project District of Manele. And the desalination facility is located up slope from the Manele Project District. The various components of the desal facility. This is a 14.95 acres project site and many of the components of the desal facility will be located on that parcel. The other components for the facility are the RO wells, the Reverse Osmosis supply wells. There are three supply wells in total. Two are located on agricultural land and well number three is located within the Project District. So you see the three wells there, very close to the Project District lines. The disposal wells are located approximately half a mile or more away from the supply wells, and there are two disposal wells as well a control tank for – that will control the water that would go into the disposal wells. And then there's a sediment basin as a precautionary overflow area in case the injection wells are not functioning, so there will be the sediment basin will be used in emergency situations.

Within the Project District there are utility corridors that would be transmitting the supply water, or the product water, down into the Manele – sorry – down into the Manele Project District, as well as providing, here, there will be a transmission line and conveying the product water up into the Palawai Basin, 15 million gallon reservoir. So the RO facility has kind of many components to it and that's why you have before you a State Land Use Special Use Permit for the desal facility that will be on the agricultural lands, and then the Project District Phase Two application for those components of the project that are located within the blue boundary line which is the Manele Project District.

This is a conceptual site plan of the RO facility. It's a 14.9 acre site. It will be landscaped to buffer visual – provide a visual buffer. This is the desalination building, and these are sort of pretreatment facilities. There's a small administration building of 800 square feet with some parking. A power generation building because the desal plant will be based on its own power. It would have its own power that would supply the power that would operate the plant. So there's a generation building. There's some chemical storage for – on the site. This is the post treatment facilities, post treatment tanks. And then there will be two product water, potable water tanks supply, tanks that will be located in the southern portion of the site. Other parts of the facility will involve some diesel storage and then liquified natural gas (LNG) fuel storage. Access will be provided by an existing agricultural road that would come up from the east side of the desal facility. And there's also an existing agricultural road on the west side. And there will be two driveways or access points into it from the east side ag road, as well as access from the west.

This is an aerial overview of the, of the site. As you can see this is the Manele, the Manele Project District, the Four Seasons Resort at Manele, some residential developments, the golf course Challenge at Manele. Here's the existing ag road up to the site. This is the Manele Wastewater Treatment Facility over here. The source wells would be located in about this area. The desal facility will be located up in the where the, the road forks. 14.9 acre area up here. The wastewater, the injection wells will be located along this area. So that's kind of an overview of where this facility will sit in sort of respect to the existing conditions.

Photographs of the site – this is up at the top of the site where the road forks. And looking



down over the site as you can see it's a little flat area up in here. This is down in the mid section of the site, looking to the east. And again, it's a flat kind of bench, but it will also be graded to provide the citing for the buildings. As you can see from the description that Ben made, the area is, you know, sort of scrubbed vegetation, pili grass, kiawe and here's another picture of the site, looking to the west, the other side. And the – a lot of sort of rocky, stony ground. So based on the agricultural productivity of this area it's very low. And I think it's then – it's not taking any prime agricultural land out of production and that's one the criteria that is used to assess the Special Use Permit.

The permit approvals before you tonight is a State Land Use Commission Special Use Permit, and that is for the desal site, the disposal wells, and the source wells, number one and two. And then the Project District Phase Two approval will involve source well number three, and parts of the distribution lines, the utility corridor and the paving of the agricultural road that goes up to the desal site.

A project time line is provided in this slide, and it's a very rough project time line, but here is the development of the project in terms of looking at it from a preliminary design feasibility and costing and getting all the components of the desal process figured out. And this started last year, in 2013, and at that time we also made the application for the Project District Phase Two and the Special Use Permit for the Desal Facility. We're through the land entitlement process, early 2014. This is the land entitlement process and this the applications before you today. The remainder of the 2014 would see the design of the facility and the applications, the building permits and some site prep work that will happen. 2015 will be kind of the construction period for the desal facility and into early 2016. And our target of operation, first or early second quarter of 2016.

This is a conceptual diagram of the desal process just to give the Commissioners and, and the audience an idea of how this process will be designed and operated. The source well will bring water. This is ground water. You'll see this is volcanic rock. There's the basal lens sitting on top of sort of the saturated salt water ground water. This is approximately 0.6 miles away from the ocean, at an elevation of about 500 to 600 feet. This is the RO supply well that would draw up from the saline ground water, and it will go into a pretreatment process. And from there it would go into the reverse osmosis process. From the reverse osmosis process there are two streams that will be produced. One would be the, what we call the super saline water. That is the water that is rejected or sort of taken out when the, the saline, when the permeate water is produced or the product water. So you'll have the beginnings of the potable water going into post treatment, and the super saline water being disposed of in the injection wells.

This is the post treatment process. So we go through a post treatment process to make it to the standards of the drinking water standards branch. And then it would go into storage. And once it's in storage, there will be two streams where the water will be used for supply. It would go into the Manele Project District, and as well as, it would go to support agricultural in the Palawai Basin for ag irrigation.

I'd just like to mention some of the questions that came up. In terms of the, you know, the

impact on the saline ground water that's available for the RO process, right now these wells have been approved by the Department of Health, and they have, they have been pumped tested. And the pump testing really determines how much water you can take out, how much you can draw, and how much recovery there is and how fast it recovers. And it met all the requirements in terms of the pump testing, and therefore, it seems to be a good product to go for the RO process and that there is enough water there to supply the anticipated demand and, and as well that it would recover.

In terms of the summary of the project components, the proposed project will be made up of a number of project components which we sort of briefly described. But there the RO feed water supply wells. As I mentioned there are three supply wells. Two will be in production, one will be used for backup. There will be a pump, a pump house that would be required to pump the water up and put it into the desal process. There's the disposal wells, and there are two disposal wells for the discharge of the super saline water that's a bi-product of the process. There's the RO desal facility itself. There's a generator facility. This is the building that would house the generators that would power the desal facility. There's the project access road, the existing agricultural roads that would be paved, and the utility lines and the utility corridors. And that's the transmission lines for the product water, as well as the lines that would feed the water to the disposal wells.

This is just a cross section of the desal site just to give you of an idea of how it would look if you're looking through the site and, and through the physical ground. This is the makai side. So you have the golf course Manele Project District and the water down in this area. And this is the mauka side. The low part of the facility is at an elevation of about 670 feet above mean sea level. And the top part is about 720 feet above sea level. It will be kind of terraced. There will be three terraces. These will be the storage tanks, water storage tanks, and then the desal facility would be on the top level. So this is kind of, if you look it through the – if you cut the land right through the section of it, of that site, you'll see this type of arrangement.

It's a – part of this is to use, to be used as a view analysis. We wanted to make sure that the desal facility would not have a visual impact from public areas, and from the Manele Project District. So a visual impact analysis was done. This is the site itself. And there were view analysis taken from, you know, three public areas. One was along Manele Road. There other was at Hulopoe Beach. And the other was at the Challenge at Manele golf course. In order to sort of get of an idea that facility would be seen, this tower crane was sort of place right on the site of the desal. And this boom is about 70 feet in height from the ground, and there were just some flags that would mark it so that it could easily be seen from those other areas. This is from Hulopoe Beach and as you can see this is the ridge of sort of the slopes behind the Manele Hotel Resort. And that boom cannot be seen, so the desal plant will not be seen from, you know, this public view. This is a view from Manele Road, looking across. This is a temporary facility. This is the drill rig that was used for the RO well number two. And this won't be here, or this is not there now. The boom again cannot be seen. It's behind this ridge and it's not visible from the Manele Road side. And then from the Challenge at Manele golf course, from the Fairway as you can see, or as you can't see, you can't see the boom. So it's sitting behind this hill and so it's not visible from the golf course as well.

In terms of other studies that were done for the RO process, there was a Marine Water Quality testing that was done to get a baseline data for future marine water quality testing. And Pulama Lana'i has committed to ongoing testing with Steve Dollar who will do test to make sure that the water is not impacting the ocean. There was an archaeological inventory survey done of the area, and there are no archaeological sites within the project area. . . . (Inaudible) . . . the utility corridors nor the 14.95 acre desal site. Nevertheless, Pulama Lana'i is committed to do archaeological monitoring during any ground altering for the, during construction. And with respect to the flora/fauna analysis, there are no anticipated adverse aspects, impacts to flora or fauna.

In terms of the project summary, again, Pulama Lana'i is requesting that the Lana'i Planning Commission approve the State Land Use Commission Special Use Permit, and as well, the Maui County Project District Phase Two approval this evening. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Mich. County, your recommendation.

Mr. Sticka: Again, the application complies with the applicable standards for a Phase Two approval and Land Use Commission Special Use Permit as found in Title 19, Zoning, Chapter 19.45 and Hawaii Administrative Rules Title 15, Department of Business Economic Development and Tourism, Subtitle 3 State Land Use Commission, Chapter 15 Land Use Commission Rules, Sub-chapter 12 Special Use Permits, 15-15-95 respectively as listed in the Department's Report. The Maui Planning Department recommends that the Lana'i Planning Commission grants the State Land Use Commission Special Use Permit and Project District Phase Two approval subject to the 19 conditions included in your report. In consideration of the foregoing the Planning Department recommends that the Lana'i Planning Commission adopts the Planning Department's Report and Recommendation prepared for the April 26, 2014 meeting as the Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Decision and Order, and authorize the Director of Planning to transmit said written Decision and Order on behalf of the Planning Commission. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Ben. Alright, I'll open up the public testimony. People want to come up and speak your peace. Please come up and grab the mic. Have a seat if you'd like. First up? Anybody? Come here and grab the mic. Or grab that mic. I don't know. Whatever.

Mr. Bruce Harvey: Hi. My name is Bruce Harvey. I represent myself. At the beginning of the process when we had the first meeting regarding the desal plant a gentleman said our water is so clean that we won't need, first place, they'll never use chemicals to process the salt water into fresh water. On one of the drawings up there for the facility I saw this pretty large chemical storage tank and then it said pre-treatment before it went to reverse osmosis. So is that process now changed that they will be using chemicals to refine the salt water? And also I don't think it was addressed, is that chemical going to be injected into the injection wells and going to be put out into the ocean? Seeing some – why do we need a big chemical storage tank for? Excuse me. So is the process changed or I'm kind of unclear of what we were first told versus a big chemical tank and a pre-treatment center before reverse osmosis. I'm confused. Maybe it's changed or I'm – what's the chemicals for and where are they going after they're used?

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Bruce. Alright, anybody else? The questions will be answered after when we start doing ours. Okay. Anyone else in the audience would like to testify on this particular item? Go ahead. Come up. There's a mic up here. State your name and who you represent. Thank you.

Mr. Zane Dela Cruz: Zane Dela Cruz. Just a community member. So I just had a couple of questions about the, the desal, I guess. One, you guys were talking about the baseline testing you're doing before – so you can have, do the testing, so you can have the baseline. I was just wondering what – how long were you doing your base study? Was it a single point study or was it over a large period of time? And I'm still not clear on how much water is being pumped a day. So it's saying, was it like, just over two million gallons for fresh water supply. And from what I understand with the pushing back the 1.8 salinity water that means you're pumping 4 ½ million of gallons of sea water. But – so yeah I just wanted to know how much water is being pumped out and what is the salinity of the water being pumped for the supply wells. Is it, is the same salinity as the ocean or is it a deeper water brine? And in the Q&A pamphlet that was handed out it said that when the reject water is pumped back into the wells that it will, it will be at the same salinity as the ocean water when it gets out to the ocean. And just, like, basic physics that doesn't make sense. Because if you're taking fresh water out of, out of the salt water, then how is your salt going back to being the same salinity as the ocean water which without putting the fresh water back into it. That's all.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Zane. Anyone else? Seeing no one, close public testimony. Members, questions for the applicant or the County?

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Bev.

Ms. Zigmond: First of all I would like to say that I don't think anybody doubts the importance of this project. However, comma, that does not negate our duty to do a thorough review of the project. I personally have over 20 questions, and I need an answer to all of them before I make a decision. And I agree with Mr. Reilly that we need to have project specific conditions. So, that being said, I would like my first question which is not part of the 20 some is to ask how are you going to be answering the ones from the audience? Is that going to happen tonight? Is that somebody going to do that, and did somebody actually take down those questions? Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: I expect those questions to be answered tonight.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, so how shall I proceed with my 20 some questions? Because I need an answer to each and every one of them before I am able to vote.

Mr. Ornellas: You guys got the, you guys got the horse power here to answer these questions? Go ahead Bev. Go ahead.

Mr. Hirano: Mich Hirano with Munekiyo & Hiraga. May I suggest that we answer the questions

that were raised maybe during public testimony and I will call the members on the project team that could specifically answer those questions. And then you could ask – answer the 20 questions.

Mr. Ornellas: You know I want to get this answered today. I don't want a memo in the paper later answering those questions so –

Mr. Hirano: No, we're going to answer them.

Mr. Ornellas: So you want to do it this way, fine with me.

Mr. Hirano: Okay. I have to get my notes. Do you have the questions, Lynn? Why don't you just read them to me.

