

**HANA ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE
MAUI PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF MARCH 9, 2015**

** All documents, including written testimony, that was submitted for or at this meeting are filed in the minutes file and are available for public viewing at the Maui County Department of Planning, 2200 Main St., Suite 315, Wailuku, Maui, Hawai'i. ***

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Hana Advisory Committee (Committee) was called to order by Chairperson, Clayton Carvalho, at approximately 4:16 p.m., Monday, March 9, 2015, at the Old Hana School Cafeteria, 5091 Uakea Road, Hana, Island of Maui.

A quorum of the Committee was present (see Record of Attendance).

Chair Clayton Carvalho: Alright, good afternoon and aloha. Welcome to the hearing for the Hana Advisory Committee to the Maui Planning Commission for March 9, 2015, Monday. My apologies for the late start. Before I'd like to continue, we can introduce everyone on the board. To my far left, we have Anjoleen Hoopai-Waikoloa; next, we have Board Member, Ed Cashman; Board Member, Ward Mardfin; our Deputy Corporation Counsel, Jennifer Oana; to my right, we have Board Member, Ian Ballantyne; Board Member, Scott Crawford; Board Member, John Blumer-Buell; and our Secretary, Suzette Esmeralda. Directly in front of us, we have Planning Program Administrator, Clayton Yoshida.

Before we'd like to start, you have an announcement to make, Clayton?

C. RESOLUTIONS THANKING OUTGOING MEMBERS - IAN BALLANTYNE and EDWARD CASHMAN

Mr. Clayton Yoshida: Good afternoon, Chair Chair and Members of the Hana Advisory Committee. Again, with me from the Planning Department, we have your Secretary to Boards and Commission, Suzie Esmeralda, and the Staff Planner, Sybil Lopez, from Kalamaula, Molokai. So with that, we have -- this is the last meeting for two of the members and we'd like to say thank you to them, there's a letter from the Mayor congratulating them, that's Board Members Ian Ballantyne and Ed Cashman. From the Mayor states:

Congratulations on a job well done. On behalf of the people of the County of Maui, please accept my deepest appreciation and gratitude for your dedication and service on the Hana Advisory Committee. Your efforts and contributions have made a positive difference in our community. I truly believe that it is important for citizens to play an active role in government.

The process of recruiting and selecting nominees to the various Maui County boards and commissions has given me a greater appreciation for volunteerism and community service. I would like to commend you for your willingness to devote your time, energy, resources, and insight to the betterment of Maui County.

Once again, thank you very much for doing your part to make our county the best it can be. I hope that your experience has been rewarding and meaningful.

Sincerely, Alan M. Arakawa, Mayor, County of Maui.

Mr. Yoshida: There also is a certificate signed by the Mayor for Mr. Ballantyne and Mr. Cashman, and then we have the Resolutions of the Hana Advisory Committee to the Maui Planning Commission. The first one for Ian Ballantyne reads:

Whereas, Ian Ballantyne has served the County of Maui since January 2012, as a member of the Hana Advisory Committee to the Maui Planning Commission; and

Whereas, Mr. Ballantyne has served with distinction and has performed his duties in the highest professional manner with the Hana Advisory Committee; and

Whereas, Mr. Ballantyne's term of office expires on March 31, 2015; now therefore, Be it resolved that the Hana Advisory Committee and the Maui Planning Commission hereby commends Mr. Ballantyne for his dedication and untiring public service to the people of Hana; and

Furthermore, be it resolved that the Hana Advisory Committee and the Maui Planning Commission express their sincere appreciation for Mr. Ballantyne's services and extend their best wishes in his future endeavors; and

Furthermore, be it resolved that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Alan M. Arakawa, Mayor of the County of Maui; the Honorable Mike White, Council Chair of the Maui County Council; and Ivan Lay, Chair of the Maui Planning Commission.

Mr. Yoshida: So if you could sign this resolution for Ian Ballantyne. Okay, we have another Resolution of the Hana Advisory Committee to the Maui Planning Commission thanking Edward Cashman:

Whereas, Edward Cashman has served the County of Maui since December 2010, as a member of the Hana Advisory Committee to the Maui Planning Commission; and

Whereas, Mr. Cashman has served with distinction and has performed his duties in the highest professional manner with the Hana Advisory Committee; and

Whereas, Mr. Cashman's term of office expires on March 31, 2015; now therefore,

Be it resolved that the Hana Advisory Committee and the Maui Planning Commission hereby commends Mr. Cashman for his dedication and untiring public service to the people of Hana; and

Furthermore, be it resolved that the Hana Advisory Committee and the Maui Planning Commission express their sincere appreciation for Mr. Cashman's services and extend their best wishes in his future endeavors; and

Furthermore, be it resolved that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Alan M. Arakawa, Mayor of the County of Maui; the Honorable Mike White, Council Chair of the Maui County Council; and Ivan Lay, Chair of the Maui Planning Commission.

Mr. Yoshida: So if you could sign the Resolution for Ed Cashman. We do have the audience I guess the two people who will be joining the commission -- Committee next month, and that's Dawn Lono and Gale Notestone, so -- so they're taking notes.

And I guess we have to sort of end the meeting around 7:30ish 'cause they're gonna -- there's -- State Department of Transportation is doing needed road work on the Hana Highway. We have the district engineer, Mr. Cajjigal here, and they will start work at 9:00 this evening, so we have to --

Mr. Cajjigal: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Mr. Yoshida: Okay, thank you. So we got an extra hour. So we're moving to the approval of minutes of the December 11, 2014 meeting.

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chair Carvalho: We glossed over agenda item B, sorry. If we have any public testimony for any of the items that are going to be presented, you can speak now, if you'd like; you don't have to wait for the agenda item to be passed. If someone would like to testify now? No? Okay.

Ms. Dawn Lono: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Chair Carvalho: Yes. Yeah, it's just right now this is more if you don't -- you have to leave early. Yeah.

Ms. Lono: Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: No problem. If you'd like to come forward and please state your name. Thank you.

Mr. Perry Betinors: My name is Perry Betinors. I'm a retired park ranger with Haleakala National Park, and right now, I'm the helicopter operations manager for the Maui Invasive Species Committee. What I'd like to talk about is how Tom has helped the National Park Service and the Maui Invasive Species Committee. I manage helicopters and what we do is we take care of invasive species, like Miconia and things like that, so we lost our landing zones with Hana Ranch and we were looking around for places where we could land the aircraft. Our project takes care of the Miconia in the Hana District, about a thousand acres of Miconia that is so crowded that it's just killing the native forest, where only the Miconia can grow. So Tom let us use his area for our LZs, which works our perfect. This has been a project that the Park Service and Maui Invasive Species has been working with since about 2010, and if we stop, it's kinda like letting go of the rope, we've got a handle on it, we don't have as much money as we should, but Tom has helped us with letting us use the site for the aircraft. The aircraft that we use is also used for Air-1, which is the rescue aircraft. If there's any rescues that need to be done on this side of the island, we can land at his site, refuel the aircraft rather than flying back to the other side, and we know with rescues, that time is of the essence. So Tom has really come and helped us; by helping us, he helps out the community, and he helps out the native forest. So I just want to say that Tom has really helped us out in our endeavor, and, you know, we would like to see that we can continue doing what we do, saving the forest, saving the mountains for people here in Hana, and with a good neighbor like Tom, it's just perfect for us and it's a good relationship. We could land at the airport, but with all the 911 and the 9-11 rules and regulations, it would really stifle our operation, so I think Tom has really stepped up and helped the community, help the native forest here, so I just wanted to say, you know, he's a very good neighbor and has been very helpful for the community and the Park Service and the Maui Invasive Species Committee. Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Any questions for Perry? Ward?

Mr. Ward Mardfin: Yes. Where on the property do you land?

Mr. Betinors: Yeah, in the central area, I guess he's got like piles of gravel here and there, and we land safely in-between those piles. So it's actually, other than a pasture, it's probably the next best area for us to land in.

Mr. Mardfin: Do you happen to know if it's the area where he's planning to do mining?

Mr. Betinors: Yes, it is.

Mr. Mardfin: So when they do mining, you're not going to be able to use it?

Mr. Betinors: We have a great schedule, we know when we're going to do it, so we communicate with him and then he lets us know if it's available to do it, so it's kinda like a give and take, we'll work around his schedule; he'll work around our schedule.

Mr. Mardfin: Thank you.

Mr. Betinors: Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Any other questions? Thank you.

Mr. Betinors: Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Please come to the microphone and state your name. Thank you.

Mr. Jim Lyons: Jim Lyons, local resident. Not only am I a county fireman, but on my second job, I do construction, and I utilize Tom and his product practically daily, and for us not to have this product readily available here in Hana for everybody to use, you know, it's a cost issue for homeowners, builders, you know, not only that, and I see it as a safety issue too 'cause a lot of people use the product that he uses for driveways and accessways, it allows us to get, as my other job as a fireman, to allow us access to some of the tough to reach places in which I'm sure everybody's been on some of the back -- back road trails, you know, it's like four-wheel drive only, this and that; without the product, you know, that he produces and then we readily use, some of the driveways and stuff wouldn't be there, so I'm in total support of the quarry and any future endeavors that he has.

Chair Carvalho: Any questions? Ward?

Mr. Mardfin: Jim, what does he charge for the use of the gravel?

Mr. Lyons: It's -- I guess it depends. I usually get a base rate for per ton, and I don't have a chart with me, but I get I think it's like \$85.00 a ton for certain materials, and it varies depending on what you get whether it's the sands, whether it's the cement mix, or if it's large rock and rubble.

Mr. Mardfin: Have you ever bought from the other side?

Mr. Lyons: Yes.

Mr. Mardfin: What was the charge there?

Mr. Lyons: With including the trucking fees, it could be up to \$150.00 a ton, you know, so it almost doubles in price just because of the trucking issue.

Mr. Mardfin: How do you handle the trucking within Hana?

Mr. Lyons: I go out and get it with my truck.

Mr. Mardfin: Why couldn't you do that from the other side?

Mr. Lyons: Wear and tear on my vehicle, and, you know, when I'm getting a large amount, I utilize his equipment, you know, he has the ability to deliver, and it saves exponentially. It's like I couldn't, you know, think of a, you know, using the other side, you know, and keeping -- being able to keep my prices down and making things affordable for, not only myself, but some of the people that I work for.

Mr. Mardfin: You said that -- that price getting over here, because of the transportation, it's a certain amount, what is your base price if you didn't need the transportation from the other side?

Mr. Lyons: Offhand, I couldn't tell you 'cause I get the bill when they show and they dump it on the property, which is all included, you know, the material and delivery, but I know getting material onto the job site, coming from the other side, it's just twice the price.

Mr. Mardfin: Thank you.

Mr. Lyons: You're welcome.

Chair Carvalho: Any other questions for Jim? Thank you. Anyone else that would like to testify right now? Please state your name.