Ms. McCrory: One of the first questions from Pat Reilly was – Lynn McCrory, Pulama Lana'i – was his concern on where the effluent was stored, and whether it would go downhill. So effluent is going into the disposal wells. There is a storage tank. You want to finish?

Mr. Hirano: On the project site the effluent will be going into the injection wells. They'll also be cleaning out the filters of the RO facility and those will be going off, off the site for disposal. They won't be disposed on the site. So the chemicals that are in the treatment, I'll have IDE Americas discuss that. But they won't be stored on the site. They'll be going either in the injection wells, or the sludge will be removed and disposed of...from the treatment, filter treatment.

Mr. Arlan Chun: Arlan Chun with Pulama Lana'i. I just want to make a little clarification. When the term effluent is used that's typically with wastewater, and we're not dealing with wastewater here. We're dealing with either the permeate which is the product water or the concentrate which is the higher salinity water that is the reject water.

Mr. Ornellas: I think Bruce, Bruce's question was the chemicals you guys gonna be using, where is that going?

Mr. Hirano: Yeah, we didn't get to that question, but I'll ask Mark Lambert from IDE to talk about the chemicals.

Mr. Mark Lambert: Hi. Mark Lambert with IDE. Thanks for the question. The majority of the chemicals that are stored are used for the re-portsablization process. The desalination process makes a permeate water and then we put lime stone back into the water for distribution into the drinking water system. That's the storage of those chemicals and that's what those chemicals are used for. There is no chemicals that will be at part of the disposal, the brine, it's disposed back in so nothing goes back down to the disposal wells.

The chemicals are lime stone which is a re-mineralization chemical, and sodium hypochlorite which is used currently in your drinking water system as a disinfectant for distribution systems.

So those are the two primary chemicals that will be stored there.

Mr. Hirano: An earlier question was also proven technology of the RO process, desal process, so can you just speak on the Mark?

Mr. Lambert: Yeah, our company alone – there's – I won't guess, but there's more than several thousand desalination plants operating globally. My company alone has built and operates 400. Very similar process to what's proposed here. Very, very large scale. Very, very small scale. This is proven technology. It's been around since the 50s. Some plants have been in operation for 30, 40, and 50 years. My whole generation has seen, and yours has seen the use of desalination to support lack of fresh water from rain or other sources on multiple other locations, many, many of which are island nations and the Carribean and the south Pacific. I hope that answers that question.

Ms. Zigmond: Can I ask a question Mr. Chair of what he just said, please?

Mr. Ornellas: Sure.

Ms. Zigmond: Thank you. When you were here back last summer or whatever, there was some discussion about the, the fact that – we were kind of surprised that the water wasn't coming from the ocean. We were kind of – many of us were, any way, surprised at the fact that this is actually going to be coming from our aquifer, and understanding about the high level and the basal lens and all of that stuff. But still I believe that you or someone from your company had said that there was not project that was ever done exactly like it is done here. So that didn't leave a lot of us with a warm fuzzy. Could you speak to that please?

Mr. Lambert: I'm not sure it was me that said that, but many desalination facilities get their water from the beach. They'll build a beach well or wells at the beach. In your particular case – and Tom's actually the hydro geologist that's here. He's probably better in answering this than me – you're building ground water wells. So you're drilling a well into a ground water table and getting water that is – someone asked the question about the salinity and it's virtually the same as sea water salinity. So you're bringing the water up from a ground water sub, subterranean ground water source. The only difference here is that you've chosen to collect the water about a mile inland versus right at the beach.

Ms. Zigmond: But you've never done it exactly like this anywhere else, correct?

Mr. Lambert: All projects are unique. Every single facility, globally, has some different nuance about it. How you get access to the water is always a geographic, a geological issue of the function of the conditions of the global site. So technically your answer is correct. But you won't find any two locations any where on the plant that have the exact same inlet or outlet conditions.

Mr. Hirano: I'd just like to add, though, the difference, I think the, you know, taking water from a deep well and ground water is very common in Hawaii. I think the difference here is that this

is saline ground water. Whereas normally in terms of the water systems, they're taking clean water, or, you know, unsalted water, potable water.

Mr. Chun: This is Arlan again with Pulama Lana'i. Just one clarification Ms. Zigmond. We're not drilling into aquifer. We have a basal lens, and we're actually outside of the aquifers and drilling down into the saline ground water, so it's really ocean water.

Mr. Ornellas: Joelle?

Ms. Aoki: I have a question in reference to the sodium hydrochloride. What will your security be like in securing that chemical because I believe sodium hydrochloride is one of the core ingredients to make bath salts which is one of new and upcoming drugs here in America.

Mr. Hirano: Part of the condition is that there is a spill prevention and containment plan that's done that will be reviewed by the Department of Public Safety and Fire Protection so –

Mr. John Stubbart: John Stubbart, Director of Utilities. As far as the security for the site, we will have security. We will have fencing. We will have monitoring egress and, access and egress. But we use sodium hydrochloride right now. It's bleach. It's what you use in your house at – our's at 12%. The bleach you normally buy in the bottle is at about half of that strength. And we use it right now for all of our chlorination in the water system, and in our waste water. And so it's brought in in 50 gallon drums, and/or in totes, about 350 gallons. Our plan is to use this type of chlorination because it is the safest in the type of product for our disinfection that was required by the Department of Health in the system. We have to maintain a residual in the system of 0.2, which was similar to what you're drinking right now.

Ms. Aoki: This chemical secured is my question because will it be in a concentrated level, like, powder form? Liquid?

Mr. Stubbart: It will be a liquid form, and brought in, in these totes, 350 gallon totes, and stored onsite. And then each container will be used and then the containers are recycled back and forth to Oahu. So security is the same as what we have here at our well sites – fencing, monitoring – but it will be a higher level of security at the site. But they'll be in plastic containers.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you John.

Mr. Hirano: Responding to the question about water sampling and testing. As you know, Pulama Lana'i has been testing the water quality in front of the Challenge at Manele golf course for about 25, 30 years. There's an excellent baseline on that. And the – for this particular facility, two tests have been carried out. Basically in discussing this with the water quality consultant right now that water quality is pristine water. Sea water is AA classification, Department of Health water. So it's, it's a baseline that will be used to test for future testing,

and that's going to be done quarterly. So they'll be quarterly tested on that.

Mr. Ornellas: And just a reminder that you guys are going to expand the testing site. Go ahead.

Ms. McCrory: Yeah, we have done two baseline testings right now. And if you look at the map, the testing was occurring below where the disposal wells are, and then below where the source wells are, and then we're going to put them even beyond Manele Small Boat Harbor as another baseline. And they're testing three different sites at each location, so that will continue quarterly. So we'll actually be able to see between Dr. Brocks' – Clarification.

Mr. Stubbart: Down in the bay we'll have three arrays that we've already done that extend from the hotel area –

Mr. Ornellas: John, can you, can you identify yourself?

Mr. Stubbart: John Stubbart, Director of Utilities. That will extend out into the bay, and then down the coast out where the injection wells are, about 0.7 miles away. There's three more arrays and they extend out into the ocean about – how far? 300 yards out into the ocean. And we measure on each array, surface, midpoint and ocean bottom, and as you work your way in to the shoreline. So multiple sample points up to 50 some samplings taken each time.

Ms. McCrory: So you have control samples which should not be affected whatsoever, and then you have where they could be.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: In our original presentation by IDE we had requested for water temperatures to be included in your baseline testing. Was that preformed as well?

Ms. McCrory: Yes. The water temperatures have been, on each of the wells, have been tested, and they will continually be tested. That will be part of making sure that everything is working correctly, and that the water quality is coming out.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: And will, will the Planning Commission receive –

Ms. McCrory: We can –

Mr. Ornellas: – quarterly when you guys release it? Give us a copy so that way we can also monitor it too.

Ms. McCrory: We can – we're looking at probably even putting it, you know, in to the water report. You've got two quarters here, adding some of the pieces right on to that, so you get one report that has the various parts to that. Answer another question that came up was what



quantity of water is being pumped each day and I'll give that to Arlan.

Mr. Chun: Arlan Chun, Pulama Lana'i, Senior Vice-President, Development and Construction. So our target phase one goal would be 2.5 million gallons per day. The conversion rate is about 43% of the water that we actually pump. So we're – total quantity that we're pumping is probably, probably around 5 ½ million if my math's correct, somewhere around there, total in order to get 2 ½ million gallons of potable water each day.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. McCrory: Lynn McCrory, Pulama Lana'i. Another one was how does the saline water get back to sea water, and over what period of time?

Mr. Chun: Arlan Chun, Pulama Lana'i. You know the ocean is such a, a large base in the water, and the, the, the disposal or the concentrate water that we're pumping back into the injection well is about little less than twice the salinity of sea water. So over time it will just defuse itself into the rest of the ocean. And if you think about the other part, you know, from when it rains and everything goes into the ocean, you're really diluting the water and it just really offsets everything that we're also doing. So when you, when you think about the amount of water that we're disposing compared to the volume of the ocean, you won't see any increase in salinity.

Ms. McCrory: Lynn McCrory. And it will take approximately two years for it to slowly go through the rock and out to mixing with the ocean. From the bottom of the disposal wells, it moves slowly through that and that's because it's volcanic rock. I asked the question, how does it move through the rock. It's volcanic rock so it's porous, which is how you're bringing the water up.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Thank you.

Ms. McCrory: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Any more questions? Are you going to answer more of the questions from the testifiers?

Ms. McCrory: I'm looking. Hang on. Pat Reilly also asked about a trial module, and I'll turn that back over to Arlan.

Mr. Chun: Arlan Chun, Pulama Lana'i. In working with Department of Health one of their requirements before we can go and work on the full size plant is to do pilot plant. And what they're going to require of us is to run a pilot plant about 125,000 gallons per day which is about 1/10th of, little – I think it's a little less than 1/10th. But anyway, we're going to be running that somewhere between 30 and 90 days, and taking samples all along that time. And we're going to be monitored by the Department of Health for the process and the water quality at the end of this. And once they are satisfied then we'll be able to start our work on the full scale plant.

And, and that should be happening later this summer.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Arlan. You will come back when the test is final to let us know?

Ms. McCrory: We're kind of hoping we can have you come out to the site and actually do a site visit so that you can see this pilot facility.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. McCrory: Kauai uses a – there's a surface water treatment facility which is similar and I know when I was on the water board at Kauai it was important to see that facility. So this gives you a quick look at what it's going to be but on a smaller scale and that you can see how it would function.

Ms. Zigmond: Actually Lynn that was one of the things I was going to ask, have a site visit prior to us voting on any recommendations. When the solar farm came up we got to do a site visit before we actually voted on that.

Ms. McCrory: We, we cannot go ahead. Department of Health will not allow us to go ahead without permits in place.

Ms. Zigmond: No, I don't mean the pilot, I mean just for us to go and see now.

Ms. McCrory: Oh, just the site. Oh, we can do that anytime. Whether you want to do it as a group or you want to – which would require noticing or –. Before the vote? No, we want to vote tonight, Bev.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Any more questions? Any answers? You guys took care of the testimony, the testifiers?

Ms. McCrory: Yes. Those were it.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Those were it. Okay. Bev, you want to start your 20?

Ms. Zigmond: Actually a couple of them have been answered already.

Mr. Ornellas: Can, can – we'll go until seven and then we'll take a short break. Okay?

Ms. Zigmond: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: You've got 20, 15 minutes.

Ms. Zigmond: So, it says approximately 14.95 acres and that is just a hairline under what the Land Use Commission needs. So I'm wondering is it really 14.95 because it says approximate. And my second question is did Land Use Commission have anything to say even though they

weren't required to? I know in the past that has happened, they had some comments.

Mr. Hirano: The Land Use Commission didn't directly comment, although it was sent to the Land Use Commission. But Office of Planning which is the, I guess, the advisory agency for the Land Use Commission did provide a comment. It's in your packet and it was very positive comment where they felt that this desal operation would, would be a positive impact to the community in terms of the existing aquifer that it would take the demands of the existing aquifer. And they felt that was a positive kind of benefit.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, I'm looking at the report here on page 4...the second paragraph, the very last sentence doesn't seem to be a sentence and I'm wondering what else, maybe something got left out. It says that the long term goal is to be able to produce 5 to 10 million gallons a day of water at the water treatment facility with the intent of fully supply not only the Manele area and agricultural uses in the Palawai and Miki Basins. But it's like it got chopped up, so what else is it going to say there?

Ms. McCrory: That's it.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, so we didn't just forget about anything. Okay.

Ms. McCrory: No, there isn't anything else there.

Mr. Ornellas: Bev, if you look at the bottom of the last paragraph, I think that's what the six to 10 employees to operate and –

Ms. Zigmond: No, no. It's talking about how many. Okay. On page 5 it talks about all the people who received notifications. Like we found out in the recycling application that it wasn't the people who were directly involved who got those notifications, so I'm curious who received the notifications of this.

Mr. Hirano: As required through the procedural rules of the Planning Department under a Special Use Permit and for the Project District Phase Two, people within 500 feet of the TMK or the property were notified. And we actually did two mail outs because the first one that was scheduled in March was, again, delayed or postponed, so – and rescheduled –so we notified 30 days in advance for that public hearing. And then we noticed again for this public hearing. And so all those property owners within 500 feet of the TMK.

Ms. Zigmond: So it was real people.

Ms. McCrory: It was –

Ms. Zigmond: Not, not some, not some mega corporation some place that wasn't going to be . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. McCrory: No, and realize that this TMK is 16,000 acres. So, I mean, it got almost all the

way up into Lana'i City. I received phone calls from the mainland from people.

Ms. Zigmond: But it's people here who will be affected that . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. McCrory: Yes.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay. Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Hirano: As well as Planning Department does it also notifies in the newspaper 30 days before the agenda, so that was notified as well.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, and I'm going over to page 6 under the generator facility. So it talks about 4.7 mega watts of energy to run the facility which is actually more than what is required to run this entire island. I think I heard about 4, 4 ½ on that so I thought that was kind of curious. And even more so all throughout here it talks about sustainability and reducing the imports on fossil fuels, yet this is going to be fueled by LNG and diesel and they don't really seem to be sustainable and they – I'm wondering what happens if weather prohibits and LNG shipment of something like that. What's the backup plan?

Mr. Chun: Arlan Chun again from Pulama Lana'i. Couple of questions – couple of answers to your questions. Number one, the 4.7 plus or minus mega watts is the total generating capacity of the generating facility. But it's not the amount of energy that's needed to run the plant. A part of that is backup in case our, you either have a failure on one of the generators or you need to take one offline, the main generator offline so you can maintain it. You need to be able to still produce water for the Manele area, and up in the Palawai area. So it's more backup. We're probably closer to 3.5, 3.6 mega watts.

And then your – I'm sorry, your second question? Oh, on the LNG. So, you know, this is sort of the first step in the sustainability. I agree that it's not sustainable when you look at diesel, gen sets, and LNG. But the longer term goal for Pulama Lana'i is to be sustainable and, and it's our plan to create, to integrate renewable energy. But we first need water in order to help the island grow, and then we'll start integrating renewable energy into the island.

Ms. Zigmond: And what kind of time frame is that?

Mr. Chun: That's –. Our first step is to get the desal plant up and running, and then we'll start looking at the kind of designing of the rest of the island. Now LN – as far as backup we will have backup LNG . . . (inaudible) . . . on the island. We'll store at Miki Basin and bring out to the plant as we need it. Now we have generators that also do fuel, both diesel or LNG, so we have that ability to switch fuels.

Ms. McCrory: LNG is a cleaner fuel than diesel, so –

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Brad.

Mr. Oshiro: I have two questions that kind of go coincide. The LNG is very explosive. You guys going store at Miki Basin, it's going to be in a fenced in area? Coming from an explosive, I've worked with explosives so, you know, one of them tanks going leave a big crater in the ground if it so happens to accidently go off, and it happens. And I really would hate to see Lana'i, you know – because you talking more than one tank you guys going to be storing down there. If one goes, they all go. And the other thing is because I'm worried about this LNG also talked about one time about the road going down there. I know you said you going put a 10 foot road in this, but is there a safety runoffs? That's another thing I'd like to see before I even talk about approving this because, you know, it's one that really burdens me real bad because I lost a relative on that road.

Mr. Chun: Just, just to answer a couple of questions. One is we are concerned about that road. You know we're paving that road so we're taking – you know, there's a lot of potholes. There a lot, that road, it's pretty beat up. And we've also taken and re-paved those sections. But we're also engaged engineering firm to design a run away ramp for that road, and that's already, it's in process right now.

Ms. Zigmond: That was actually one of my questions to Lynn because in a previous project I think it was stated that that would be done within a year, and we're kind of coming up closer to that so about where are we in that process?

Ms. McCrory: It's actually to be done by the end of this year. And they started the re-paving yesterday, as a matter of fact. And I don't know how much longer the engineering firm is working on the run away position. I know they've been out here, and –

Mr. Chun: I'm sorry. Arlan, again. Yeah, they actually got started. So what they're doing is now we need correct topo surveys of the area so we kind of make sure that our design is correct.

Mr. Hirano: Just to add in terms of the safety precautions that are being taken to respond to Commissioner Oshiro's question. These tanks that will be, the LNG will be stored in, are tested by the Federal Department of Highways because they operate on highways so they go through a rigorous test and they have to meet their standards as well as the condition that the Planning Department is proposing and recommending is that the tanks and the plans for how they're being designed in terms of their placement on the site and storage will go to the Department of Public Safety and Fire, to – and they would review the plans and approve the plans during the building permit process.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Joelle. I have, I have one. Your presentation eight months ago to us and to the community, you know, didn't – LNG and diesel was at the bottom of your list. Solar, wind, pump hydro were at the top of the list. And in this thing I see no, I see no pump hydro. I don't see any solar except for the building. But I don't see you guys powering this desal plant with what you guys said you were going to do in the beginning.

Ms. McCrory: The first thing that you must have with this facility is stable power so it can

function and that's what the LNG will give us. And then as we look at adding other things, you add in the flexible power, the power that varies which is the solar and the other pieces. But to begin with, in other words to actually provide water to Manele, we have to be sure that that facility is operating. And that's what the LNG does. And then we add the other components. And the pump hydro as we've said eight months ago was really in phase two, and that is where it goes up. And that's when you start looking at moving from 2 ½ million to 5 million gallons. That's when it goes up and then it comes back down again. And that provides more stability. This is the initial one.

Ms. Richelle Thomson: I just wanted to add, I also advise the Department of Environmental Management and they have solar, solar facilities located within Kihei and also in Lahaina, at the wastewater treatment plant. And those facilities operate, you know, obviously solar is just a day time use and they don't have battery back up there, but they have, they function and historically have functioned on diesel I believe. And then now the County is also incorporating other kinds of alternative energy such as solar in those facilities.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: I understand what you're saying as far as getting stable energy to get it started, but I personally would like to see a plan or a deadline taking into consideration Mr. Ellison's vision of renewable energy here on Lana'i, and some kind of a time line or a plan on how you're going to move forward with, with integrating renewable energy into the plan.

Mr. Chun: Arlan with Pulama Lana'i. You know, Joelle, that's something that we are working on. That's, you know, it's, it takes a lot. It's a complicated topic. I'm not trying back off on you or anything, but that's something that is a vision for Mr. Ellison to add in the renewable energy into the entire grid. The thing that we also need to understand is that this grid is very fragile because it's, it's a small grid. One of the, one of the things that we're trying to understand is, you know, how fragile the grid is and that's something that we're just starting to do now. You can see somebody like a parker ranch trying to go through and trying integrate their renewable. But, you know, they would have to also work with the utility at that point too, so that's something that we're trying to understanding and work towards. So we are working on plan, but, you know, we don't have anything at this point that we can, we can give out.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. I understand. And my reasoning is like the solar panels, the, you know, the photo voltaic that's on airport that's not running because of the, of our power plant and their capabilities, and I'd like to see us moving forward towards that. And this is another item on the list that they will need to deal with. And so I just wanted to make sure that that's noted in the record that we'd like to ensure that we're moving forward in that direction and keeping in line with our state's goals as well. Thank you.

Ms. McCrory: And, and you could – Lynn McCrory – you could ask for a quarterly report or something like, or every six months report that we tell you where we are on the energy and the renewables, and we would be able to do that. That could be a condition.

Mr. Ornellas: I'm just –. You guys sound, sometimes you guys sound like this is something brand new. I mean, you guys hired probably the most top notch energy guy here in the United State or in the world, and, you know, we've known – he's – you know, you guys told us. And, you know, so why – I mean, we know how to do a solar farm. We done. Okay. So why not just build on it and, and, and get rid of this diesel or this –? Or, you know, or keep LNG as a back up, not as a primary.

Mr. Chun: Arlan Chun again. You know the, the tough part about renewables, and like a solar farm is that it is not stable. And in order to be able to utilize that you would need to have full diesel or LNG capabilities once that goes offline or you need storage. So in phase two that's, when we talk pump hydro that's an energy storage device so that during the day you can have solar and at night you can, you can pump so that you can continue to wean yourself off of the generators. You know the solar farm that we have right now is not running at 100% just because there's no way for people, for the grid to be able to use the full energy that, that the solar farm can create.

Mr. Ornellas: You know, there is wind and, and those wind power doesn't require the sun. Alright. Do you want to – Bev, do you have any more of your questions? Alright, we'll, we'll take a five minute break.

*(The Lana'i Planning Commission recessed at 7:00 p.m., and reconvened at 7:07 p.m.)*

Mr. Ornellas: Bev is gonna...gonna re-group and then – so, Joelle, do you have any questions? Bev? Bev's okay with it. Joelle, if, when you go, when you have questions can you refer to the page and so we can, we can turn to that page please?

Ms. Aoki: I will as best as I can.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. When . . . (inaudible) . . . ag water to be available once it's up and running?

Ms. McCrory: Right away.

Ms. Aoki: And what do you anticipate the usage will be set aside for the Manele Project District? What will be allocated for it?

Ms. McCrory: What we're looking at is about half of the 2.5 million will go to Manele and the other half could be available for ag. Maybe I should clarify. Right away means when we get to 2 ½ million, not when the first gallon comes out.

Ms. Aoki: Why is ag use described as limited in – what section is that? Let me look for that.  
Page 3.

Ms. McCrory: Primarily the uses, what type of ag have not been defined at this point. As you know crops take different amounts of water, and we have not finalized what crops we would be looking at and where.

Ms. Aoki: Will – okay, so currently there's a, there's a rate case for Manele Project District. So when you start producing, when you start producing water from the desal plant will you need to go back in to the PUC for a new rate case?

Ms. McCrory: We have –

Ms. Aoki: And what will be charged?

Ms. McCrory: Okay. We have a rate case that's due five years from the purchase date, so in 2017. And that was required as a part of the purchase. Should the desal facility look at –. I can't tell you at this point that what it would cost because what we're going to be doing is we're bringing an independent company to do facility's reserve charges and needs assessments, and is going to look at our whole water utility to define that. They then will have the base information as we go forward for that rate case we must do for the PUC to actually help us with a rate. Can't say whether any of the costs of the desal will be in that rate at this point.

Ms. Zigmond: Lynn, could you repeat what you said about the five years? I missed that part. Sorry.

Ms. McCrory: Five years from the purchase date we have to produce – we have to have a rate case in front of the PUC. It's required, purchase of the island. That was a requirement. And that, that really is then looking out at what's happened over five years and seeing what is going on. So they're looking out for you at that point.

Mr. Ornellas: Joelle?

Ms. Aoki: Your report says that the saline ground water wells are located outside of the high level aquifer. How did you determine this?

Mr. Stubbart: The high level aquifer was defined as anything that would be above the basal lens. And the basal lens on your drawings which is the slide over there – yes please. And the – I'll go over this slide. So there's a rule of thumb that for every one foot of water above mean sea level means that they're at the basal lens. There's fresh water floating on the salt water. And we had studies done by Black – what was the name of the firm? Black Hawk? And this was a while ago. And they did studies that – I'm sorry, I'm probably blocking somebody – that showed us where the soundings that they made, showed us where the high level where the sound bounced off the aquifer. And they could determine where that extended to. And so our hydro-geologist Tom Nance had mapped that out where that would be, and we wanted to make sure we were outside of that. We didn't want to be drilling into the high level aquifer at all. And so we identified where we thought it would be, where that boundary is. And when we dug the first well we drilled a pilot hole and then made water level measurements. And those



measurements showed us that we were identifying the basal lens which was just about six inches above mean sea level. Around there. So that told us we were out of the high level and we were measuring the basal lens. And that's how we knew that we were high level because we could actually do it from measurements of the actual water level.

Ms. Aoki: So –

Mr. Stubbart: John Stubbart, Director of Utilities.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you John Stubbart. So – I have to ask this question – what if you affect our high level aquifer, what is plan B? What is your – how will you mitigate?

Mr. Stubbart: Let me start this way. The water that we're pulling as shown in the representation here – so we're pulling below the basal lens, the water that runs off from the high level. And this water is the water that floats along and out to the ocean. And what we didn't want to do was to impact that in any way. We don't want to affect that and that's where you would really see any of your impact to what is lying above up stream. So that's why we went deeper, pass the aquifer into basically it's the ocean, in the rock, the underlying ocean water in the island. The entire island is saturated with water underneath. And so by pulling from deeper salt water wells we have no impact on what's happening up radiant because we're pulling from, actually from the ocean over here. Plan B would be not to use this source. But the expectation and science tells us that wouldn't be the case.

Ms. Zigmond: John, what would plan B be? You just said plan B would indicate –

Mr. Stubbart: I mean we wouldn't do this type of – well, we'd have to change sources, but can't. From the experts we have, we can't see that being the case.

Ms. Zigmond: Well I remember last summer they said failure was not in the vocabulary and that just doesn't give me a warm fuzzy about my drinking waters.