Mr. Shane Sinenci: Hi. I'm Shane Sinenci, and, today, I'm representing the Aha Moku Council, the advisory -- the cultural advisory to DLNR, and I wanted to -- well, my first question is, the property is designated ag right now, is that correct? Ag zoning? I is? Okay. So in the report, there were, as far as archaeological sites, there were noted 169 historical sites on the property, as stated in Exhibit 12, and so -- and some of them include some pre-contact sites. As the Aha Moku Hana, we wanted to just address some of those sites. I don't see the map of those sites on here. I don't know if that's part of the exhibit where these sites are. We would like to advise the board to -- to even maybe check out these sites. I understand that the report was made on just topical features and our concern with the Aha Moku is anything underground, if there are any burial sites, or bones, remains, so I would want to recommend that part of this report be -- if so happens, during the

process of excavating and we do find some type of cultural human remains, that the report -- that we want to address those and maybe create some kind of plan, I don't know if include the Burial Council or anything like that, so that we have a process in the event that something like this happens that it be put into the report where we can have some kind of process for removal or designation. And, you know, as just from the Aha Moku's standpoint, we want to make sure that these, the cultural things are addressed. So I ask that the board maybe visit these sites and create some kind of a plan in the event that human remains are found during the mining. Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Any questions of Shane? Ward?

Mr. Mardfin: Shane, do you happen to know, and you may or may not know this, do you happen to know if there were Hawaii either dryland or wetland lo'i up there?

Mr. Sinenci: I don't. I know, historically, Pi'ilani did some kind of auwae out there, up above, I don't know how far up, but I can find out, that there was supposed to be an ancient water canal, but I don't know if it's on the property or above the property, it might be further up, but I'm not sure, but I can look into it.

Mr. Mardfin: Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: John?

Mr. John Blumer-Buell: Shane, you're recommending to the Hana Advisory Committee that we have a site visit and make all the information that we can get available to the Aha Moku Council?

Mr. Sinenci: Yes.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Am I hearing that correct?

Mr. Sinenci: Right. As the Aha Moku --

Mr. Blumer-Buell: I respect the Aha Moku Council. I think it's an important -- it was enacted by State Legislature. I think that's a very important organization that we should be paying attention to. Just for a point of clarification, on page 1 of Exhibit 12, which you referred to, it said 26 sites were documented including both pre-contact and historic era sites containing 169 features. Now, this is one page. This is one page of I don't know how many pages.

Mr. Sinenci: Yeah, it doesn't go into detail so --

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Right. I've requested, from the Planning Department, the entire letter from the State Historic Preservation Division, and I've also requested the information referred to in the first paragraph, and that is there is a draft report titled "Draft Archaeological Inventory Survey" for that parcel at Kawaipapa Ahupua`a, Hana District, and that's got a 2014 date on it, and addition to that, there's a earlier 2013 draft, so I've requested both of those be brought into the public record because, as people that have followed some of these issues, sometimes the information changes from one draft to another, so it's real important to clarify what's true and what isn't, and I will support making all that information available to the Aha Moku Council and any maps and that sort of thing. So I appreciate you coming down today.

Mr. Sinenci: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Mardfin: Clayton?

Chair Carvalho: Ward.

Mr. Mardfin: John, when I got -- I was very glad you asked for that material. When I got here today, I found it on the -- a 72-page document right in front of me, I imagine you have one in front of you, and a one-page letter that has both sides of it, including the signature you asked for, and I'm very glad that you asked for that material, but I'm not -- I can't read a 72-page document in 5 minutes.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Me neither, and I want to thank -- thank the Planning Department for bringing this over. Do you have an extra copy of this to give to --

Mr. Sinenci: I just received one right now.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Okay, great.

Mr. Sinenci: So thank you. We can document this with the Aha Moku Council.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Okay, good.

Mr. Sinenci: Thank you.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, we haven't read it either. Mahalo.

Chair Carvalho: Any other questions for Shane? No? Thank you. Anyone else that would like to testify right now, public testimony? Okay. We can close early public testimony and

move on to agenda item D, Approval of the Minutes of the December 11, 2014 meeting.
Any discussion on the minutes? John.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 11, 2014 MEETING

Mr. Blumer-Buell: I wasn't here so I think somebody that was here ought to make the motion.

Mr. Ed Cashman: ...(inaudible - was not speaking in the microphone)...

Mr. Mardfin: Though I haven't read it, I'll second the motion.

Chair Carvalho: So Ed will -- John?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, I have one request. I did read through the minutes and it was an interesting meeting. I would just like to request the Hana Advisory Committee to attach my letter that I wrote to the Hana Advisory Committee to the minutes. It was -- you know, that -- if you attach all the correspondence you received on that issue, that's all I'm requesting. That will save us doing a lot of revisions.

Chair Carvalho: Okay. I know that it was presented in the public record that night so -- so I hear a -- Ed will present the motion, and Ward will second, correct? Any other --

Mr. Mardfin: Yes, but now I have a question. Is John moving to amend to attach his statements?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yes. I'm sorry if I didn't do it properly.

Mr. Mardfin: I'll second the motion to amend.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Okay, so John's comments came after the second and so we will have that new motion, John will present the motion with the amendments, Ward will second. Any other discussion on that amendment? With the quorum here, I guess we can put that to a vote.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Committee Member Blumer-Buell, seconded by Committee Member Mardfin, then unanimously

VOTED: *to amend the motion that correspondence received on agenda item D.1. of the December 11, 2014 meeting be attached to the minutes.*

Chair Carvalho: Okay, seven, and that means it passes unanimously. Thank you. With that, we can move on to agenda item E. So the amendment as well as the motion for the main, as well, we'll put that to a vote as well.

It has been moved by Committee Member Cashman, seconded by Committee Member Mardfin, then unanimously

VOTED: *to approve the minutes of the December 11, 2014 meeting as amended.*

Chair Carvalho: Alright. Seven. That will also pass unanimously. Thank you, Ward. We can move on to agenda item E, Public Hearing. Clayton?

Mr. Yoshida read the following agenda item into the record:

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

- 1. MR. WAYNE I. ARAKAKI, of WAYNE I. ARAKAKI ENGINEERING, LLC, on behalf of MR. THOMAS HOEFFKEN, requesting a State Land Use Commission Special Use Permit for the mining and resource extraction of rock to be processed as aggregate for roadway maintenance on approximately 12 acres of land located next to Kawaipapa Stream in the State Agricultural District, TMK: 1-3-004: 001 (por.), Hana, Island of Maui. (SUP2 2014/0002) (S. Lopez)**

Ms. Sybil Lopez: Good afternoon, Hana Advisory Committee. My name is Sybil Lopez. I'm the staff planner on this project today. So this matter arises from an application for a State Land Use Commission special permit, SUP2, filed by Wayne Arakaki, the engineer, LLC, on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Hoeffken, the applicant. The subject property is Maui TMK: 1-3-004:001, and is also owned by the applicant.

So the applicant is requesting a special use permit to allow a portion of the property to be used as aggregate and rock crushing operation. The total area that will be used is 12 acres, so the area will be approximately 5 acres, which will be a small portion on the 72.8-acre parcel. So the equipment storage area will be approximately 0.5 acres of the

property land area, and the rest of the property will be under farming and ranching activity. If the special use permit is granted, the proposed use will be allowable on this property. The gravel will be sold and used for road improvements and repair, leaching field with septic tanks, backfill material for various residential, commercial, and government projects. All building materials are imported to Hana, which is costly, so providing a local source of processed rock will help the local economy. I have both Thomas Hoeffken and his son, Gabe, and Gabe will do a powerpoint presentation explaining their project. So I guess give him a few minutes to setup. Thank you.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks for allowing us to speak here today. I really appreciate everyone's time. And my name's Gabe Hoeffken; Tom's my day; he's the landowner. Basically, he and I are co-owners of Tom's Backhoe & Excavation Company, and Tom's Backhoe & Excavation would be the entity which actually would be crushing the rock.

Our goal here today is to -- we're requesting a special use permit to allow crushing on a 5-acre portion of a 72.8-acre piece of property, a half-acre for equipment storage. And as mentioned previously, the property is classified as state ag, county ag, and it's located mauka of the Hana Highway.

This just kinda shows the land use designations. State land use is ag; Hana Community Plan is ag and rural; county zoning is agricultural; and a section of the property is interim. And then the flood zone is minimum risk and no base-flood elevation determined. It's pretty much a low flood-risk area.

Surrounding uses of the property. An important thing to consider is what's happening around the property. To the north, it's undeveloped; to the east is Hana Highway; to the south is Kawaipapa Stream; to the west is some undeveloped and some residential property.

This a map kinda showing the subject parcel, I don't know if you guys can see it, but, basically, on the down side of this drawing is the stream; to the left would be the mountain, of the mountain; and then on the right side is Hana Highway.

This property is kind of interesting. It's mostly rock with dense jungle foliage. There's really not very much top soil. Actually, there's almost no top soil. Rocks pretty much just grow out of the rock on the property. It's uneven; dense jungle foliage; mostly made up of hills and valleys. And in most of the area, if you let livestock in there, you'd probably never find them again. It's really, really dense. This is just one photo. I tried finding a bunch of different photos but they all kinda look the same. When you take a photograph of dense jungle, it doesn't look like very much.

As mentioned before, aggregate is a very useful construction material. It's used in concrete production. It's used for septic system leach fields, gravel driveways, road base for either asphalt or concrete road construction; it can be used for drainage systems, and it's also used for base cores under concrete building pads; so pretty much any type of construction that's going to require a road or a building is going to need aggregate.

This roughly -- this shows the acre that'll be mined, and you can kinda see it's in the center of the property. That kind of isolates it from the neighbors on the other boundaries. Additionally, as I'll show later, it also kind of keeps it out of the way of any archaeological sites.

Benefits of rock crushing. As stated previously, crushing rock in Hana, having it locally available, reduces the cost. Even though it's reduced in cost for the hauling and the material, per ton, it's more expensive than you're going to pay on the other side of the island, and the reason for that is it's a much smaller operation. We don't have -- you know, in Hana, it doesn't make sense to have a huge operation 'cause you're not going to have a huge amount of customers, so it's really impossible to get the pricing as low as it would be on the other side. The only reason crushing rock in Hana is viable is because transportation cost from the other side are so high, and it's just the nature of any sort of small production thing. You don't get the benefits that you do of a larger scale production.

Another benefit is, by not having to haul that aggregate in, we reduce the wear and tear on Hana Highway. I'm sure everybody's noticed they've been doing a lot of work on the highway, paving it, a new section is getting done right now, and it's really nice. I think the road's in great shape right now. And the less heavy trucks you have on the road, the longer the road lasts and the better shape it'll be in. Additionally, the less big trucks you have coming in and out is the less big trucks that people have to dodge while driving in and out of Hana, so if you have a lot of volume of large trucks, it's just, you know, more slowdown, more weight, more risk of potential accidents.

As was mentioned, having aggregate readily available to local contractors, homeowners, and government agencies is a plus. You know, sometimes you need something right way, and having to get it from the other side of the island can take a fair bit of time and cost. And additionally, we do have employees, and sometimes employees here in Hana, and if we're able to crush rock, we usually hire more help when we do that. So those are some of the benefits.

Archaeological, historic, and cultural resources. This is a very, very important topic and subject. And archaeological inventory survey of the project site was done by Haun and Associates. We kind of already heard what it said but, basically, there's 26 sites, both pre-contact and historic area; 22 are adequately documented, and further work or preservation

-- and no further work or preservation is recommended. Three sites are recommended for mitigation through either data recovery or preservation. And this inventory survey has met the requirements of the state.

Here is a map of the proposed mining area with the map of the archaeological survey map, and it shows all the different sites, and, basically, the proposed site and the roadways leading to it are not in any of the archaeological sites. On the report it said that 3 sites were recommended for further study, and I'm sorry I didn't get a chance to put this on the power point but I'll point to them. It was sites 6528, which is this one right here; site 6545, which is right here; and site 6549, which is right here. So we're not impacting any of the sites and we're definitely not near the 3 that have been recommended for additional study.

Infrastructure, public facilities and services, water. We don't expect there to be a lot of water usage. An estimated somewhere between 250 and 1250 gallons per day. Most times crushing will be done after or during a rain event, and it rains quite a bit in Hana usually, and that really, really helps with keeping the dust down. And generally, the amount of water used is dictated by visual emissions testing, so if you see dust, you add more water until you mitigate the dust, and generally, that's only needed during crushing operations. It rains enough so that if you have a pile of aggregate, it rains, and that pretty much controls the dust in the interim between crushing periods. And the existing infrastructure should be enough to accommodate the volume of crushing; basically, there's not going to be a need for a huge water line or going into the state roadway and doing a water tap and bringing up like a six or an eight-inch waterline; that's not necessary.

Drainage. The drainage impact isn't that big of an issue on this property due to the porosity of the rock. Additionally, the crushing operation isn't going to be making any new concrete roadways or asphalt roadways. You're not going to have additional services which are going to increase runoff. Additionally, because we're kind of in the center of the property, there's a small likelihood that the runoff will actually be able to get to any of the neighboring properties, the Hana Highway, or the stream, Kawaipapa Stream.

Environmental impacts. Everything has environmental impact, as I'm sure you'll aware, driving a car, using lights, everything. But the impacts of the crushing and volume we're planning to crush are quite minimal. Basically, the operation of crushing equipment is regulated by the Clean Air Branch of the Department of Health, so in order to operate a crusher, you have to have a permit, you have to do tests, you have to keep logs, and it's all documented and at the end of the year, you pay a fee based on the amount of pollutants you generate, generally. Due to the small scale and limited usage, impact would be minimal. Aggregate production would only be used in Hana and East Maui, so it's not like we're going to make aggregate to export to the other side of the island; that's not cost effective or efficient and just wouldn't happen. We'd only making enough material to meet

current and upcoming project demand, so we're not going to crush a whole bunch of material that's going to exceed the amount that's going to be needed because then we're just spending time doing things that are necessary. Generally, we expect -- oh, the way they do a crusher production year, it's a rolling year, a 12-month cycle, so, basically, in a 12-month cycle, the crusher is permitted to work I believe it's 20 -- 2080 hours. In a rolling year, we expect to do less than 25% of that, and that's still probably higher than it would actually be, but, yeah, probably 25 or less than 25% production rate.

Conclusion. If we're able -- if we're granted the special use permit, we're hoping that we will reduce the amount of heavy trucks on Hana Highway, we can reduce the Hana community on imported aggregate materials, we can have a minimal environmental impact with out low-volume production, and we can have no disturbance of existing archaeological sites. And I think it wasn't clear as to the helicopters being able to land, it's a fairly large area. What happens, when you're able to crush, is the terrain is so up and down, and hilly, and rugged, now when you're able to crush, you actually are able to kind of flat out the land and make it more usable. So the area where they would be taking off and landing wouldn't really be affected 'cause it would be a flat area. But if we aren't able to keep working in that area, then it would eventually grow over with foliage and it'd be unusable. So that's the concern. If -- the other thing is crushing operations are generally in a fairly small area, and then over time, as you crush rock, then you move to the operation, so it's not like you would be taking up the entire area at one time; it'd be a small area, and then you'd move on, and the grass would grow up, and you move on to another area. You're not going to be opening up a whole area at one time.

Additionally, I think it's fairly well known, one of the projects my father's been working on is also a affordable housing project, we've been the process of putting together a 201H application, it's been slow going but we've made a lot of progress on that, and having rock available for that project is very important; in fact, it's key to keeping the project affordable. Currently, we're proposing a 24-lot subdivision with all of them being affordable, and we're working in cooperation with Habitat for Humanity. So, you know, there's a lot of positives to having rock. If we have to bring the rock in from the other side to do the roads, and do the septic, and do everything else, there's no way the project will be able to be affordable because it'll more than double the price of all those materials. Questions?

Chair Carvalho: Should we start with questions from the board or -- yeah. Okay. Let's start with Ed.

Mr. Ed Cashman: You folks had any complaints with this operation - dust, noise?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: We haven't done anything in several years, but we never had a complaint. We're always very aware of the community and the environment around us, and

even the wind, you know, if the wind's blowing in a way that's going to make noise or make a nuisance for somebody else, we don't do it. I mean we try and be good neighbors whenever we can.

Mr. Cashman: One more question. How do you actually do it? What you do, you scrape with the rock, you blast?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: No. Well, most of the rock can actually be pushed over with a dozer, with an excavator, so we push the rock towards the crusher and then we use an excavator to scoop it. Most of the rock is kind of already fractured to the state where it will just go into the crusher. Every now and then we'll get bigger pieces, we just put them on the side, and then if we need them, we can get a hoe ram and break them, but we don't blast, we don't do any real aggressive methods. I mean there's enough rock pretty much on the surface and if that's loose, we can just crush that.

Mr. Ian Ballantyne: Yeah. I don't quite agree with you on a couple of points. I mean there is noise up there most days that we hear ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Okay. I apologize.

Mr. Ballantyne: And I would just -- I mean I think it's a good idea, I like the idea of keeping trucks off the Hana Highway, I like -- you know, I'm not against it in principle at all, but there is, you know, we got the flower farm next door. There are times when there's dust settling on the flowers in certain circumstances, and, certainly, there's times we've been woken up at 5:30 in the morning with trucks crawling up the hill ready for the start of an -- I'd like to suggest that there are hours put this, maybe 8 till 4, Monday through Friday, because it is noisy, and there is dust, I don't think there's any way out of that one.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you, Ian. Ward, you had a question?

Mr. Mardfin: This may be for Sybil, or maybe Clayton, is this an after-the-fact permit that they're requesting? I mean it sounds like they're doing it.

Ms. Lopez: No. It is not an after-the-fact.

Mr. Mardfin: It's not after-the-fact?

Ms. Lopez: No.

Mr. Mardfin: Then how are they doing the crushing now?

Ms. Lopez: Because it doesn't exceed what the requirements are for what they're doing, what they've done previous, so when they put in the application, it was specifically for a special use because of the acreages that they're expanding, up to 12 acres, because like how he said, they only do it in small 5-acre areas.

Mr. Mardfin: That was another question, by the way, while you're going to answer this, let me toss this into the pot. Couple places says 5 acres and a lot more places it says 12 acres, and I'm not sure what the deal is.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Yeah, that was -- the engineer did that, and I know we wanted 12, I don't know why 5 was written, but I switched my powerpoint from 12 to 5. I didn't get the chance to actually calculate what the area that he had on the map was as far as the actual acreage.

Mr. Mardfin: Sybil, is it 12 or 5?

Ms. Lopez: So it was explained to me by the engineer, sorry that Wayne Arakaki couldn't be here today, it was explained to me, by Wayne, that the 12 acres were requested because of how they move around by acre, per acre, up to 5 acres on how they operate their rock extraction. So they were requesting the total of 12 acres over that 72.8 parcel, but that 12 acres would be over a period of time because the request and the recommendation is made for a total of 3 years, so within that 3-year period, they'll be using a total of 12 acres. So that was what was explained to me.

Mr. Mardfin: And after the 3 years, they could go in for an extension?

Ms. Lopez: Well, with the recommendation that is set - hold on. So the recommendation that is set is for to be valid for 3 years of the date of the Maui Planning Commission approval, subject to extension by the Maui Planning Director upon a timely request for extension filed at least 90 days prior to its expiration.

Mr. Mardfin: So if they extended, they might be at 16 acres, or something like that, instead of 12. Is that correct?

Ms. Lopez: Possibly. I --

Mr. Mardfin: So this is a sneaky way around having to go before the Land Use Commission?

Ms. Lopez: No. You would still have to go in front of the commission.

Mr. Mardfin: No. The way you're doing this, because it's less than 15 acres, we make a recommendation to the planning commission. If it's less than 15 acres, the planning commission can grant the special use permit. If it's over 15 acres, it's -- it has to go before the land use -- State Land Use Commission, I think. Clayton?

Mr. Yoshida: Yes. If the land area is more than 15 acres, it will go to the planning commission for recommendation, and then if the planning commission recommends approval, then the record is transmitted to the State Land Use Commission, like your landfill here in Hana, expansion of your landfill here in Hana. But if it's less than 15 acres, then the county -- the planning commission is the -- can be the final authority on the special use permit.

Mr. Mardfin: And that's why, you know, if they need 5 acres at a time, over 3 years, that strikes me as getting close to the 15, unless there's some other restriction.

Mr. Yoshida: Yeah, I think the agencies would have to look at the areas 'cause, right now, it's defined as that 12-acre site. If they go to other areas, then agencies would review it.

Mr. Mardfin: But if they go -- if they go from -- if they have 12 for 3 years, and then they go to 16, they're going to say, well, we're only adding 4 so we still don't have to go before the Land Use Commission.

Mr. Yoshida: Well, you know, cumulatively, it's more than 15 acres, so it's like your big rock quarrying operations, Hawaiian Cement or Ameron, you know, they've -- well, I mean in Central Maui, basically, Ameron has kind of done their resource extraction by the landfill, and then the county comes in and puts the rubbish in the whole that's created, and then they -- when they run out of space, then they move to another phase, but all of that goes before the Land Use Commission.

Mr. Mardfin: Yes, but this project won't because --

Mr. Yoshida: Yeah, well --

Mr. Mardfin: Because it's small scale. I'll grant you it's small scale.

Mr. Yoshida: Yeah, but when they go over 15 acres, then, cumulatively, then it will go to the Land Use Commission.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Currently, the production rate is so low that it'll take a while to use up the 12 acres, and I mean it probably, you know, we don't really expect to be quarrying forever; we want to quarry, have a stockpile, get the affordable housing project done, have

some on hand for whatever else is going on. In reality, my dad would like to retire, and I have no intention of coming over here and running the quarry, so there is a limit on how long this is going to take place. I mean the reality is we don't have --

Mr. Mardfin: Can you tell -- you've been doing this for -- or Tom's been doing this for some time I gather?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: On and off. We haven't run for almost two years now ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Mardfin: And -- what area are you quarrying?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Pretty much the same area. We're kind of on, where the map was, it's kinda towards the top of that area.