Mr. Stubbart: Okay. Drinking water is excellent here on the island. But, I guess that's the, that's the answer I, I can give you. We wouldn't be gambling this kind of exercise without being pretty sure.

Ms. Zigmond: I'm gonna put that on the record, pretty sure. Again, that doesn't give a lot of us a warm fuzzy, and I, and I realize there's not an exact science.

Mr. Ornellas: Joelle, any more questions?

Ms. Aoki: Yes. So, thank you Stubbart. So if the desal plant is supplying the water needs of the Manele Bay Project District, the agricultural needs, limited agricultural needs in Palawai Basin and Miki Basin, if something went wrong where – God, God willing doesn't happen – but we get hit by a natural disaster, we're unable to bring in the fuel that you need to run the plant. Being a native of Lana'i, I recalled when we didn't get a barge for three weeks, and so if you're

no longer utilizing high level water aquifer to supply those areas, and now you have more demand because you're supply more areas than just the Manele Project District, what will happen then? Will you, are you intending on going back to the high level aquifer to fulfill the needs of the areas that you're currently supplying and now have ceased to be – your supply is no longer available for this period of time? Or if something should happen to mechanically at the plant? Or be a drilling, they find, the run into some type of problem? Pardon me, not drilling, but during extraction, if there's some sort of challenge that they have to shut down the plant, will you go back to the high level aquifer now when you have all these other demands? How will you handle that situation?

Mr. Chun: This is Arlan Chun again. Joelle, I think initially the intention is to, you know, the long term intention is to cut off use of the high level aquifer. I think that's the goal of the desal plant. But I think initially, even when the plant is up and running, I think we need the ability to be able to tap into the high level aquifer and the wells that were currently serving the Manele area only as an emergency backup. What we've done at the plant itself, so we have redundant backup power and that's why I mentioned that out of the 4.7 or so we're not using all 4.7. Some of that is backup. We have also have redundant trains. You know, the capacity of the plant itself is 3.75 million gallons per day and it will be rotated so that, you know, we could use 2.5, and we always have one as a backup. And as far as the design of the facility, you know, we're designing to the level 3 hurricane status which is a pretty sizable building. So we're taking all of the precautions that we can to make sure that, that we're treating this as a central facility on this island. That's right. And there's also fuel storage backup. I mean, I understand that because of the weather, barge service can be interrupted.

Ms. Aoki: So in the case that there is an emergency, who would declare the emergency? Would it be our local government? Would it be Lana'i Water Company? Who would have the jurisdiction to say this is an emergency, you now have to pull water from the high level aquifer for human consumption only, let's say, who would determine that, that status?

Mr. Chun: I would think it would be the Lana'i Water Company and the inability of the plant to service the Manele area. So primary first, the primary group that would need to be served would be the residents.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Take a break.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Ms. Ornellas: Kelli?

Ms. Gima: Just to kind of piggy back on that, so if there was an emergency, had to pull water from the high level aquifer it would be for human consumption only, not to go and irrigate the golf course and –?

Mr. Chun: That's correct.

Ms. Gima: Okay. Alright. So, I mean, I, as well as Bev, and probably everybody else here has a lot of questions. I mean this is a huge, huge project. I think it's something new to our community, the commissioners here, so bear with us because, yeah, we have a lot of questions. But I kind of wanted to refer to the section about the socio-economic impacts which I think are on page 26. Hold on. Okay, a couple of things. It says, you know, that there will be conditions placed on the, on the contractors, that there's going to be contracts. Is this –? – and the community code of conduct. Is the community code of conduct something that Pulama Lana'i has developed? And is it possible for us to see this community code of conduct?

Ms. McCrory: The community code of conduct was written for the Planning Commission for a condition when we did, when the did the Manele room renovation. This is that.

Ms. Gima: So it's the same one.

Ms. McCrory: It's the same one. It's the same one.

Ms. Gima: Okay.

Ms. McCrory: And we put it into every SMA that we do. You see that.

Ms. Gima: Okay.

Ms. Zigmond: Kelli, excuse me, to stay on that train, though –

Ms. Gima: Go ahead Bev.

Ms. Zigmond: That's for your contractors, right?

Ms. McCrory: Yes.

Ms. Zigmond: But it doesn't necessarily get enforced with the subcontractors, and we've seen that.

Ms. McCrory: It's for both, and it has been. It has been given to everyone.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, well, it seems like some of the subcontractors may be aren't as bound by it is what it seems.

Ms. McCrory: They are bounded by it. There's – they're all bound by it. And we – and one of the other conditions from that first room renovation we had was the creation of a hotline, and we have the hotline and it's been operational. And we have not had calls on that hotline.

Ms. Zigmond: Nobody's gonna call that hotline, Lynn. We're gonna call the cops or we're gonna

deal with it ourselves. Nobody's gonna call that hotline. No excuse me, don't speak totality. There are very few people who will call that hotline. Guarantee.

Mr. Ornellas: Kelli?

Ms. Gima: On that same page, in the same section, in the third paragraph it talks about, you know there will be an increase of construction workers, the increase has the potential to add additional demands social services. But you guys really only mentioned emergency response and can –? What about other demands on social services? Have you looked at – because I see that it's just the emphasis here on emergency response. So was there any looking at other impacts it's going to have on the demand of other social services here within our community?

Ms. McCrory: You're talking about what in particular? Depression?

Ms. Gima: Mental health services. That, that would be a big one. Substance abuse services. Because social services is not just – I wouldn't even put emergency response in social services. I think that's two separate things the way I look at it.

Ms. McCrory: Okay. All contractors, all construction employees are drugged tested before they even come to the island.

Ms. Gima: Are the continuously drug tested, randomly?

Ms. McCrory: And they are continuously, random drug tested.

Ms. Gima: Okay.

Ms. McCrory: That's part of what's in their contract. And that's part of the other condition piece. In terms of mental health, I think possibly if a contractor is seeing that one of the employees is having a problem, that contractor should be dealing with it, and should either get them off the island or get them some help. I don't know whether or not they would be going to immediately say to you, or to Bev, as an example. Well, their families aren't here so we won't have woman abuse, child or woman abuse. Spouse abuse, let me do it that way. So that should not occur. I don't think they would be doing that. I think they would take care of their own employees. And I can verify that. So I'm trying to see where they would be coming into that realm.

Ms. Gima: For example, you know, I provide as part of a contract with Aloha House for adult mental health, I provide on-call crisis intervention where, you know, at times I'm on-call 24/7 and I have a night shift. So let's say one of your contractors needed mental health intervention. So you're saying that their employer would take them off the island or –

Ms. McCrory: I would think so.

Ms. Gima: So if this happened at one in the morning. I mean, I'm looking at all the different situations here. And sure, I mean, we'd like to believe that nothing can happen and their

employers gonna handle it. But their employers aren't mental health professionals. So, you know, I'm just trying to look at what effects it would have on the different social service agencies here on Lana'i. And I don't think it's safe to say that it won't happen.

Ms. McCrory: Well, I don't think it safe to say nothing could happen. That would be – it could.

Ms. Gima: It definitely could.

Ms. McCrory: It definitely could. I would think that it would be handled primarily by whatever company has that employee. And that company certainly has the ability to get a helicopter coming in or fly them out on a plane or any of the other pieces. I don't see them picking up the phone and calling. They could, but I don't see them actually doing it.

Ms. Gima: That's kind of scary.

Ms. McCrory: Well, I think they would move them off the island is what I'm saying too. I think it's what would happen.

Ms. Gima: No, I'm just saying it's kind of scary because it seems like there would be no immediate response and how would that impact the work, how would it impact the employees around them, how would it impact the community?

Ms. McCrory: It certainly could be an immediate response whether the plane comes in or a helicopter comes in. At any hour of the day that could be done.

Ms. Gima: I guess – maybe we're talking about two separate things. I mean there's, there's resources here, for sure to provide services to whomever. And I think it would be good to have the contractors aware of what resources are here in our community so that things don't go, you know, things aren't treated or, you know, we'll just going to handle it internally. I mean we have professionals here on the island who can assist with that.

Ms. McCrory: Okay. I can tell you they have that, to be told to use any of the facilities on the island.

Ms. Gima: Okay.

Ms. McCrory: They can be.

Ms. Gima: Well, I would – as resident and . . . (inaudible) . . . knowing that . . . (inaudible) . . . if a contractor or a construction worker is here or whoever it may be that's working for Pulama that they have access to resources and doesn't go left untreated which then can put other people in jeopardy and other people at risk.

Ms. McCrory: Yeah, I don't think anybody is dealing with it as being untreated. I think they would deal with the individual. I mean, not differently than I think one of the pieces that we had,

early on was we had three individuals who were not behaving appropriating on the island, and they were moved off. So it would more of the same type of situation. Individuals will be removed from the island.

Ms. Gima: Yeah, we can, yeah, we can discuss this more later in terms of how our resources here can, can help because I think it should be.

Ms. Aoki: Quick comment. Joelle Aoki. I think, I feel it might be a good suggestion to allow the resources to be utilized because if we're anticipating the population to increase in the next 10 to 15 years we need to start ramping up for that population increase. And if we, if we're, if our social services network is not being utilized and then all of sudden we're being impacted and we're not ramping up for it, we cannot justify for a larger population with limited staff. For example, like, the Police Department or other, other social service agencies that may need more resources to be able to provide to a larger population. So in my opinion it might, it maybe beneficial for our community to allow those resources to be utilized so that way we are prepared for the population increase that Pulama Lana'i is anticipating.

Ms. McCrory: We could add into the orientation that we do with all of the contractors so that they would have that and you and I can get together and we can talk about – and Joelle also. Bev, if it make sense to what resources do we want to show them and tell them that are on island. And we do it right in the orientation that they get. Would that make sense?

Ms. Gima: Well, yeah, I think that would make a lot, a lot of sense.

Ms. McCrory: Okay, we can do that.

Ms. Gima: Okay. Staying that same section and here's the hot topic, housing. You know, it says that you guys are gonna be working on a number of programs to provide housing options for our construction workers who are brought to Lana'i. Could you please explain what these housing programs are and a number, what is a number. . . (inaudible) . . . ?

Ms. Chun: I think everybody understands that housing is limited on the island. You know, what we've done and what the owner is committed to is I think everybody is aware that half of Koele shut down, and the south wing is currently being used for worker housing. So they come in on a Monday and they leave on a Friday and that's part of the reason we have the Island Air charter flight coming in, bringing the workers in. The other workers, all the other workers are currently commuting on a daily basis either on Island, on the commercial Island Air flight which will eventually go to a charter or on the ferry which will also go to a charter basis. Now, now as far as other housing, you know, we're, you can say that we're developing, it's limited numbers, but you can see the homes that are going up around Lana'i City. We're going to be working on housing in the Koele area so that we can at least utilize some of those so we can free up some homes in Lana'i City for –. And that wouldn't be for workers. That would be for community. Because I think that's the biggest crunch right now.

Ms. Gima: So what is this referring to specifically then about providing housing options for

construction workers?

Mr. Chun: For Koele, number one, because that's taking revenue out of Pulama Lana'i to put, to provide 44 rooms for construction workers.

Ms. Gima: So strictly just being housed at the hotel?

Mr. Chun: At this point yes. We don't have any other options at this point.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Bev, more questions?

Ms. Gima: No, go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: I wanna go back to page 25 where it talks about on site safety protocols, and we had this conversation before. I think it was with the hotel renovations. And I totally get it that staff is going to be trained to deal with medical emergencies or accidents or things like that, but virtually everybody needs some sort of primary care. They might get a cold. They might need more than Tylenol which your people are suppose to be able to hand out. They might be diabetic. They might have high blood pressure. They might need something or another where they need primary care. And again, it says there's no adverse impacts anticipated on existing medical facilities. Well, whether it be all the people coming to work on this project or any other project, it is going to impact that. And we're not talking about emergencies and things that, that hotel security or whoever who are able to, to do. I just find it hard to believe that there's not going to any impact on existing medical facilities. And you're not going to be screening people to say, hey, you have high blood pressure, you can't go work there. You have diabetes, you can't go work there.

Ms. McCrory: No, I'm clear on that. I don't know that I can tell you what –. As far as I know we have not been utilizing the clinic, Straub, as an example, for situations with people. I don't know of any, and I just asked Arlan whether or not he knew of any. Does Kurt know of something? Here we go.

Mr. Kurt Matsumoto: Kurt Matsumoto, Pulama Lana'i. We are working with Straub Clinic, and we're actually subsidizing. So as you know on Lana'i there's two doctors, two resident physicians. That's standard. And then we are going to be subsidizing a third for the clinic. Straub.

Ms. Zigmond: Well, we actually have three now because Dr. Humphrey with Lana'i Community Health Center is here, but –. So that it's noted that we can indeed, that workers would need primary care. That was my point. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Stacie? It's about time we give everybody a chance. You're next Stu.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: I have a couple of comments. The boom picture that you showed, the slide, how is that suppose to compare to a big building on 14.95 acres, the comparison with a

silver or a white building to that little thing?