Mr. Mardfin: So a 5-acre part of the 12 acres maybe?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Maybe, but we're only working at maybe an acre at a time.

Mr. Mardfin: Ah.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Yeah.

Mr. Mardfin: Okay.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: So there will be like a pile of gravel here, pile of gravel there, some flat areas where foliage is starting to grow up that we can actually mow.

Mr. Mardfin: Okay.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: But as far as -- it's not a bit production. If you go to Ameron or Hawaiian Cement's quarries, they have massive quarries --

Mr. Mardfin: Right. I've seen that.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: They have the blasting operations, they have conveyor belts to deliver the material from the blasting site to the crushers, and then they crush it, then they move it to the screeners. We -- we're much more compact. We have a small simple jaw crusher and a single-phase screener, so everything is really labor intensive. With a large quarry operation, they have conveyor belts to take everything right to where they need it, they have specialized crushers that make the type of aggregate that you need; if you need sand, they've got a - what is that called?

Mr. Mardfin: Yeah. I've seen that stuff.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Cone crusher. Yeah, so they have all these -- this is a very simplistic operation. It's very labor intensive. In order to make smaller aggregate, we actually gotta take the jaw down and it's a very slow process. To screen things, we only have a single screen, so if you want to get different aggregate, you actually gotta change the screens every time you want to change it; whereas, the bigger operations will have big screens where they can just hit a button and it'll, you know, give you what material you want from the base rock.

Mr. Mardfin: Okay.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: So it's a very small slow process, and it doesn't take huge areas. I mean we're not going to have 5 acres open at a time.

Mr. Mardfin: Clayton, is this an after-the-fact request?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Previously, the crushing operations were done as part of a grubbing and grading because the only way to really make the land usable was to knock the rock out and crush it, but it's always been done on a very small scale.

Mr. Yoshida: Are you selling to third parties?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Not directly. We've used it on our projects previously.

Mr. Mardfin: Jim Williams just said he bought some from you.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Huh?

Mr. Mardfin: Jim Williams said he just bought some from you.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: I think we delivered it for him. I don't know. Did he ever come bring it, I don't know.

Mr. Mardfin: It's being delivered off site.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: You know, I think that's why we're trying to get the permit, it was a bit of a grey area.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the mike)...

Chair Carvalho: Please state your name.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: My name is Tom Hoeffken.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: The father. Anyway, a couple years ago, the county dump people came to us and said could you make a bunch of material, landfill, because they're losing the cinder pit and they wanted us to crush for them, which now they're bringing it from the other side, and it's they're bringing truck and trailer pretty much daily now, which is not good on our highways, and then they're hauling off the green waste ...(inaudible)... taking them to the other side. Well, I said, yeah, but we have all the permits to do what we do, and there was a grey area, nobody could tell us if we were doing anything illegal so we said we'll just go for a special use permit now, and we started this about two years ago. We're just trying to tidy it up and make it more compliable to the law, but nobody could tell me if we ever did anything wrong because we have all our permits in place. And we do sell our aggregate for anywhere from \$40 to \$75, depending on how many times we run it through the crusher, how many times we screen it; it all is on our -- how much time. And as far as \$85, we do have aggregate that we bring sand in from the other side, and we mix it with our aggregate, and we make a concrete product aggregate that you can add cement, and it is a lot cheaper. When we first started this operation, it was \$100 a ton just to have the trucking, that didn't include the product from the other side, and that's when -- when highways gets on legally hauling material from the other side, that's what they charge. If they're a little lenient, then it -- you know, they can bring the price down. But just like Hawaiian Cement told me, they only bring 3 yards of concrete in at a time, 'cause anymore than that, they're breaking the law and the feds could put them out of business. Now the other --their competitors will bring in 6 at a time, which isn't very good for our bridges and the new highway we're getting.

After-the-fact, we didn't never -- the reason we actually started this was because of the high price and the Federal Government, the Department of Interior came to me and said, look, we don't want to bring over these 3, 400 trucks to go Seven Pools, could you make it for us, and they gave us the criteria and I said, yeah, we'll try, and we did. But we have a little bit of a surplus now because I did make a lot by the dump and then the county came and said, oh, we can't now because you don't have a special use, so that's -- it's not like we're doing anything after-the-fact, we're not trying to be sneaky; we just trying to be more compliance, and I, like I say, nobody has ever told us what the real rules are, so that's where we're at, and if this doesn't go forward, I can understand, but this is, to me, this is so important for the 24-lot subdivision. If we don't -- and --that's not a done deal, but the monies we have made on that have gone to getting all the permits, and all the paperwork, and everything that we've got going for this project has cost us over a couple hundred

thousand dollars, and to get that kind of money, it's come from the rock, and we're still hoping that's going to go forward. Right now, we're just waiting on the access permit, but everything else pretty much has been ready, then we're going to the county council.

Mr. Mardfin: Tom, thank you very much. You answered my question. I read this stuff and I -- just little things come up, it's not that I'm necessarily for it or necessarily against it, I just want clarification of things. And I used to be on the planning commission and sometimes we'd get after-the-fact permits, and this kinda looked like one.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: Well, we never had any complaints ...(inaudible - not speaking into the mike)... we're trying to help -- we're trying to help the ...(inaudible - not speaking into the mike)...

Mr. Mardfin: He wants you to be -- she wants you to be on the mike. No, I'm going to ask you -- I'm going to ask you another question so you're going to need the mike, and you alluded to it, which I remember being I believe it was in this very room where I was at a meeting and you were talking about this self-help subdivision, self-help housing subdivision, and I was wondering whether this was in lieu of that and you're telling me that, no, this is going -- you still have that plan to do the 12-unit subdivision. Is that correct?

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: Oh yes. It's till going forward, but slowly.

Mr. Mardfin: I understand that.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: But we're hoping to break ground for that within the next year. I mean we're close enough where - what would you say, Gabe? We were hoping to get it -- just be quiet.

Mr. Mardfin: He doesn't want to commit. He doesn't want you to commit yourself. It's the deal.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: It's going at a snail's pace but we've gone through a lot of hoops and doing a lot of ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Mardfin: And where would the housing be on that map relative to the crushing?

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the mike)...

Mr. Mardfin: That little curved piece at the bottom?

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: No, it kinda goes all the way down to the bottom. It's about 350 --

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: I already turned off the projector. I'll come show you on this map.

Mr. Mardfin: Okay, and there's a curved piece on the Hana Community Plan that goes like that, so it's partially in there, partially in there. Thank you. I'll yield to whoever else wants to pursue this.

Ms. Lopez: And, Vice-Chair, I just wanted to point out, under pursuant to Section 205-6, under special permit, Hawaii Revised Statutes, that the county planning commission may permit certain unusual and reasonable uses within agricultural and rural districts other than those for which the district is classified. So the applicant is requesting for a special use permit based on Maui County Code, Section 19.30A-060 --

Mr. Mardfin: Yeah. I got that. I understand how you're doing it.

Ms. Lopez: Okay. Well, I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Mardfin: No, I understand that. I can -- you know, you was very clear -- the report was pretty clear. I got the whole picture, except that, often, my experience has been that people before the Maui Planning Commission don't always tell the full story.

Ms. Lopez: I understand.

Mr. Mardfin: And I've had some very bad experiences with people saying, well, we don't intend to do that, and then as soon as they get the permit, first thing they do is what they didn't intend to do at the time we were making a decision. So that's why I ask a lot of questions. I do see why it has to come before the planning commission because they do need a special use permit to do mining on agricultural land, it's a special use problem, okay. I get it. Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: John, question?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, I have a couple follow-ups to your presentation, and then a follow-up on some of Ward's questions. I missed it when you told us the production rate allowed by the state. I missed that part of it.

Mr. Gabe Hoeffken: Basically, the permit is 2,080 hours of production a year, and that's a rolling year, so it's a 12-month period, so you couldn't -- if you did, you know, 2,000 in one year, and then in January and February you did whole bunch more, you'd go over your amount.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah. No, I've got it. Thanks for answering that. The other thing I wanted to touch on, then I'm going to go back as a follow-up on Ward's question, is a couple kama`aina residents from Hana were here earlier and they said where do we get the applications for affordable housing. So I will talk about this later, but, you know, I'd like to see the big picture all talked about at once, you know, the affordable housing and your proposals, and ag use, and so forth, that's just me. When the -- when the makai land at Howard Cooper's old farm, Haulani Farm came up, the owner, at that time, wanted to sell it speculatively. Now, I got several calls because I was one of the people that worked on the 1994 Hana Community Plan and we designated that for affordable housing, and we wanted it to be half-acre. Now, what happened is, at that meeting, I brought all the evidence and there was other people from the committee there to confirm the reason that it was redesignated was because of the affordable housing, for no other reason. The owner, at that point, committed to making it affordable housing. Now, the lots are smaller than half-acre, but the owner moved forward with that and the community appreciated it, you know, there's -- you know of all the drainage and flood problems and everything else, my point is I wish we were talking about the affordable housing first and foremost because there are people in the community that have been long time advocates for affordable housing, and, you know, the rumor today was that there was applications, and I said, no. It's mentioned in the report. So I just wanted to let you know that I think that it would be good to establish a dialogue with, you know, I mean I think a good place to start is the Aha Moku Council, sincerely, I mean they're a bonafide organization created by state, and then now so thanks for bringing up the affordable housing idea. I mean that's -- I'm one that really appreciates that. And I sat on the Maui General Plan Advisory Committee and saw several proposals from Hana come forward for affordable housing; one, for a hundred acres, and nothing happened with that. And so I'm just saying I would love to see, if you're not going to be here in the long run, I'm somebody that would love to see the affordable housing on lots big enough for people to grow some things and there's people that are a lot smarter regarding finances that could help you to make a profit from the whole thing. So I'm just throwing that out.

Now, the next question is to go back to -- I never heard an answer from -- regarding Ward's question is this an after-the-fact permit. Now, I'm looking at Exhibit No. 3, and it's a photograph from January 8, 2011 showing the Kawaipapa mining, and then if you jump over to the Public Works' exhibit, which is no. 6, it says, in paragraph 1, second sentence, "It appears that mining activity was present in 2011. The application states that land is currently being used for pasture land." So I just -- I wanted to, instead of ask Clayton this time, I'd like to ask our esteem Corporation Counsel, is this an after-the-fact permit? What is the legal definition of an after-the-fact permit? I mean I think it's important.

Mr. Jennifer Oana: An after-the-fact permit is something that it's granted after the person does whatever he's doing that requires a permit, and it goes through the regular process.

But I'm not quite sure if this qualifies as an after-the-fact permit because what they're doing beforehand, I'm not sure if it required this State Land Use Commission special use permit for the scale that they're working on, so I'm not sure. I can get back to you on that. But I don't know what they -- I don't know what permit they needed to do for the small scale that they were doing. It seems like now they want to broaden it, make it a big scale 12-acre operation. But again, I'm sorry. I can't answer that at this time.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Okay, well, I was just trying to get that -- trying to get that answered legally speaking 'cause I don't know what the implications are. I think that was what, I'm speculating, that Ward was trying to understand what the implications of an after-the-fact permit are. And also, I completely get his point about anything over 15 acres going to the State Land Use Commission, rather than through the Maui Planning Commission. I have -- I have a number of questions regarding the agricultural use of the property. There are so many contradictions in this report regarding being able to use it agriculturally and not being able to use it, I'm confused, so I have a whole bunch of questions that I'd like to -- I would like to defer to other members of the Advisory Committee at this point and let everyone ask any questions they may have. Thanks.

Chair Carvalho: Anjo?

Ms. Anjoleen Hoopai-Waikoloa: I don't have a question, but because I have to leave, I just want to state my mana`o on this. I'm on the fence. I appreciate what you do for our community. However, as a person of Hawaiian ancestry, rocks have life, so any type of operation dealing with rocks scares me. It gives me fear. So my biggest concern would be to make sure that this specific site does not have any -- it's really hard 'cause, to me, Hana is sacred everywhere, but archaeologically, if there are sites, you preserve what -- what is, what was. You protect the life that was before and you allow it to live. So I'm on the fence. I, personally, would walk the 12 acres to be comfortable because it's life. That's just mana`o on it though.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you, Anjo. Before we proceed, I'd like to make it known that the company I work for, and the company that I work for and Tom, in his company, we actually have a business relationship right now, and I'm sure that if this -- if this item passes, that might lead to a different type of relationship, perhaps an increased one, actually I'm pretty sure it would, so I would like to excuse myself from this conversation and from a vote. I will still preside over the -- over the deliberation, but I will -- I see it as a conflict of interest and I hope that the board does as well. John?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Well, I thank you for disclosing that, and I think that, you know, that really, you know, is very helpful to the whole process, you know, so I appreciate that and

I respect it. There's no problem with having a business relationship with people, but it's proper not to have a conflict of interest in a decision, so I just say mahalo.

(Committee Member Hoopai-Waikoloa was excused from the meeting at 5:27 p.m.)

Chair Carvalho: Thank you.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Mahalo, and I think you should conduct the meeting. That's fine with me.

Chair Carvalho: Yeah, just for the sake of transparency, thank you. Any other questions? John.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Well this is really for the staff. Are they here still? This is for was it Ms. Lopez, Sybil Lopez? Did she do the report? Yeah. Oh, hi. Yeah, this is -- these questions are all based around a lot of conflicts I see in the report regarding the demonstration of agricultural use. Now, I don't expect long-winded things, but I just want you to know what my questions are. The cover page refers to this project as the Kawaipapa Agricultural Park. I mean that's an agricultural park. To me, that's pretty self-evident. Page 2, as they're numbered, paragraph 3, it says, "The equipment will also be used for farming purposes for the property." Okay, the indicates to me that there's going to be farming. Page 2, paragraph 4, it says, "The property may have been used for sugar cultivation or cattle ranching." I mean there's an indication there that that was -- that there was agricultural use and I would really like Aha Moku to look into what the actual use was. On page 3, the fourth paragraph, it says, "The property may have been used" -- oh, I've read that. Page 3, number 4, "since it is not being used for agricultural purposes," there a conflict there, just about it not being used, and there's a reference to maybe being used for grazing. The other thing that -- the next question was that, let me just unload them if I could, Tom, and then I could go back, but the other thing is on page 5, there's no reply from the Department of Agriculture. I mean, to me, that is just a big hole in the report, and what I'm getting to with all -- and then Exhibit 6 -- oh, on page 7, under the analysis, it says, "The compost layering would eventually create a usable farm site and small acreage used for orchard," so forth. And in Exhibit 6, it says, "The application states the land is currently being used for pasture land." And I am requesting, at this point, from the Planning Department, the application. The application for this permit is not included in the information I got. We should know what is being represented here. Okay, those are the questions, and why is the -- the other thing is the characterization, I mean we know that there's big trees, I'm familiar with the area, but, you know, that particular kind of soil is a`a and that doesn't mean it's not farmable at all. Forty odd years ago, there was a big papaya operation in Wakiu named "Menehune Papaya," and Crystal and I used to go down and see my papayas's from Aunty Clara Tolentino every weekend, but the point is a`a is one of the

best type of soils for growing papayas, and it's very good drainage, it's not pilau at all. So, you know, where I'm going with this it's actually I would like to really clarify what the -- it seems to me that it is good soil and the idea that it's in the report of digging a -- I won't characterize how big the pit would be -- but the idea of digging a pit, and then filling it up with compost to create perhaps good soil in the long run doesn't make sense to me. I have lot of experience with composting, sheet composting, I would think that composting, sheet composting would make much more sense than just filling up a whole that used to a`a. So why are all these questions -- why is this -- why is this important? It's because one of the five test of this application is the land upon which the proposed use is sought is unsuited for uses permitted within the district. If our group finds that it's suitable for agriculture, it doesn't pass the five tests, and we have other options as how to deal with this. I'm just trying to get to the contradictions between them saying it's not usable for ag and, on the other end, quite extensively saying that it is usable for ag. So sorry to -- I just wanted to get all those out, Tom. I'd love to hear your, you know, hear your responses. I wasn't trying to lobby for anything, I just wanted to get it out, so please respond if you could.

Ms. Lopez: Thank you, John. Can I respond, Chair?

Chair Carvalho: Go ahead.

Ms. Lopez: Okay. Thank you so much for pointing out all of that in the report. I'm making a note as you're saying it, but you're absolutely correct. I do agree with you. I was working with the engineer, Wayne Arakaki, like I said, he can't be here today, but what we did is we looked at the overall 75.8-acre parcel, so you're looking at a fair amount of big area, yeah, and when he -- when we addressed it, and I like your point, maybe it could have been more organized to where these areas are located, which we were looking at what part could be for farming, what is unsuitable for farming, and what -- what are just rocky and hilly and made just for mining, so I do agree with you on that, thank you so much for pointing that out, and what are those farming activities as well as that pastured areas. Like I said, we were looking at the bigger picture, at the 72.8-acre parcel, and as an agricultural district, how would that compensate for the agricultural uses. So we could have categorized it as much as you said from pasturized, what areas are pasturized; for agricultural uses, what areas are made for suitable for agricultural uses, as well as what areas are not made for agricultural uses, like what Gabe said earlier, some of the areas are really hilly, there's just a lot of rocks in that some areas, some areas are located right next to the streambed, and you do have archaeological sites in those -- some of those areas. And like I agree with you on the soil areas, so there's some areas on that parcel that do have, in that area, a sense of farming activities that are plausible, but I agree that it could have been organized and maybe categorized in such a way that you could understand it more. I don't know if you wanted to address --

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: Yes, there is some earth on the property and that's where the affordable is, hopefully, going to go, and that is from the railroad, down to Hana Highway, there's area that they probably did put sugarcane years ago 'cause there is some earth there, not much, but it is pretty flat and it's kinda nice, and that area is not where we're at, we're above that. Above the railroad track is -- a lot of the area is a solid blue rock, you can't even -- you can't even hardly scratch it with a ...(inaudible)... and then the other areas is kinda like rolling rock, it'll go from here to 15 feet high, and then drop right down again. We tried to walk it. You walk a hundred feet in that, it might take you an hour, and the trees are so thick, the inkberrys, you couldn't even fall down in it, you just -- you're just stuck in it, you know, 'cause there'll be 12 trees in a foot. It's very rugged, it's very rough land, and that's the land that we've been working on. We had the archeological survey and pretty much everything is at the very top of the property, it's almost on the boundary, it's down by the river, and it's down on bluff, and all those areas, we have stayed away from. Yeah, it's not -- and once we clear it, Dan's been planting papayas, and our plan is to grow papayas up there 'cause we can get a good strawberry papaya. And you're right, papayas do grow well in rock and that's -- but it takes so much energy to get an acre it's just -- and if you're worried about us expanding and going beyond that, I'm too old already. Sorry. I can't do it. I just wanna get, really, I just wanna get this subdivision off the ground before -- while I still can, and then that's it.

Ms. Lopez: So I hope I answered your question regarding the --

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, I have another question for Tom, if that's okay. Would you agree to having a site visit with the Aha Moku Council, Mr. Sinenci, and Anjo Hoopai-Waikoloa also said she would take a walk. I think that would be very helpful, and if they could see the site and, you know, I know at this point, we all want to read the archaeological report, so, you know, I don't want to belabor all these points, I have a lot more questions, but if you would agree to that, I would -- I would -- you know, I think we could wrack up -- wrap up today's hearing and make a request of things we'd like to see provided to us, including the application and so forth, and then, you know, meet as soon as possible. I'd be happy to meet, you know, next month, or whenever, after a site visit. I just think that that would do a lot to help things so that's -- I'm not trying to put you on the spot. I do think that's appropriate. And the other thing, without having read the archaeological reports, is, you know, I was, you know, I don't want to overstate this, but if this was -- if this area was near Pi'ilanihale Heiau, you know, there would be no support for this kind of an operation. So I think, you know, when you look at the big history of archaeology and the history of Hana, and these islands, this is our history, this is Hawaiian history, and I think it's really worth taking an extra month to make sure that everybody's on the same page. That's all. I mean I would really would like to see you successful, you know. I'd like to see the affordable housing and all these things blend together to be successful. So that's, basically, my take on it at this point, I'm only speaking for myself, but I've got another page of questions too,

but, at this point, I'd be happy to have a site visit, get everybody informed, and at the next meeting, maybe we could here more about the affordable housing and kind of integrate the whole thing so it would really work, and that's all. Thanks.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: I have no problem with that, and the sooner the better. If you want to tell us when you can shop up, we'll be glad to give you a tour and show you the sites ...(inaudible)... that are very important and we couldn't find anything there because the jungle is so thick, but I'd be glad to take you there. No problem ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Chair Carvalho: That just depends on if we defer, defer the vote at first. We still haven't discussed that yet. Yeah. If the idea is -- if we make a motion to defer, we can -- we can make something happen within the next month-and-a-half or two months. Ward?

Mr. Mardfin: Sybil, this is for you. I'm just curious, and I probably should know this but I don't think I do, who writes this report? Do you write it or does Wayne Arakaki write it?

Ms. Lopez: The staff planner does, I do, with the help of the applicant or the consultant, so in this case, the engineer was helping me with some of the pertinent information in there. I do the analysis and the research and gather the information along with his help.

Mr. Mardfin: Okay. Would you look at page 11?

Ms. Lopez: Sure.