Mr. Hirano: Well, it was the height of the boom which 70 feet. These buildings at the desal facility will be lower than 30 feet because that's the height limit for the buildings. There's a smoke stack that will be 40 feet. That boom towers above it. And the point of that view analysis was that you can't even see a 70 foot tall boom from those places, so the buildings would not be visible from those areas.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Okay. Another comment I had – I think I might know the answer to this though – is there any where in Hawaii with the similar type of plant that you're proposing?

Mr. Chun: I'm not sure if I'm the right person. This is Arlan Chun. I'm not sure if I'm the right person, but you know we just came back from touring the three RO facilities on the Big Island. One was at . . . (inaudible) . . . One was a Kukio. And then there was another one, it was by Koyo, their water bottling facility. They bring in water from deep in the ocean, and they, and they use the exact same reverse osmosis and they sell that. So they're not, they're not doing, you know, they're not selling water for the community. They're selling bottled water back in Japan, and doing, making a pretty good business out of it. The ones in . . . (inaudible) . . . Kukio, I believe those are brackish water wells, but they are well based RO plants. So I think this one would be one of the, if not, the first doing drawing saline ground water through wells. Most of the ones that doing now are taking open in takes on the ocean.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Is there – where is the nearest kind of closest type that you're proposing? Like, and maybe even the size? I'm a, I'm a visual person, so I would like to go there and actually hear it. I would like to see it. I would like to be in it. So I'm trying to figure out how I would be able to do that.

Mr. Chun: I'm, I'm not familiar with all the plants in the state. We went to the Big Island because, number one, they dealt with wells and also the same type of process which would be the reverse osmosis process.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: So if there's none in Hawaii, where's the closest one? Is it California or –?

Mr. Chun: I'm sure Maui has desal plants, but I don't know what the actual technology and how, what their intake and out take is.

Ms. McCrory: Lynn McCrory. Kauai also has – it's called the surface water treatment, and what they're doing is they're taking water coming down through the irrigation ditches into a reservoir, and then they're using the same process. It's running through the membranes. They're cleaning all the components within that water and they produce drinking water. And that's right on Kauai. And the sound is a hum, a very quiet hum. But that would be another one you could look at too.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: And how, how – do you know how old that one is? I wanna know like –



Ms. McCrory: It was put in – the aqua engineer. I don't know. Aqua Engineers runs it on Kauai, I can tell you that. It would be probably started – it started to be constructed in 2003, and it was operational probably in 2004 or 05 and it's still running.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: They're not putting anything back in, in the ground?

Ms. McCrory: No, they're cleaning the water, and putting everything else out. They're just taking the components out, and then the rest is disposed of. They're not putting water back in.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Do you know how they dispose?

Ms. McCrory: They haul it away because it's just small little pieces of things. Because they're filtering all the water.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: And then my – and then I have another comment. So, yeah, I heard an EIS is not required. So even if a EIS is not required, is it something that Pulama Lana'i would be willing to do as a good faith gesture to the community or a good faith to show the people that they actually wanna do what is right for the environment? And to put an ease everybody else's concerns.

Mr. Hirano: You know, although a EIS is not required and was not done, there was a project assessment report. That was a very thorough analysis. That report was prepared by our firm, and it had all the input from the technical experts that are working on the project. And that was a, a report that analyzed the process, and as well, the impacts. That report went to all the agencies during the review of this application for the State Land Use Special Use and for the Project District Phase Two. So it went out to about 34 agencies. And the comments that came back were very minimal. You have them in your staff report that the agencies really didn't have a concern with this process. They're familiar with it. They feel that it won't have an adverse impact, and that's what they stated. So, although it wasn't an EIS, it went through a very rigorous public review and agency review process.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Were any of the agencies from Lana'i?

Mr. Hirano: There were State and County.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Yeah, but, they, sometimes, off island agencies have a different view of what Lana'i people feel and are connected to. They – some – probably those people who have read it have never been to Lana'i, you know?

Mr. Hirano: These –. Sorry.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Yeah, so that was my concern that other people are making decisions and comments for us that, you know, maybe we should, the people that actually live here.

Mr. Hirano: Well, you know, some of the key agencies that have the expertise in this area were

Department of Health. There's the Clean Water Branch as well as the Safe Drinking Water Branch that had commented and reviewed it. Commission on Water Resource Management which manages, and they're very familiar with Lana'i. I've spoken with the, you know, the hydro geologist at the Commission of Water Resource Management. Again, there were very few concerns about it, and, you know, they regulate all the water, all the ground water in the State of Hawaii. So, it did go through a very thorough review.

Ms. Gima: I have a question. So when we're reading in the report, there will be no adverse effects on this or on that's based upon this project assessment report? And based upon what these agents, how the agencies reviewed it and made their comments?

Mr. Hirano: It's the – the adverse impact assessment was based on the technical expertise that has, that had studied this process and is involved in the design of it. The agencies then reviewed that, and made their comments on it. It was our report that they were basing it on. Yes.

Ms. Gima: That – the one that you were referring to, that project assessment report?

Mr. Hirano: Assessment report. Yes.

Ms. Gima: Okay.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: And then I have a couple, just a couple of questions on page 20, archaeological. It says, number one, surface archaeological and surface cultural deposits. So they only did a surface review?

Mr. Thomas Dye: Hi, I'm Tom Dye. We walked the whole surface, and we had two places where, we had some, some soil we thought we, we might have subsurface deposits. We did test bits there, and we didn't find any cultural deposits at all.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: What were you, what were you looking for? What kind of cultural deposits?

Mr. Dye: The thing that shows up most easily is charcoal. We find that. When we don't find other things we find charcoal. But typically we're looking for food remains, such as rain shells or bones of fish.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: And then it also says potential significant historic properties. What potential – did you find, you didn't find?

Mr. Dye: No, we didn't find any within the project boundary.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: What's the three potential significant?

Mr. Dye: Those are outside the project. The project area wasn't staked when we did our work, and so we ended up covering a larger area than just the project area. And we did find some

sites that we reported, but they're outside of the project area. Yeah, there's a trail that runs up, next to the gulch, at the – a little dyslexic – the east side. And the – there are a couple of ahu that are marking the trail, and then we did find a scatter on the surface of marine shells and some stone flakes.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: But those are outside of the –

Mr. Dye: Yes.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Okay, so it says near the site of the disposal well, so I was kind of –

Mr. Dye: That's what they're nearest, yes, but they're outside the site, the project area.

Ms. Zigmond: Stacie, if I can ask, so how near and, and, yeah, how near? What is, what is near? And how likely is it that if something is near that there might be something nearer? Thank you.

Mr. Dye: No, I don't think there's – there's nothing within the project area. We didn't find anything within the project area. Pulama Lana'i has committed to doing archaeological monitoring when there's earth moving activities. Sometimes, you know how it is when you've got the earth moving guys they run the machinery any where. But as part of that, we'll work up an archaeological monitoring plan, and part of that plan will include that, that snow fencing, that orange snow fencing, to clearly keep machinery off of that trail, two sites, two little ahu and that scatter of marine shells.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: How do you plan on, if, if, if anything were to be uncovered, what's your plan on – do you plan on going around it? Do you plan on moving it? Do you – what? Well, stop. I know you stop, and you do whatever your investigation. But what's the ultimate or end result? Do you, do you move it? Do you –

Mr. Dye: We'll draw up a plan and that plan will be drawn up according to the rules and regulations of the State Historic Preservation Division. And so that will all be set out in the plan. We haven't written out the plan yet.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: Will the, our Lana'i Archaeological Committee be involved in that?

Mr. Kepa Maly: Aloha. My name is Kepa Maly, Senior Vice-President Cultural and Historic Preservation. We're with Pulama Lana'i. The work that was done by Tom Dye and members of the Lana'i community that are in our, our program was written up with a detailed ethnographic report and I believe, and I'm sorry I can't remember with a 100% certainty, that there was some discussion at Lana'i Archaeological Committee. If not, clearly, this is something that will be come in. I think this is probably a prelude into, into its being brought before the archaeological committee. So I think we can make a commitment without a problem that it could be placed on the agenda, if not this coming month, in the month of May.

Absolutely. I'm sorry. So the whole monitoring process is a real critical one, and it's one that's been underutilized in the past, and we, we plan to ensure that there are kamaaina of Lana'i and those that have been working in field as, as native Hawaiians and others on Lana'i in the field archaeology out monitoring and ensuring. And they actually have, they have the authority that if something appears that was unexpected, even it's a questionable. And I think a part of your question was charcoal. How is a charcoal a cultural material. What's evidence of often is when people in the past have lived and worked the landscape had a fire hearth . . . (inaudible). . . or an imu or other features like that, that's an indicator of cultural and traditional use. And so what we've done is we will be monitoring, looking for things like that while the ground moving work is occurring, to ensure that nothing is impacted. And I believe and has been the practice is that should something come up, as we've said, everything stops, that area, and you evaluate it, you assess it, the proper State authorities, community authorities are brought in, and the potential of being able to push or relocate. That's, that's the next step.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: And my, my last comment would be if anybody wants to sponsor the Lana'i Planning Commission to go and see a plant, that would be very helpful and wonderful.

Ms. McCrory: I should write that down.

Mr. Ornellas: Stu, can you take –? Stu, you have a question? Okay. You have no questions?

Mr. Marlowe: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: I will. Alright. Anybody else has questions? Go ahead.

Mr. Oshiro: I might have misunderstood, but you said that the high aquifers will be stopped using by Manele, not all of Lana'i, right? Okay. The other thing will Pulama still restore it, the hale? Because right now the hale is in bad shape.

Mr. Chun: I'm not sure if we have that commitment right now. I'm not part of the natural resources group so that is something that probably is on the agenda. You know, to get water, I'm assuming that you're talking about water, but I think there are other ways to restore the hale and that's –

Ms. McCrory: We talked about this at the last CPAC meeting. One of the things that we're doing is we're just started to work with USGS and also the US Forrest Service on what are the different ways that in dealing with the hale we can plant either the correct trees, the plants, whatever, to create a better fog drip which will start restoring the water down. We're going to be doing what I'm going to say a long range study with probably real no end in site because we're going to try different trees, we're going to try different plants.

Mr. Ornellas: Lynn, can I stop you? Can – can – that's another, that's another topic, but she gave you basically the –. Can we get back to the, to, to the desal plant? We're running out of time, so I want to make sure everybody gets their questions answered about the desal plant. Go ahead?

Mr. Oshiro: You said something about sludge. This facility is not going to make any sludge, right?

Ms. McCrory: No.

Mr. Ornellas: Bev, you have more questions? Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: Well, I think there actually is a nexus with the hale and the watershed and this project. But I will, I will go to page 22, they talked about – let's see – it talks about –. I know, number three, the last sentence, the water treatment facility site characteristic will be altered due to the addition of these impervious services. How is it going to be altered?

Mr. Hirano: Yes. It will be altered from its natural state because as you saw in the photographs it's undeveloped land, and they'll be developed to, you know, site to buildings and the facilities. So there will be grading, and then there will be asphalt roadways within the site. So that's the impervious surfacing that will occur. And that's how the site will be altered.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, so should that be surfaces, or do they really means services?

Mr. Hirano: I think it's surfaces, yeah. Surfaces, not services. Sorry.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay. Okay. That makes more sense. Thank you. Also, going back to the construction workers, how many and from where?

Mr. Chun: Most of the – you know, we're in the process of starting to talk to contractors, and obviously, you know, there's not the size and expertise on island. And so all the contractors and the men, and the working men will probably come from off island. I'm guessing probably in Honolulu, or in some cases Maui. Don't have an exact count, but it could be probably 75 to 100 people.

Ms. Zigmond: Thank you on that. On page 25, we talk about onsite safety protocols. What are they? The second to the last paragraph.

Mr. Lambert: Mark Lambert, IDE. I'm presuming you're speaking of during the operation of the desalination facility?

Ms. McCrory: Yeah. The statement – Lynn McCrory – the statement says the proposed project will have onsite safety protocols as well as personnel trained to address health and safety issues associated with operations of the water treatment facility.

Mr. Lambert: Yeah, as part of our normal operations and maintenance manual which will be drafted specifically for this project. And our people are doing supervisory training of John's staff who will operate the plant. There is a range of issues ranging from entry and security to compliance with the data control SCADA system as we call it, chemical, safety and storage protocols. There's, you know, 100s of pages of safety protocols, and this is what we're expert

at. Does that answer your question?

Ms. Zigmond: Yes. Thank you. Associated, who is the private security?

Mr. Lambert: That won't have been identified yet, but it will be somebody that the water . . . (inaudible) . . . will identify as a subcontractor to them.

Mr. Ornellas: Mark? Before you go, according to this it will be six to 10 people hired to run this plant?

Mr. Lambert: That's correct.

Mr. Ornellas: Will – I think we talked about this eight months ago about you training local people to run this plant. Is that still to go?

Mr. Lambert: That's still to go. We will be here to facilitate the training of local people, and the six to 10 assumes the 24/7 operational shifts. So roughly two to three people per shift. During the day time, typically two operating staff during that swing and night shifts.

Mr. Ornellas: And when will –. Well, I guess we're gonna start pumping within the next year so –

Ms. McCrory: 16. 2016.

Mr. Ornellas: 2016. When are we going to start training these people? I mean, onsite training would be best if they went to one of your facilities and learned how.

Mr. Lambert: You could do it either way. There's a lot of questions to come and visit a facility and I certainly welcome any invitees that want to come to a facility. But I would suggest that the easiest way for you to see an operating facility is to wait for the six weeks or eight weeks from now when the pilot will be operational and drive up the road and see that one in operation here.

Mr. Ornellas: And they – you can use that as a training facility for –

Mr. Lambert: Absolutely.

Mr. Ornellas: – our local people?

Mr. Lambert: Yup.

Mr. Ornellas: Great. Thank you. Bev, you have anymore?

Ms. Zigmond: Yes, please. Page 26, under environmental impacts, it talks about the noise standards. Can you speak to that just briefly please? What are, what are they?

Ms. Ka'iulani Sodaro: Aloha kakou. My name is Ka'iulani Sodaro. On the noise, the zoning that we're in is agriculture so it's 70 DBA, or decibel requirement for ag at the property line. Obviously we are aware of Manele residents and so we are designing to be below that.

Mr. Hirano: Mich Hirano with Munekiyo & Hiraga. The other noise abating mitigation that will be carried out at the facility that – you know these generators will have mufflers on them and that will sort mitigate sound so they'll be equipped with mufflers.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Zigmond: Thank you. I don't think I'll, I'll hear it, but I worry about Dave Green.

Mr. Ornellas: Dave Green. Dave Green might hear it.

Ms. Zigmond: I bet. So then when they talk about exhaust stack height. What's the height and what's going to be emitted?

Mr. Hirano: The exhaust stack height is 40 feet, and that's a permitted height within the ag district. In terms of what is being emitted, Ka'iulani.

Ms. Sodaro: Ka'iulani Sodaro again. So the EPA regulates air permits which covers a set list of emissions, and so as part of our gen sets we are complying with what would be required. The primary emission that everybody's concerned about is referred to as NOX, which is nitroxide. So we are – they are regulated. So we wouldn't be able to operate the facility if we didn't meet the EPA standard. We can provide, you know, that published list. I don't have that now. We have – we're configuring our gen sets as we speak, and so what you have before you, you know, is just a potential configuration in size, like how Arlan mentioned. But we're not running at that peak. It's operating on a lower threshold, so we could always get the EPA standard requirements to you. But that's all published, and that's online.

Mr. Ornellas: Anymore Bev?

Ms. Zigmond: On exhibit A, page 3, the exhibits are kind of funky the way they're, they're labeled. Sorry. I have exhibit A, page 3, it talks about the water source, and I'm wondering if that's potable and from where? So it says item B providing an adequate water source at the site prior to start up of construction activities. I was wondering if that's potable water and where's it coming from?

Ms. McCrory: I'm sorry once more. We've got the page. And the question? Bev, could you give the question again? I'm sorry.

Ms. Zigmond: Sure, it says to provide an adequate water source at the site prior to start up of construction. I was wondering where the water's coming from, and is it potable water for item B?

Mr. Chun: Arlan Chun. I think this would be either potable or brackish because this is really for dust control.

Ms. McCrory: It would be coming from the brackish wells would be my first guess that are down in Manele that they use now.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, but not the potable?

Ms. McCrory: No.

Ms. Zigmond: And then on page 10 of that it says, under the next to the last response, it says promote the collection of reusable and recyclable materials. So is there a plan for recycling construction materials?

Ms. McCrory: I would, I would – part of the recycling would come from – John was talking about the containers where the bleachers, that would be something that would be recycled. Construction materials would be, should be included and at this point shouldn't be recycled because it's new construction. There may be smaller – I mean, I'm thinking of like lumber where you don't need something that's eight feet long, but you needed it six long, and there would be that two foot board, and that could certainly go into one of the chippers to create mulch easily enough.

Ms. Zigmond: Yeah because it's talking about developing solid waste management plans to ensure proper handling of wastes, so it's just these big containers with the bleach in it?

Mr. Hirano: Part of the, part of the, I think the reference to that is, in construction, that there will be bi-products ends of some of the materials, and those will be as much as possible recycled. So I think it's during construction – this is new construction. It's not reusing recyclable material. But what of any bi-product or waste product during construction will be recycled as much as possible and that's frequently too.

Ms. McCrory: And then also like the containers that the LNG is in will be returned and then brought back filled again, so those would be recyclable.

Ms. Zigmond: And why a siren for civil defense?

Mr. Hirano: Again, during the agency review it went to the State Civil Defense and their comment was that they would like to put a siren at the facility. I think it was a convenient location for them in terms of, you know, their, their needs. And so it wasn't because of the operations itself, but it was their needs and they thought it would be a good spot for a siren.

Ms. McCrory: It wasn't a warning system for the facility.

Ms. Zigmond: In the Planning Department recommendations it says to do this until 2044. Is that a typo or are you really asking for a 30 year permit?



Mr. Hirano: This is a permit. It's a State Special Use Permit. It has a, you know, a life time or life term. And I think in order to give the Pulama Lana'i some assurance that they can operate for a period of time to, you know, be able recover the cost, the whole effort of doing this that they wanted an operational span that it was, you know, reasonable, but yet, within the rules of this Special Use Permit. So 30 years is a, is a typical span that the Planning Department has been giving for Special Use Permits especially on those that require, you know, long term sort of use. We've had quarries that have been permitted for Special Use for 30 years. And heavy, heavy kind of operations, they've been going for a longer period of time.

Mr. Ornellas: Would you guys object to a 10 year review? Think about it. Any, Bev, any questions? Any more questions?

Ms. Zigmond: Yes please.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you Bev.

Ms. McCrory: If we're – Lynn McCrory. I would –. If we are giving you status reports on a regular basis that you are seeing, that would not be adequate? I mean, you would, you would be looking at them, as we were talking, quarterly, where you would see the water quality, you would see the temperatures and all of the other pieces that are going. We're talking also about renewable as that's occurring. You would be seeing that's increasing as it's going forward.

Mr. Ornellas: Let me ask the County. If things start to head south, what is our recourse? Does the Planning Commission have a recourse? Can we call Department of Health?

Mr. Hirano: Can I? I think there are a number of sort of checks and balances in this process. First there's the continuous reporting that's being done to the Safe Water Drinking Branch so operations and quality of the, of the facility is, you know, going to be monitored. Under the State Land Use Special Use Permit, there are certain, there are as well rules and regulations that govern your compliance with the State Special Use Permit. And if those are not being followed then as you can see in, in the conditions there's a couple of steps where there's a fine and then there's a remedial period to, you know, correct any infraction of that permit, or the rules and regulations of the State Land Use Special Use Permit. So I think those are two checks and balances that would sort of be for this facility.

Ms. McCrory: Let me get John back up.

Mr. Stubbart: John Stubbart, Director of Utilities. This will also be on the – this is a source just like our other wells, and so we will be reporting on the periodic water report every 28 days for the items that they ask for – volume, pumpage from each well resource, the water levels, water chlorides, temperature. So we'll get with all those the – being recorded also that comes to this group.

Mr. Ornellas: And also to LWAC?

Mr. Stubbart: Yeah. It comes to the members of LWAC right now, periodic water report. Department of Health, Commission on Water Resource Management, and a bunch of other people including the County Planning Department.

Mr. Ornellas: Great. Thank you.

Ms. McCrory: So there's this –

Mr. Ornellas: Bev? Go ahead.

Ms. McCrory: Lynn McCrory. There's consistent reporting.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Bev?

Ms. Zigmond: Okay. It says under standard conditions subject to further extension by the Planning Director. Why wouldn't that come before this body?

Mr. Ornellas: What page is this?

Ms. Zigmond: It is page 2 of the Planning Department's – it's after exhibit 13. I don't see where the page one is, but any ways, it's page 2. It's standard condition one. I hope to heavens I'm no here in 30 years, but I think that whoever is, maybe your son Kelli, be here.

Mr. Yoshida: So you're talking about number two of the standard conditions? Number one? Oh, that it would be for 30 years?

Ms. Zigmond: No, no. It says that, that any extension would be by the Planning Director.

Mr. Yoshida: Typically I mean, you know, if the Commission wants to say that extension should be granted by the Commission that's, you know, their, their authority. But in the interest of streamlining, you know, the Director, it's handled administratively.

Ms. Zigmond: That could be –

Mr. Yoshida: It's more efficient.

Ms. Zigmond: – a project specific condition perhaps. So as we think about those. One last question, all the heavy equipment that's going to be moved around and the big pieces and stuff, like, is it coming in from the barge, and how is it going to get to the site?

Mr. Chun: All the equipment would be on trailers and then down the, the access road.

Mr. Ornellas: Bev, you're done? You okay? Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: In phase one you are utilizing 14.95 acres. In phase two, will that be an expansion,

internal or external?

Mr. Chun: Arlan Chun, Pulama Lana'i. That would be internal. The site plan and everything that's being designed is being designed for the ultimate. But we're only starting out with the, the phase one, and we intend to grow within that 14.95 acres.

Ms. Aoki: So together, phase one and phase two will not exceed the 15 acres.

Mr. Chun: No. So our, so our – you know the desal trains all come in modules and the building is being designed so that we can house the full, all the modules for the full build out.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. And then in the, in the Planning Department's conditions, page 4, project specific conditions number 10, it indicates a storm water best management practices plan. Do you have one in place already? Are you developing that? And if you are developing it, will you be working with the community on that as well?

Mr. Hirano: The storm water best management practices plan is usually prepared during the grading permit process and building permit. It gets reviewed during that time. R.M. Towill Corporation is the civil engineer for the project and they'll be developing that during the, you know, when they do the design. If there is input that the community wants to give maybe you can give it to Lynn and go through.

Ms. McCrory: We can do that.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. I think that's very important particularly for our residents at Manele Bay Project District because they experience torrential floods and we want to ensure that we minimize runoff. And on that note, are you doing any type of baseline studies and documenting the reef and coastal areas along the southeastern coastline of Lana'i just to get pictures of what it looks like and how it looks in progression over time particularly the coral?

Mr. Ornellas: Southeast? Who you talking about?

Ms. Aoki: Excuse me. Along the coastline, below the, the projected development site.

Mr. Ornellas: East of Manele? Lopa? Is that what you're talking about?

Ms. Aoki: No, I'm just talking about just below the desal plant. So south of the desal plant.

Ms. McCrory: Lynn McCrory. We haven't done photos at this point, but we can. Yeah, we can do photos.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. And I think that would address – Mr. Harvey left already – but he didn't feel like his question was answered. He's very concerned about the fish in that area because he frequents that area. And that maybe good documentation for the community so they can see the result overtime, and it would also give us good record keeping on what the conditions of the

coral and our sea life is in that coastal area. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Mr. Oshiro?

Mr. Oshiro: A real simple one. Page 23, parks. But anyway, page 23 on parks, can somebody tell me where Kaunalapau Highway and Fraser Avenue park is?

Ms. McCrory: Yeah, it's right at the corner. It is zoned park. It's the biggest piece of grass you have seen, and...and there's a fire station right next door.

Mr. Oshiro: Yeah but where's – where's Fraser Avenue park?

Ms. McCrory: It's Fraser and Kaunalapau. It's that corner.

Mr. Oshiro: No, no, no. You've got Fraser Avenue, park, and then you say and Kaunalapau, Fraser Avenue park.

Ms. McCrory: I think it's the combination. Kaunalapau –

Mr. Ornellas: No. Excuse me. It's the little plot of land below Iwiolo. That is a County park. Even though there's nothing there, it is considered a County park.

Ms. McCrory: Okay. I'll take your word for it. There's a block of land.

Mr. Ornellas: Anybody else? Joelle? Kelli? Stacie? Stu? Okay. I do have a few. A lot of my questions did get answered so --. I'm pretty, I'm surprised that, that there was no comment by the County's Department of Environmental Management. And also the Department of Natural Land and Resources, there was no comment. You know, and these guys have, have something –

Mr. Hirano: I think –

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Mr. Hirano: Chair Ornellas, I think they did respond, but there was no comment. They didn't have a comment. But they did respond. They reviewed it, and they didn't have any comments.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. And then also –

Ms. Thomson: And just regarding a response from Department of Environmental Management, they would be commenting on waste water and solid waste issues, and I understand they just didn't have a comment.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. And then also whenever we talk about water in this, LWAC is not mentioned, so anytime we talk about water in this, I want LWAC mentioned and be part of the

discussion. That's the community's – that's one way of keeping the community involved in the process. Okay?

Ms. McCrory: In the reporting piece?

Mr. Ornellas: Yes.

Ms. McCrory: Lynn McCrory.