Mr. Mardfin: It says, "Types of growth boundaries and protected areas." It's urban and rural growth boundaries in the new plan. Then it says, "Analysis." It says, "The subject parcel is not located in the urban growth boundary." And by the way, I know that because Hana does not have any urban growth boundary. Then, "The parcel is located in the planned growth area." Would you explain that to me because it's not in the rural growth area either?

Ms. Lopez: So I was going to answer his question that pertains to your answer when he was requesting for the application, so within the application, it is stated - hold on. If you give me a minute?

Mr. Mardfin: Sure.

Ms. Lopez: I can go get it. And just to let you know, the "Kawaipapa Agricultural Park" is the name of the project when the applicant turned in the application.

Mr. Mardfin: John, that means it's just a name. It doesn't have any force of law or anything, like your agricultural parks out by the airports, that's not what this is. It's just a name.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: I understand, but it's -- it leads one to think that it's agricultural park.

Mr. Mardfin: Yeah. I understand.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Chair?

Ms. Lopez: Part of the application, I think it might have been my oversight, but looking at part of the application, under the page 1 of the zoning and flood confirmation form, where we gather this information from, under planned development, zoning committed that area to be a non-planned development area. I do not see that being consistent with the planned growth area, but I have to get confirmation from the zoning administration, enforcement zone, but when they commented, they never had any comments when we put -- when we issued out an agency commenting period, so zoning never confirmed if it was planned growth or not.

Mr. Mardfin: I think -- I looked, when I got this application, I looked at the -- I was on the planning commission when we went through the Maui Island Plan, and I remember I was involved with figuring out where we were going to have -- there's no urban growth in Hana, there's rural growth areas, and I looked at it, my recollection, and when I looked at it the other day, it looks like the very bottom of the property, right off the road, is rural growth area, and that's why they can put houses there.

Ms. Lopez: I think it was only for a section, yeah. Just a portion.

Mr. Mardfin: It's only for a section.

Ms. Lopez: Correct.

Mr. Mardfin: And up where, having seen the map, of where the quarry rock crushing operation's going to be is out of that area, so it's not within the -- the part we're talking about is not within the urban -- the rural growth boundary. The bottom where they want to do the housing is within the urban growth boundary -- or rural growth boundary. I keep saying that. Excuse me.

Ms. Lopez: So I can correct, instead of saying "the parcel is located in the planned growth area," "the proposed area is not located," is that better for you?

Mr. Mardfin: It is not located in the rural --

Ms. Lopez: The proposed the area. So the proposed activity, the 12 acres --

Mr. Mardfin: Is outside --

Ms. Lopez: Is outside of the --

Mr. Mardfin: Of a rural growth boundary.

Ms. Lopez: Correct.

Mr. Mardfin: Yes. That's correct.

Ms. Lopez: Thank you.

Mr. Mardfin: And I just -- I'm just going to make a comment here that, you know, I agree with John. It's -- we're -- it's either ag -- I mean you can't tell me that there's jungle there and that it's not suitable for ag because if there's jungle, clearly, things -- plants grow, but that's okay. I can get by that because I understand what's going on. And John referred to the Menehune Papaya, that was the name of the papaya; the company was the Hana Tropical Fruit Plantation, and I was employed by that in 1964-65 so that's why I know that one. But I'm not going to belabor this anymore. I, personally, think what they're doing is probably not going to be a bad thing, particularly, if it's a way -- if it's a means to an end to get affordable housing. I think if that weren't in the picture, and it's not formally part of the plan, but if that weren't in the picture, I might be a little bit more skeptical but --

Ms. Lopez: Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you, Ward. And, John?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, one thing I was -- you know, I got -- I didn't -- my wife, Crystal, brought home the county packet Thursday night, so I had a chance to look at it, Friday was the first time, and one of the things that I will do, if we should vote to have a site visit and so forth, is I will put together, and give it to Tom and everybody, just some of things that I think we need to overcome, and I'm just going to give you -- and because there's -- what the Planning Department often does is just to pick out the language to support a project. Now, I just want read a couple short excerpts from the Hana Community Plan, and this, the Hana Community Plan that was passed in 1994 by an ordinance with the Hana Advisory Committee, the Hana advisory to the planning commission, the planning commission, the county council, and the administration supporting it, so this is not just something that was

pulled out of a hat, a lot of work went into this, on page 12, under Land Use, it says, Objectives and Policies 6, "Prohibit uses and discourage activities which adversely affect active diversified agricultural endeavors within designated agricultural use areas." The second one I wanted to read, and this is under Cultural Resources, Implementing Actions, page 16, "Require development projects to identify all cultural resources within or adjacent to the project area as part of the county development review process." I think we're on our way to doing that. "Further, require that proposed development include appropriate mitigation measures, including site avoidance, adequate buffer areas, and interpretation." And one of the things under that, there's a number of things, but one of them is to be -- is habitation complexes, both shoreline and interior, and on the surface, it appears to me that this could be, you know, a complex, and that's one of the things that I hope that the Aha Moku Council will be able to look into. So I'm bringing all these things up because, you know, in my opinion, too often that the Planning Department puts out only the positive language. There's some -- there's some very prohibitive language, not shall, it says, "prohibit," and that's pretty direct, and you don't usually see that in the community plans or the Maui Island Plan, the language has really been watered down, so this is very strong for a community plan. And I'd like to put -- I'd like to just put these together, not with a point of view, but just to have everybody, be happy to give it to the Planning Department, and Tom, and anybody else that's interested, put this together so that we have this really, I think, in perspective. I just want to say again I'm glad that you came forward, I appreciate the fact that you're here trying to get a permit, I really do, and I think that the site visit and really getting a grasp of the big picture, you know, we might be able to move something forward, out of this Committee, that really benefits this community. I mean I, just on a personal, if there's any question, during the 1994 Hana Community Plan, I helped to designate what is now the Helani affordable housing project on the maps, I may have said this, my point is this, the community was willing to change the zoning to get affordable housing, I was willing to change the zoning to get land for affordable housing, so I think, you know, keep that in mind and let's really look at the big picture and see if we can come up with something. That's my mana`o. I appreciate it.

Chair Carvalho: Ward.

Mr. Mardfin: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if Scott or Ian or Ed want to say anything more 'cause John and I have sort of dominated this, but, Mr. Chairman, if they don't, I think they should be given an opportunity to, if we're finished, I think we ought to get public testimony, and then I'm prepared to make a motion to defer.

Chair Carvalho: Okay, I'd also like to open it up to public testimony, but before I do that, I'd just like to read this from the Sunshine Law, I'll read it verbatim, it says, "A board can designate two or more board members, but less than the number of members that would constitute a quorum of the board," which would be four, so less than that would be three,

“constitute a quorum of the board to investigate matters concerning board business. The board members designated by the board are required to report their finding, the resulting findings, and recommendations to the entire board at a properly noticed meeting.” So if we -- if we do vote to defer, that is certainly an option. We would possibly have to designate a committee to go out. John?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, I think, you know, for example, the latest one that, I wasn't in on the motion, but there was a cell tower proposed in Kaeleku, and at the request of this Committee, the Planning Department scheduled a site visit. Now, if it's a publicly agendized site visit for this Committee, it doesn't -- you know, three members can be there, I mean more than three can be there, then we can get around any Sunshine Law issue with that. The only question I have is do we need four people to have a site visit? No. Corp. Counsel is saying no.

Mr. Oana: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Ms. Blumer-Buell: Okay, but so I'm just saying if it's an official meeting, then I think we overcome the Sunshine Law and nobody can say, oh, you're meeting in secret, you know, so --

Chair Carvalho: It's not an interaction; it's an actual site visit. Right?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Right. We're not going to make any decisions. People -- I mean I've been -- I've worked with Clayton for a long time and we were always encouraged to, you know, discuss issues with other members, not more than one, and to -- you're free to interact with the community, but I have done that but I have never committed to anything with somebody, I've never said thank you -- I've always said thank you for your mana`o, but I have to look at the big picture as far as the Committee, so I'm just trying to overcome any conflict of interest or so forth so --

Ms. Oana: Yeah, so you're correct. If you want the whole board to go, we'd have to notice it as a public meeting and invite the public, which, at this point, I'm not sure if that's a good idea because it's on someone else's personal property, I don't know what the terrain is, it might be dangerous, so inviting the public to some kind of dangerous area might not be a good idea. But as the Chair said that there is this investigation exception to the Sunshine Law. If you want to designate two or more board members, but less than a quorum, to be in an investigation committee, they can do the site visit, and then come back to the board to report their findings at the next meeting.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: If that's makes it legal, that's fine with me. Now, in addition to two board members, it would be permissible to have Shane Sinenci there as an independent party for the Aha Moku Council, that would be permissible?

Ms. Oana: That would be fine. I just want to remind the Hana Advisory Committee that you are an advisory committee to the Maui Planning Commission, so if the other entity wants to go, that's fine, but it's -- and they can report, and they can testify publicly at our next meeting and tell them what their -- tell us what their findings are as well, but they are not the advisory board to the Maui Planning Commission, you folks are, as you all know.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: As just a suggestion, I would be happy if, I can't volunteer them, but I have a bad back right now, I can't do this within the next month, I'd be happy if Ward Mardfin went, as one representative, and Scott too, those two people. I think Ian and Ed are off the board, and our Chair has recused himself, so that's appropriate, so if that's -- that would be fine with or --

Mr. Mardfin: The third person can be Anjo.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: You're right. I'm sorry. Anjo wanted to do it. So it should be Ward and Anjo, or Scott or Anjo, according to --

Unidentified Speaker: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Oh, there can be? Okay. Yeah, great.

Chair Carvalho: And it must be two, but it can be three. Ed, question.

Mr. Cashman: I have a comment.

Chair Carvalho: Comment. Sorry.

Mr. Cashman: I have a comment. You know, we look at it practically, somebody wouldn't spend thousands of dollars to come before this board if the land was agriculture. He could do something. You not going come for one permit if there's rocks to grind, I mean none of us can do that. He has the means. He's not going to grind something, trees or rock, I mean dirt. The rock is there so he can make aggregate. He wouldn't be spending thousands to come to do that, and yet we're making it hard. I don't know this guy, personally, it's the first time I've seen him, but I've seen him, the work he does in this community. It's good work. When they did the bridge at Koki, the cement came from outside, about \$700 a yard. I helped pour couple slabs and he was charging like \$300. You know, I don't see what the argument about. I'm ready to approve it now. I cannot see

why we going to the -- and look at rocks. That's what we're going to see, we going see trees and rocks. If the Aha Moku, he can take them and show them the sites. If the Aha Moku thinks they should go further, they can go to the planning commission. We just going give one recommendation. I'm ready to approve it now. I don't see why we gotta go there.

Chair Carvalho: Question for Clayton. If we defer this to the next meeting, would that be considered a continuation of this meeting or a brand new meeting, and would that involve the new board members or the old board members?