Mr. Ornellas: And for the Manele homeowners down there. No helo pads? Helicopter pads down there? I don't want to get phone calls in the middle of the night wondering why all of these helicopters are flying around. And then Kepa – Kepa, cultural training will continue with these new – just nod, you don't have to say anything – but you will continue to do training with these new employees that are coming in with these contractors? Thank you. And then also – I'm sorry that Pat left, but, you know, he's got, he's got this 10 year, 15 year thing about the, the fiber optic that comes to Manele Bay, but doesn't go anywhere from there. Will you guys be using fiber optics to manage this, this facility and maybe you can run it up the hill a little bit for our community to get benefits?

Mr. Chun: You know, one of the long term goals for us is to distribute fiber around the island. This would probably be one of the facilities that would probably qualify for that because you know the SCADA reporting and the SCADA system for this we're gonna want to be able to monitor that back in Lana'i City. So as – so one of the things we're doing as we open up trenches we're going to start adding conduits that we can at least, you know, we're already there doing piping work and what not, we can always easily add another conduit or fiber. So at some point, yes, I think we will. I can't guarantee if this going to be tied to Lana'i City, but that's the ultimate goal. So the, the island is networked.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, great. Thank you. Anybody no more questions let's –. I want to open it up one more time for the, for the public if they've got any more questions about what they've heard so far.

Ms. Gima: I have a quick question.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Gima: Are we scheduled to –? What time are we scheduled to go till tonight?

Mr. Ornellas: These guys are staying overnight.

Ms. Gima: No, I understand that, but what time are we told are we going to be scheduled to? I'm not staying here until 11 o'clock at night.

Mr. Ornellas: Nine? 9:30? Nine o'clock. We've got, we've got –. Let's finish, let's finish this and then we have a few more other things on the agenda that we need to get through. Because

our normal time is – only reason why the normal time was 8:30 was because these guys had to catch a flight. That's not happening anymore. Alright, so public hearing. Go ahead. Please come up.

Mr. Tajiri: Do we know the max, the max in, intake that we can do? In that, like, how quickly the, it refills, what was been taken out from the ocean?

Mr. Stubbart: The – John Stubbart – the – because we're drawing from the ocean, we've tested the withdraw and the response when we've done pumping test up to – Tom Nance our hydro geologist here – we've done our pumping test up to 3,500 G.P.M., gallons per minute. And we saw some draw down but it indicated that we were drawing from the ocean and the response time was quick. One or two minutes for recovery. So that told us number one we're in the ocean. We're in the sea water and we have a very porous rock material that was allowing the water to immediately recharge. And so every time, each of the wells we drill, we do the same testing to confirm water quality in response, and then the demand curve of the capacity of that water resource.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Anyone else in the community would like to say something please come forward. If not, we'll close public testimony. And then I'd like to, I would like to get a motion to approve, disapprove this project.

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: We have received a whole lot information which needs to percolated through our brains. I think it is important that we put on, and we carefully think about because this is going to be for 30 years, our project specific conditions. And therefore, I am making a motion that we defer.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, hearing the motion to defer. Do I have a second?

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: I second that motion.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Any discussion? Any more discussion?

Mr. Yoshida: Again, as experienced in the past when the Commission has moved to defer we need to know exactly what additional information the Commission needs so that we can – and from whom – so it can be provided at the next meeting.

Ms. Zigmond: Clayton, I think if anybody has that, but I think more, for me, any ways, it's time. It's some additional time to assimilate to read the minutes to have a – if they're in front of me as I formulate those project specific conditions. So if you want to put a limit on anybody asking for additional information, you know, what you have done in the past, that's good. But for me it's just time to really think about this. Like I said, 30 years is no – I mean, it's pretty long and

it's a big, albeit important and necessary, but it's still a really huge project that most of us aren't trained to, to really be knowledgeable in.

Mr. Yoshida: I think – well, if the motion passes, you know, I think, we would like to know, the applicant would like to know, what additional information do you need so that it can be provided at the next meeting so that you can make a decision.

Ms. Thomson: And just to add to that, you might be able to formulate, from what you've heard tonight, you might be able to walk through some of the project specific conditions so that you can, you know, tell the applicant or the Planning Department what exactly you might be missing so you can formulate the project specific conditions that you were discussing. So if there's some data that you're missing or a person that you'd like to hear from. They may be here tonight or they can be invited back if they're not here, or invite them if they're not here. But I think they brought the whole team.

Ms. Zigmond: Like for me personally, again, it's not so much that I still have unanswered questions as I need for it to percolate through my head.

Ms. Aoki: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Aoki: Joelle Aoki. I have some information that I'd to . . . (inaudible) . . . and it was the request for the temperature readings, the measurements. I'd like to see the baseline data and the water quality reports that you're going to be utilizing moving forward with this project. And I believe that was reflected in the minutes when we received our original presentation by IDE was to see that report and that you're gathering that information. For me, personally, that's what I would like to see, please. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: John, please come up. Well, she's passing the baton.

Mr. Stubbart: John Stubbart. Can you specify the quality data ground water offshore?

Ms. Aoki: I would like to see of shore, particularly, with the water temperature measurements that we requested on your initial presentation.

Mr. Stubbart: So the off shore data. You referenced IDE.

Ms. Aoki: When they did their presentation for us. It's reflected in the minutes that I had requested for that data to be provided prior to approval of the, of the permit request.

Mr. Stubbart: Okay.

Ms. Aoki: And if you could provide that for us I would appreciate it.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Gima: I have a –

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Gima: So we would be expected tonight to be able to take in all of this information, process all of this information, and be able to come up with conditions tonight? That would be expected of us? We wouldn't be able to take all that was discussed in almost four hours, sit on it, and really not feel rushed to come up with project specific conditions? We would be expected to do that tonight? No, but they're saying like you have to have this in order to defer. You have to ask questions in order to defer. So I'm asking if we wanted to defer based upon being able to put more time in to coming up with our conditions.

Mr. Yoshida: If that's what the commission wants, that's fine. We just – if it knows now what additional information you'll need to make a decision, or if it desires to make a site inspection. Because we don't want to go to the next meeting and say, oh well we gotta defer because we need to make a site inspection. If you know that now, you know, let's put it on the table. If you don't, then, you know, we won't do a site inspection.

Ms. Gima: Okay, no. And I was just asking because it sounded like we had – if we were choosing to defer we would have to be able to ask for additional information. I'm asking if it's other reasons we can defer, or not just needing more information.

Mr. Yoshida: Well if there's specific information that the commission needs –

Ms. Gima: Right, then we will ask.

Mr. Yoshida: – in order for it to feel more comfortable making a decision at the next meeting, then, you know, we'd kind of like to know that now because you're here as a body rather than individual commissioners.

Ms. Gima: Right.

Mr. Oshiro: Okay. You know, for one, one thing I wanted, though, I would want to see, okay, would be the access road. Because if like they just filling in pot holes, that road is not safe especially if you going to be hauling heavy equipment down there. It's not safe. There's no runoff. There's no place you can runoff a truck off of there if the brakes give or they miss a gear. You know, I want to see something like that before I make a decision.

Ms. Thomson: Sorry. You can include that a project specific condition.

Ms. Aoki: Mr. Chair? Joelle Aoki. May I please request for a site visit for the Lana'i Planning Commission? Thank you. The project desal phase one project site.



Ms. McCrory: Joelle? Lynn McCrory. You're also looking to see –

Mr. Ornellas: Let's get Corp Counsel involved in this idea because there's, there's some things that we have to do if we all want to go down and go do a site visit. Hang on.

Ms. Thomson: So for a site visit, it is a meeting, if you are going to have more than quorum go. You could form a special investigative committee that's less than quorum that can go and then report back. But it sounds, it sounds to me like all of you or most of you want to actually go take a look at the site. So to prevent like Clayton was saying from doing, you know, maybe multiple site visits. If all of you want to go, we, we would schedule two meetings on the same day probably. One of them would be the site visit and then we'd follow it up with a regular commission meeting.

Mr. Ornellas: Pulama, what if we did, like, two? Two site visits?

Ms. McCrory: Can we do that?

Mr. Ornellas: I mean, there's no quorum if we do two site visits.

Ms. Thomson: It's getting a bit around the spirit of the sunshine law. So it would, it would be – it's not that arduous to get you all together and do a meeting. I mean, it's really, we have to notice it, and the public can, you know, come if they want to. And generally we try to, you know, limit the questions so that it makes taking minutes a little bit easier, and then we do your questions when you get into a meeting portion like this so that it's more conducive to recording.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, so you guys interested in doing a site visit at the, at our next meeting? Okay, so you guys are willing to take off in the afternoon and go do this? Okay. Is that –? Okay. Okay, so can you guys come, can you guys come early on the next?

Ms. Thomson: And do you, do you want any of the – which members of the group would you like present at the site visit if they're available?

Mr. Ornellas: Byron wants to come back. Arlan Chun, Lynn, Mich. Anybody else you want to show up? John Stubbart. No, I'm asking these guys. I know you don't want to show up. But that would be –? Anybody else you guys want to talk stories with when we go down there?

Ms. McCrory: Ka'iulani.

Mr. Ornellas: Ka'iulani. Alright. Anybody else? IDE? The IDE guys? The guy that's building the facility?

Mr. Lambert: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, Mark. Thank you. Okay, and then IDE. Is that okay with –? Mark said he'd love to come back. This is going to be our next meeting is scheduled for May 21<sup>st</sup>. That's

a –.

Mr. Lambert:. . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: We have sunshine law. They got to be posted seven days in advance, so sorry. The County's the one that's gonna have to come and staff it, so you guys willing to come over early? They, they may, they have other things to do other than keep us happy. The Planning Department. Because they have to staff the meeting. Okay? Okay. Yeah, we're gonna –. This is part of the discussion to defer, but we have to make sure we have a meeting. And one of, one of the items that we have to provide is exceptions and the reason why we're deferring. So one of those items is a site visit. Okay, so these guys are gonna have to come over early to, to facilitate this meeting.

Ms. Koanui Nefalar: So my questions on top of that is if they are not able to come at that time, does it get deferred to the following, June meeting?

Mr. Yoshida: We'll come earlier, just tell us what time.

Mr. Ornellas: David you have something to say, I know. Is there something we're missing? I'm just asking that's all. Alright. Okay, let us hear it. This is a little out of the ordinary, but –

Mr. Green: Dave Green. Resident. It seemed to me what most of you're concerned about is coming up with project specific conditions, so I was going to suggest why don't you vote to approve the project or not approve the project tonight, and at your next meeting you work on the project specific conditions.

Ms. Zigmond: Dave, that's really not a good idea.

Mr. Green: I thought it was a good idea.

Ms. Zigmond: Well, I'm sure you –

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Great. Thank you Dave for you input. Alright, so we will, we will schedule the Planning Department to come over on –. Would we be able to do –? Will we be able to get you guys like about two o'clock on the --? Members, would you have any objections to start this at two o'clock in the afternoon? Stu, are you okay at two o'clock on the 21<sup>st</sup>? Okay, so, no objections, then let's get back to the –. Does that satisfy the County as far as the deferment? That the motion that we have on the floor is to defer till the next meeting. Does that, does that satisfy your requirements?

Mr. Yoshida: Well, you know, that's, that's fine. Whatever direction the Commission can give to us so we can be prepared and the applicant can be prepared at the next meeting to provide the answers to the Commissions' concerns and questions.

Ms. Thomson: And I would highly encourage all of you to take a look, you know, through the,

through the conditions as they're written, and, and try to formulate your questions or your conditions that you are concerned about. So when you come to the next meeting that you're able to use each other and formulate some very strong conditions if that's where you want to go.

Mr. Ornellas: Is there a way, is there a way the members have their conditions formulated before, like a week before the meeting so we have an idea what these conditions are so we don't spend the whole night discussing this again on the 21<sup>st</sup>?

Ms. Thomson: Unfortunately we can't distribute those. You know, the Planning Department could compile them, so that, you know, if you wanted to send them all in to staff and they can compile them for the meeting. But we can't distribute them to each other, you know, the members, prior to.

Ms. Zigmond: And I think part of our conditions might come from the, the, the site visit, so I don't think we can really do that a week ahead.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Alright, so let's get back to the motion that is on the floor and that is to defer, defer the, this decision until our next meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> of May. Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: Mr. Chair, I have conditions that I'm ready to go with, so if it's alright with the others, maybe, if we have some ready we can send them ahead of time what we do have. And then that way when we go to our site visit we can develop more. Or do you want it to be all given to you at one time?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead and send it to the Planning Department. They'll, they'll start, they'll start collecting them. I mean, it doesn't hurt the –

Ms. Zigmond: But I thought we can't all see them. You can't, you can't distribute them.

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah, but you'll be able to see them the day of the meeting, or seven days before when you get your packet.

Ms. Aoki: I'll just wait. It's okay.

Ms. Thomson: I was going to say, if you have, you know, as part of the discussion on this motion if you have your list of either conditions or areas of concern that, that might inform the discussion for next time too.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, so vote on, on deferring this, this item until our next meeting.

Ms. Aoki: Mr. Chair, you still have a motion on the floor.

Mr. Ornellas: That's what –. She second it. So, this is the discussion. Okay, all in favor of the motion to defer raise your hand. Five. Good enough, so we'll defer.