Mr. Yoshida: I guess it depends on when you have the next meeting. If it's less than six days, then you could recess to a date, time, and place certain. If it's more than six days or more, then you would have to file a new agenda. We would at least like to get through the public hearing, completion of the public hearing portion, so at least that is done, and then if you want to hear our recommendation ...(inaudible)... recommendation, or you folks have a, you know, some recommendations that you want to make, you know, fine, but we would like to at least get through the public hearing portion because we spent money to -- and the applicant has spend monies to provide notice.

Chair Carvalho: So I just thought I'd present that because it might be a touchy subject because we have outgoing members who may want to vote.

Mr. Yoshida: Well, if it's before April 1st, then the current members can vote; if it's the next meeting is after April -- I mean March 31st, then it's the new members that will be making -- helping to make the decision.

Chair Carvalho: I just wanted to clear it up. Thank you. We'd like to open it up to public testimony for anyone who would like to testify. Please state your name. Thank you.

Ms. Dawn Lono: Good evening. My name is Dawn Lono. I just had a question, there was all this discussion about the State Land Use Commission special use permit but I thought that's what he was applying for, according to this? It says, "On behalf of Mr. Thomas Hoeffken requesting a State Land Use Commission special use permit." So I didn't understand that part of the discussion.

Mr. Mardfin: I think the -- if you don't mind? Yes, he is applying for a State Land Use Commission permit. If there's less than 15 acres, it devolves to the Maui Planning Commission. If it's more than 15, it is before the State Land Use Commission itself. I believe that's correct. Is it, Clayton?

Mr. Lono: Well, then if it's under 15 acres, even though it's a State Land Use Commission special use permit, the Maui Planning Commission would make the decision and it wouldn't have to go to the State level? Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Yoshida: Yeah, that's correct.

Ms. Lei Soares: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Carvalho: Yes. You can --

Ms. Soares: Hi. My name is Lei Soares. I just had a small question. The area you're going to mine is pretty much where you already do it now? So there would be no increase in sound effect to bordering neighbors or anything like that?

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: That is correct.

Ms. Soares: And since you don't do any blasting or anything, that doesn't affect us foundationally or anything like that?

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: No. We couldn't blast. It's way too expensive.

Ms. Soares: Okay. I --

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: It's basically just taking the top and pushing it down ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Ms. Soares: That's all I wanted to know because I live in the bordering area.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you. Please state your name.

Ms. Joanne Young: Hi. My name is Joanne Young, and I live in Kawaipapa. I was born and raised there. And as far as that crushing of the rocks, I also had used him to do my driveway, and I think he did a very good job, and it was not costly at all. And as far as the noise is concerned about crushing the rocks, I hear it and it doesn't disturb me because it's during working hours. They do it in the morning, and they end it in the afternoon. So, you know, I'm in support of what Mr. Cashman had said in his statement. And as far as the -- this is not about the affordable housing; this is for the special use permit. So I'd like to give my testimony for that. Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Any questions? Not on that? Okay.

Mr. Sinenci: I just wanted to add. I wanted to --

Chair Carvalho: Please state your name again. Sorry.

Mr. Sinenci: Shane Sinenci, again with the Aha Moku. I just wanted to thank Tom and his team. I mean I do recognize his -- the benefit to our community, and I appreciate his -- to cultural significant sites, culturally significant sites, and we offer to work with him if the offer with us, we'd like to, and to also, like Anjo said, to make it safe for our residents that they can enjoy. We do -- I do support housing. My uncles and my -- wouldn't -- they wouldn't forgive me if I didn't. But I do support the housing, affordable housing. I would like to -- maybe if the board could, after listening to the potential of the property while still doing the mining at a small scale so that it can benefit the community with housing and with the refuse site, that that operation be small scale to support community-based projects in accord with the community plan. I would love to see percentages of the 72 acres, the bottom rural part for housing, mining, keep our culturally significant sites, maybe towards the top more farming, even, you know, if you're partnering up with the county with the refuse, you know, maybe taken on some of those green wastes that could help maybe provide top soil for future or for the yard or yard maintenance. I know, it's just an idea. But thank you. I mean I just wanted to -- maybe you guys can make those recommendations in your decision today. Thanks.

Chair Carvalho: Any questions for Shane? No? Thank you. Anyone else that would like to testify right now have any testimony? With that, we can close public testimony. Have any -- another question from Ian?

Mr. Ballantyne: No, it's not a question, it's more a comment, updating. We've had two more public testimonies about the noise during the day, so I would like to see, in our resolution, some notification on restriction on site working hours because, to me, 5:30 in the morning isn't normal working hours.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you. Tom?

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: Whenever we crush, we crush from our 8:30 to, at the latest, 4:20. We don't -- we try to even start later than that. We don't try to -- we don't want to intimidate the neighbors. We like to get it when the wind's blowing up the hill so the noise is going further away from the community. But if you're hearing noise at 5:30, I'm not quite sure what that is, but I'm not saying it is -- we do not crush during those hours. We haven't done it for a few years. We made such a large for the refuse that we still got plenty of aggregate. But we are going to be firing up the crusher tomorrow to do a test. We're flying a guy from Oahu to do a clean air test for the state, so you're going to hear a little noise tomorrow, I don't think it'll be much, but we have to do that just to comply.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you. Okay, any other questions or comments from the board? Ed.

Mr. Cashman: I make a motion to recommend approval of the special use permit to the planning commission.

Chair Carvalho: Do I hear a second?

Mr. Scott Crawford: I will second that motion.

Chair Carvalho: Do we have any discussion on that motion? Scott? Ed presented the motion, and Scott seconded it, and I'll leave for a comment from Scott.

Mr. Crawford: And I want to second the motion in order to have us a chance to discuss it and give us a hearing to approve before we -- if the motion fails to pass, we can talk about deferral, but I think that in any of this process, we have to balance trying to be as thorough as we can to feel like we're making informed decisions with sufficient information, taking into account the sentiments and the interest of our community; at the same time, we want to be expeditious and not drag things out further than they need to be, and, you know, and not just belabor the point just for the sake of trying to feel like we're being thorough. So, you know, after listening to the questions and the responses, and listening to the public testimony, not hearing anyone really speaking against it, there's some sort of procedural and maybe conflicts with how things are presented in the application or in the department's report, and there's some conditions that people would like to be placed on it, but I haven't heard anybody speaking in opposition to it. It's certainly, for myself personally, I can see the benefits of it from just the basic principle of it, I can see it's worth supporting, so it's really just a matter of, you know, do the details work? And at this time, you know, I could see the benefit of doing a site visit to really more thoroughly understand the project, but I'm not really sure if that's necessary. I'm not sure if it would get us that much more information that we, you know, that we don't, you know -- we can -- and, you know, to answer some of John questions about the exact nature of the agricultural quality and what it could be used for, I think, to some extent, those just get into -- it's getting into the details, getting into the weeds, literally and figuratively, that aren't probably really Germaine to whether we want to support it or not. It's kind of getting, you know -- we can sort out all those details and have them all lined up and we'll be back at the same place. So my sense, at this point, would be that I would be willing to support approval at this time. If, you know, if the rest of the board doesn't agree with that, then I would be happy to go on a site visit and come back for another hearing at another time, but at this time, I'm willing to approve it without having to go through that step.

Chair Carvalho: I just wanted to ask, Ed, is this approval with conditions or approval with no conditions?

Mr. Cashman: I think had some conditions that were mentioned so we can add that, yeah, like Shane, people were making -- they would like to see conditions placed on it. I just wanted to see where we all stood so I made the motion, I mean if we had support or not, you know. If you folks want to amend it and put the conditions, it's fine with me, yeah. Ward?

Mr. Mardfin: I hear what Scott says and I have a great deal of sympathy for that, but I intend to vote no because I want to defer. I want -- I think we should have a site visit. It's not -- it has nothing to do with the applicant, but I don't like getting a 72-page archaeological report the day of the meeting, I mean not even the day of the meeting, at the beginning of the meeting. I can't read 72 pages in 5 minutes. I would be happy for -- to have an investigative committee of Scott, Anjo, and myself to go up and take a look at it. I'd be happy for it to be a continuation of this meeting if we held it within -- can we hold it next Monday and still be a continuation? Well, that could be dealt with later. I'm happy to have an expedited meeting, but I do think that there was enough flaky about this, having nothing to do with the applicant, but it makes me want to take an extra look.

Chair Carvalho: Clayton?

Mr. Yoshida: I guess if it's the board's wish, we could -- if it is -- well, it's possible to do it next Monday if we can find a place, secure a place for the meeting. Ward.

Mr. Mardfin: If we don't -- if it's within a week, and we've held the public hearing, so it doesn't have to be a public hearing type of thing, I imagine we could use the council office right next door. I imagine. I don't know that for a fact. It would be up to Dawn. But it could be done.

Chair Carvalho: So getting back to the motion. Would we have to make any amendments to that? Ed's suggesting amendment -- amendments to his approval.

Mr. Mardfin: If the motion to approve fails -- if you want to make -- you're caught in a bind. If you want to have conditions, then you gotta write the conditions now and put them in. If you defer, you have a week to write the conditions, and propose them, and vote on them, which is reason number three why I'm going to vote no on the motion.

Chair Carvalho: Okay, let Scott -- hold on. Scott?

Mr. Crawford: Well, I would support it with conditions, so if we're going to vote on it now to approve, I'd like to have that be amended with conditions. I think -- would it be possible to get a summary of what the requested conditions have been stated so far?

Mr. Yoshida: Well, I guess the department did supply our recommendation memorandum with six recommended conditions for the Committee's consideration. Now, if you want to alter, modify, add, delete, it's up to the Committee.

Chair Carvalho: Ward?

Mr. Mardfin: I, Clayton, I think the conditions in the report are the standard conditions that they put on virtually everything. It is not -- it doesn't deal with operating hours, it doesn't deal with -- I don't know what -- there were a couple of other things that were brought up. Awe shucks, slipping my mind right now.

Mr. Yoshida: The Committee could add additional conditions to address concerns, such as hours of operation.

Mr. Crawford: What I'm asking is what are the other conditions that have been raised today that we would want to add in addition to the department's recommendations? I know operating hours was one of them. There was something regarding archaeological sites? Well, not a site visit, a -- well, you know, we can have a site visit before we approve, but we can't -- but the -- a site visit wouldn't be a condition of the permit itself, so I'm saying what are the conditions that we want to put into the permit that have been raised today, other than that -- other than the restrictions on the hours of operation?

Ms. Lopez: So, Mr. Crawford, can I address your question? So the recommendation that was -- that the Maui Planning Department recommend to the Hana Advisory Committee is the standard six conditions with the valid three years of the State Land Use Commission special use permit, adding to what the Hana Advisory Committee requested was, number one, the hours of operation, and number two, to address the cultural and archaeological impact where if there was such historic properties affected that the applicant would do it due diligence to do an archaeological monitoring plan or does have an archaeological on site during the excavation work. Was that correct? The site visit was not included in the condition because it was just a recommendation for the Committee to do.