**It was moved by Commissioner Beverly Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Stacie Koanui Nefalar, then**

**VOTED: to defer.**

**(Assenting: J. Aoki, K. Gima, S. Koanui Nefalar, B. Oshiro, B. Zigmond**

**Dissenting: S. Marlowe**

**Excused: S. Barfield)**

## **F. COMMUNICATIONS**

- 1. February 6, 2014 Third Quarter Report (June to August 2013) submitted by LYNN MCCRORY, Senior Vice-President of Governmental Affairs, PULAMA LANA'I regarding the project irrigation demand associated with the Residential and Multi-Family Development at Manele, TMK: 4-9-017:001, 002, 003, 004, 005, and 4-9-002:049, Manele, Island of Lana'i. (95/SM1-015) (95/PH2-001) (B. Sticka) (Previously circulated with the February 19, 2014 agenda packet.)**

**The Commission may provide its comments on the report.**

- 2. February 7, 2014 Fourth Quarter Report (August to December 2013) submitted by LYNN MCCRORY, Senior Vice-President of Governmental Affairs, PULAMA LANA'I regarding the project irrigation demand associated with the Residential and Multi-Family Development at Manele, TMK: 4-9-017:001, 002, 003, 004, 005, and 4-9-002:049, Manele, Island of Lana'i. (95/SM1-015) (95/PH2-001) (B. Sticka) (Previously circulated with the February 19, 2014 agenda packet.)**

**The Commission may provide its comments on the report.**

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, moving on to the next one, F1, F2, I'd like to defer to next meeting also since it's just, it's just comments on the two reports. I do want us to get the next item which is Mary's, Long Range Planning for our CPAC meeting. We need to establish – establish our meeting schedule. And then Pulama, can you, can you just send us your project updates? Mary, you got it?

- 3. Approval of a revised meeting schedule to discuss recommended revisions to the 1998 Lana'i Community Plan.**

**The commission may take action on the proposed revised meeting schedule.**

Ms. Mary Jorgensen: You have two pieces that were – one was inside with your packet which is chapter topics, and then also distributed just tonight there's a calendar view. It's the same information but just shown on a calendar chart. And these pieces are to. . . (inaudible) . . . Planning Commission's meeting on the Lana'i Community Plan.

Mr. Ornellas: Can we take – excuse me Mary – can we take conversations outside please? We're still trying to conduct business. Thank you.

Ms. Jorgensen: . . . (Inaudible) . . . update that you've been working on that was delayed now for . . . (inaudible) . . . And the meeting dates that you already arranged in May were four and five, May 7 and . . . (*Due to mechanical problems with the microphone, portions of this section was not recorded.*) . . . Actions that you can send through e-mail, that would work as well.

So then getting into new dates in order to keep going on this, we had at one time on March 15<sup>th</sup>, we were going to have a Saturday workshop. That would be the Land Use and Urban Design, and we're proposing for both options that that would be June 21<sup>st</sup>. And part of the reason and the way the schedule is is that we still don't have any new staff so it may look like a little longer in the way that it's spread out. But if we do have any extra time, we hope to take what we've – has already happened at the meetings to be able to incorporate that into the, the draft that will eventually become the Planning Commission's draft. So that's sort of built in there. So we're both trying to make the revisions for your draft as well as conduct these meetings. So then – then the options change a little bit in July, and that's more on your availability. So, you know, the, the June 21<sup>st</sup> date is also on your availability as well, but we could either, since that topic is fairly straightforward on Housing, Governments and Implementation we could do either date as far as the Planning Department, but it would be on your availability. So do you want to look at just those first dates and see how we're doing, like, the June 21<sup>st</sup> date, does that work for everyone or enough of you that we have a quorum?

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, members? Okay.

Ms. Zigmond: I'm not here May 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Ornellas: Well, that's three.

Ms. Jorgensen: Is there another date that would work perhaps? Yeah, because – Well, unfortunately this calendar look like, it's in white, but it would be June 28<sup>th</sup>, would that work? It would be the nine to three, Saturday meeting. Okay. So everybody's okay with the 28<sup>th</sup>? Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: 28<sup>th</sup> is okay. Yes, the 28<sup>th</sup> – it's a Saturday meeting.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. So, so since we're moving out a little bit on that, let's look first at the beginning of July. Perhaps the, the July 9<sup>th</sup> would work a little better so they're not right next to each other. July 9<sup>th</sup>, does that work with everyone?

Mr. Ornellas: That's fine. That's fine with me.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. So we'll go with that. And –

Mr. Ornellas: Bev, you okay with the 9<sup>th</sup>? Okay, so the 9<sup>th</sup> is okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, so then...then we get into review. You'll see on the July calendar a big block that's a darker gray going from the 8<sup>th</sup> through the 31<sup>st</sup>, and that's when this plan would be out at agencies to get review of everything that you have done so far, and, and, and see the revised draft. And what we're trying to do is instead of it coming out at the end of this with a Planning Commission draft and then a month later coming out with the Planning Department draft so there's two different drafts, we're trying to bring the both of those together similar to the draft that you have here. That's the CPAC draft with – well, you don't have it tonight, sorry – the CPAC draft with the department's comments in it, but we want to get that all merged into one document if possible. So, so you'd be meeting in late July and August looking at that, that reviewed draft and –

Mr. Ornellas: Mary, I'd love to be here with you on the 30<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Jorgensen: But you can't.

Mr. Ornellas: But we're not gonna be here. Joelle and I won't be here.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. 23<sup>rd</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> don't work. Okay, how about –

Mr. Ornellas: The 6<sup>th</sup> of August?

Ms. Jorgensen: 6<sup>th</sup> of August for people?

Mr. Ornellas: How's that? Does that sound okay, 6<sup>th</sup> of August? Kels? Kelli? Okay, 6<sup>th</sup> of August is – any objections anybody? Instead of July 23<sup>rd</sup> or the 30<sup>th</sup>, we'll do it 6<sup>th</sup> of August. Yeah, it's 5:30 to when evers. Hey, we'll talk about it.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, so that, the 6<sup>th</sup> of August will replace July 23<sup>rd</sup> or July 30<sup>th</sup>. Okay, and for the, the last hopefully review meeting would be – it could either be a Saturday meeting on August 16<sup>th</sup>, and the advantage of that would be that if it went long then – if it went three to four hours, well, then you could complete the plan by having it on a Saturday, we can –. You know if we finish early, great.

Mr. Ornellas: So, yeah, the 16<sup>th</sup> or the 23<sup>rd</sup> is okay with you?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, the 16<sup>th</sup> or the 23<sup>rd</sup>, if you want to do it on a Saturday.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, members? 23<sup>rd</sup>? 23<sup>rd</sup> is okay? Yeah, 23<sup>rd</sup> of August.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, there's August 6<sup>th</sup> right now, and the 23<sup>rd</sup> of August.

Mr. Ornellas: Kelli, you okay? Alright, so the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: And that would – you think would be the last one?

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, that, that would cover what we originally had on the schedule.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: But just to have --

Mr. Ornellas: A backup.

Ms. Jorgensen: – maybe a last date, yeah, that we can put out there that if we need it we'll use it. And if not, we can certainly drop it. But it's easier to schedule it now. So as you look at the calendar, you could either follow up on the 27<sup>th</sup> because this is when you're just making your final corrections or –

Mr. Ornellas: That would put us with one, two, three, four meetings that week, that month.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, four in August. Or, you could move out into September.

Mr. Ornellas: The 3<sup>rd</sup>?

Ms. Jorgensen: You could do it, you could do it the 3<sup>rd</sup>?

Mr. Ornellas: No? No, September 3<sup>rd</sup> no good?

Ms. Jorgensen: The 17<sup>th</sup> is your regular Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes.

Ms. Jorgensen: You could do two nights in a row that week, or you, if you wanted to. Like do a Thursday night.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so the 17<sup>th</sup> is our regular meeting. Well, I mean, is it, I mean is it objectionable to everybody if we do the 27<sup>th</sup>? Because we may not need the 27<sup>th</sup> of August. You're right it would be four if we have to have that meeting. No, it would be two in a week. It would be the 20<sup>th</sup>, and the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Ms. Zigmond: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: If we need it. If we need it. So it's the 6<sup>th</sup>, and then our regular. The 6<sup>th</sup> is CPAC, 20<sup>th</sup> is regular, 23<sup>rd</sup> is CPAC, and if we need the 27<sup>th</sup> that will be the last CPAC. And we'll be done with it. Okay? Is that – Bev, you okay with that? You have no life. You're like me, we have no life so –. Kelli?

Ms. Zigmond: Just back up a little. I won't be here on May 7<sup>th</sup>. It looks like everybody else will, but I won't.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Alright, we still have –. We'll still stick the way it is. And so the 27<sup>th</sup> if, if need be.

Ms. Jorgensen: If need be.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, just very quickly we have June 28<sup>th</sup> as your first addition.

Mr. Ornellas: Let's, let's go back to the very beginning. So the 7<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Jorgensen: In May.

Mr. Ornellas: May 7<sup>th</sup>, May 28<sup>th</sup>, June 28<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Jorgensen: Right.

Mr. Ornellas: July 9<sup>th</sup>. August 6<sup>th</sup>. August 23<sup>rd</sup>. And if need be, the 27<sup>th</sup>, August 27<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Jorgensen: That's correct. That's what I have. Okay. Well thank you very much. That was great.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

**4. Pulama Lana'i's Upcoming Projects Update - Lynn McCrory, Vice-President of Governmental Affairs, Pulama Lana'i.**

**This is for information purposes only.**

**G. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**1. Open Lana'i Applications Report as distributed by the Planning Department with the April 16, 2014 agenda packet.**



2. **Agenda Items for the May 21, 2014 Lana'i Planning Commission meeting.**
  - a. **Continue the discussion on amending the Special Management Area Rules as suggested by the Chair (Deferred at the November 20, 2013 meeting.)**
  - b. **Public hearing on amendment to Enforcement Section of Short-Term Rental Home Ordinance. (J. Alueta)**

Mr. Ornellas: So, we got that out of the way. And then Lynn will, will send us, will send us that information on upcoming events. And then if you have anything to go on the 21<sup>st</sup>, May 21<sup>st</sup> regular meeting, please let me know and then we can add it to the agenda. Do you have – you want to –

Mr. Yoshida: Okay, we'll May 21<sup>st</sup>, the Commission is going to do its site inspection of the desal plant site at two o'clock. Then we're going to have a 5:30 meeting, and we're going to continue discussion on the desal plant applications, the department has proposed an amendment to the enforcement section of the short-term rental home ordinance, and possibly we would have an exemption for the commission's concurrence. We had planned to have orientation training, but I think we have to put that off while we deal with the matters at hand. So we will get there on an earlier boat on the 21<sup>st</sup> so we can make the site inspection at two o'clock. I guess if the commission, the commissioners had any, you know, questions or proposed conditions about the desal plant they want to go out in the agenda packet, they can submit it by the 9<sup>th</sup> of May. If they want it in the agenda packet, otherwise –. Okay, that's it.

Mr. Ornellas: Stu, you have –? You had something to –? No?

Mr. Marlowe: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Oh, on Mark and –. Yeah, they're still in the hospital. Mark and Doug are still in the hospital. Go ahead.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, this is Mary Jorgensen. Yes, Mark King and Doug Miller are still in the hospital. One's in Oregon and the other is up in Washington, Seattle, at Harbor View, so. Yeah, they're doing, they're doing well. They're making progress on a, on a regular weekly basis and so we're very optimistic that overtime, you know, they'll, they'll be back, come back to the department.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Thank you. Before we go, also we have, we have some money. We want to make sure that if we're going to give to Mary to take back – what's the name of that Pulama Project? Okay, we already collected the money, so have, we have money. Yeah, we can't –. Yeah, James got, James got his delivery. The problem is that the hospital is not allowing because of the family, the family is requesting that the information pertaining to rooms, wards, anything will not be given out. So the Planning Department has a couple of people that are, are relaying things to, to them. So we can either give to Mary and she can give it to those people or we can go to Bank of Hawaii and deposit it. We'll give it to Mary. Alright. Mary, please

accept this on behalf of the Lana'i Planning Commission and hopefully we get to see Doug and Mark in a very near future. I know I talked to James all the time. Yeah, he wants to come back to work. He's better. He's walking around, getting treatment, and so he'll be back soon. Okay, so –. If that's it, then we're out of here. Thank you all for coming. Appreciate it. Aloha.

**H. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MAY 21, 2014**

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further discussion brought forward to the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:10 p.m.

Respectively submitted by,

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

**RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

**PRESENT:**

Joelle Aoki  
Kelli Gima  
Stacie Koanui Nefalar, Vice-Chair  
Stuart Marlowe  
John Ornellas, Chair  
Bradford Oshiro  
Beverly Zigmond

**EXCUSED:**

Shelly Barfield

**OTHERS:**

Clayton Yoshida, Planning Program Administrator, Current Planning Division  
Ben Sticka, Staff Planner, Current Planning Division  
Mary Jorgensen, Staff Planner, Long Range Division  
Richelle Thomson, Deputy Corporation Counsel