Mr. Crawford: Okay, so what I would like to do is to offer a friendly amendment to the motion to include those two conditions as stated with the motion to approve with those two conditions.

Chair Carvalho: So we can just amend the approval. I don't believe we -- we can ask, Scott, is that a motion with the amendments, and, Ed, you will second? Any discussion on the amendment? John?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, I won't be voting for the motion. I would like to get this resolved in a timely, you know, in a timely manner, but I think it's important for us to have the feedback from Aha Moku Council, number one; number two, you know, this -- the five tests are the law and I would like to get through, you know, clarify the fact that it can be -- I mean this could be denied just because the proposed use is suited for uses permitted within the district. I'd like to pay attention to the -- to the five laws there to actually have time to really focus on those and also what's in Chapter 205. I mean I did take the time to look at that and there's quite a few things that may prompt conditions from both the five tests and Chapter 205. So, you know, I would just like the opportunity to have the Aha Moku Council look at it, get their feedback, have time to read the archaeological report we got at the start of the meeting, and I've requested the application to be able to go over that. So for those reasons, I would be voting against it. I think deferral is the really the best idea and will give everybody some time to really look at what the reports are and, hopefully, come up with a consensus. You know, I'm just -- this is too much of a rush to just approve this with conditions that aren't really -- really haven't been thoroughly discussed. So thank you.

Chair Carvalho: I don't want to belabor the point because with Anjo and I both excused, we just have five for the quorum, so let's put the amendment -- the motion with the amendment to a vote.

Mr. Crawford: I just wanted to make one comment too about your recusal. Maybe you could actually ask for legal counsel on this because while appreciate the intent behind avoiding conflict of interest, I had a situation in a previous hearing where I had a business relationship with one of the applicants, I specifically asked for guidance from Corporation Counsel and was told, if I remember correctly, that as long as you disclose that conflict of interest or that potential appearance of conflict of interest, you can still vote on the item, and I was able to vote. So I don't think that you necessarily need to recuse yourself, if you choose to do so, you can, but you don't absolutely have to, Corporation Counsel could correct me if I'm wrong on that, but I believe as long as you disclose your affiliation, your business interests, you can still participate in the decision making.

Chair Carvalho: Yeah. So we went over it. We talked about it. And it's more to do with Tom and Don work for the company I work for, Hana Ranch Ag, and it also kind of involve potential work as well. If this motion passes, there's considerable work that's going to be in line for him through our -- through the company I work for, and I don't know if that's direct enough to consider that conflict of interest, especially at a public hearing, I don't want to mask that, I guess.

Mr. Crawford: Thank you. And I appreciate your intent behind that. I just kind of wanted to clarify, from a legal perspective, that you're not actually required to recuse yourself.

Chair Carvalho: I just feel comfortable abstaining from this vote just for this motion. Let's put this to the vote.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Committee Member Cashman, seconded by Commissioner Member Crawford, then

VOTED: to recommend approval to the Maui Planning Commission with the conditions as amended.

(Assenting: I. Ballantyne; E. Cashman; S. Crawford)
(Dissenting: J. Blumer-Buell; W. Mardfin)
(Abstaining: C. Crawford)
(Excused: A. Hoopai-Waikoloa)

MOTION FAILS

Chair Carvalho: And with one abstaining, motion fails, three to two. Ward.

Mr. Mardfin: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion. I move to defer this to a shorter period as we can do but with time enough for a site visit. If we can hold the continuation meeting next Monday, that's fine with me. I thing Anjo and Scott and I can meet with the applicant and walk the property and see what's going on, and give at least an oral report to the full body when we meet next Monday. I tend to be in favor of the project so I don't think we're going to be terribly surprised, but I do want a chance to read the archaeological report and see for myself.

Mr. Crawford: I second the motion.

Chair Carvalho: Ward makes the motion to defer, and Scott will second. I believe we can -- we can hammer all the details later with Tom and Gabe, if this does approve. Any discussion on this motion to defer? Scott.

Mr. Crawford: I would prefer if we could do it as a continuation, if we can arrange that, I think that makes sense.

Chair Carvalho: And the continuation date is within the month or six -- you said six days, Clayton?

Mr. Yoshida: If that's the wish of the Committee, we'll try to do it prior to April 1st. I mean we could --

Mr. Crawford: That's two separate questions. One is being able to do it as a continuation of this meeting so we don't have to have a separately noticed meeting. The ability for the current members to vote is a separate issue, which I'm less concerned about. I'm more just can we have it be a continuation of the same meeting. Can we recess this meeting and reconvene after a site visit?

Chair Carvalho: With that we -- with that we'd have to announce a date tonight.

Mr. Yoshida: Yes. So I think you have to announce the date, time, and place, and I think it has to be less than six days because if it's six days or more, you could post -- if you can post an agenda, well --

Ms. Oana: I don't think that is a requirement. I think the only requirement to reconvene a meeting without agendizing it would be announce, at this meeting, when we recess, when is the next meeting and where - date, time, and place.

Mr. Mardfin: I hope our Corp. Counsel is correct. I don't want to sit on this for a long time, but I do think we need to do stuff, I think we've got a right to conditions, you know.

Ms. Lopez: And just for the record, that you guys have received the archaeological report when was requested, last week Friday, from John, that it was emailed replied back to you and your whole board with the archaeological report attached as well as with the historic preservation's report attached, both front and back. So it was emailed to you last week Friday. I just wanted to put that on record.

Mr. Mardfin: I didn't get it.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: I didn't get it.

Mr. Crawford: I don't think I got it either. And even if it was Friday, that's basically like half a working day to be able to review it so --

Chair Carvalho: Any other discussion on the deferral first? John.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Just that if you could, I would appreciate it if you would email us the application by Tom's Backhoe. That would be helpful to look at the application and what they've actually represented.

Ms. Lopez: Sure. And you probably might have not, if I'm hearing you guys correct, that you guys never received the email is because it was a big email, yeah, it's 72-page report, plus the 2-page of the historic preservation, so if your email is without that capacity, then, unfortunately, you guys did not receive it, but for those who has the capacity to hold a 72-page report and a kilobyte, then you guys would have received that, but I just wanted to put that on the record that the department did respond in a timely manner last week Friday that the report was to be emailed to the Committee.

Mr. Crawford: If members were unable to receive the report due to the capacity of their email boxes, then the department would have received a notice of that, a bounce back notice, indicating that the message hadn't been delivered so you should be aware of that, and there should be another means to be able to provide large files to us through placing it on a web server or putting it in a Dropbox, or something like that, so that we can access those files without having to depend on email.

Chair Carvalho: Any other discussion on the motion to defer? With that, I believe we can put it to a vote.

Mr. Mardfin: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Chair Carvalho: That would require -- we have to require like three different dates right now because we'd have to have the approval of Tom, and of Dawn.

Mr. Hoeffken: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Chair Carvalho: Okay.

Mr. Crawford: Monday works for me. Can we do the site visit on the same day prior to the continuation hearing?

Chair Carvalho: Would we have a quorum on -- next Monday?

Mr. Mardfin: One, I don't -- do we have to specify in the motion the exact date of the next meeting? Do we have to announce it before we vote or can it be announced before this meeting ends? It'll be recessed at the end of this meeting, after we go through the bridges, so we'll have it worked out by then. Secondly, on the site visit, I'd prefer it be before the Monday so that we can -- John wanted Aha Moku to be thinking about it a little bit. Now I don't -- you know, the Friday, this coming Friday, or this coming Thursday, or, you know, just about anytime, but --

Mr. Crawford: Yeah, that's fine. I don't have any objection.

Mr. Mardfin: We have other goals besides just looking. So the exact date doesn't have to be in the motion; it does have to be in the -- before we end this meeting tonight. Correct?

Mr. Oana: I'm sorry. I wasn't ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Mardfin: The meeting doesn't -- the date of the continuation doesn't have to be in the motion, but it does have to be announced before we recess this evening. Okay.

Chair Carvalho: So, okay for everyone? Okay.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Committee Member Mardfin, seconded by Committee Member Crawford, then unanimously

VOTED: to defer this to a shorter period as possible but with time enough for a site visit.

Chair Carvalho: And none opposed, so the decision, the motion to defer passes unanimously. We'd like to extend this part and make a motion to designate a committee, officially, for the site -- yeah, the investigation, the site visit on Monday or Friday, or the day we're going to designate, we'd like to designate a committee of at least two members, and less than a quorum.

Mr. Mardfin: I move that the investigative committee be composed of Anjo, Scott, and myself --

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Second.

Mr. Mardfin: To meet with the applicant and walk the property and see what's going on.

Chair Carvalho: Ward will present the motion, and John will second. Any other discussion on that motion? Can we put that to a vote?

It has been moved by Committee Member Mardfin, seconded by Committee Member Blumer-Buell, then unanimously

VOTED: that Committee Members Hoopai-Waikoloa, Crawford, and Mardfin be selected for the investigative committee to meet with the applicant and do a site visit of the subject property.

Chair Carvalho: Alright, none opposed, so the motion to designate that committee passes unanimously. Before we move on to the next agenda item, I'd just like to have a short recess, in regards to time, to be sensitive to time as well. John?

Mr. Blumer-Buell: Yeah, because of my lower back strain, I'm going to have to take off now, and so you'll still have a quorum.

Chair Carvalho: Yeah.

Mr. Blumer-Buell: but I just wanted to say, beforehand, I will be -- I am watching the bridge issues very carefully. I worked on this decades ago and will be submitting some, hopefully, helpful information to the state, so I appreciate the fact that you're doing this. Thank you.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you. So we will have a quorum, and I would just live to present a five-minute recess, if we could. Thank you.

(A recess was called at 6:36 p.m., and the meeting reconvened at 6:44 p.m.)

Chair Carvalho: Okay, we can move on. We can move on to agenda item F, if you'd like to come forward? Oh, Clayton, go ahead.

Mr. Yoshida read the following agenda item into the record:

F. COMMUNICATIONS

- 1. MS. CHARLENE SHIBUYA, of MUNEKIYO HIRAGA. consultant for the STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, requesting comments on the Hana Highway. Route 360, Bridge Preservation Plan within the Hana Highway Historic District, Federal Aid Project No. BR-0360 (012) - 75% Draft.**

The Committee may provide its comments on the draft.

Mr. Yoshida: Again, we'd probably have to end about 7:30 because they're going to close the highway at 9:00, and we gotta be pass that before they close the road, so I'll turn it over to Charlene.

Ms. Charlene Shibuya: Yeah, as Clayton said, my name is Charlene Shibuya. I'm with the planning firm of Munekiyo & Hiraga, and we've been the community outreach consultants on behalf of State DOT, and with me, I have a huge team of consultants that'll walk you through this 75% draft report, which is over 500 pages, so I think you'll appreciate the

summary. But with me, I have the historic architectural specialist from Fung Associates, Inc., I got Tonia Moy, Alison Chiu, and Virginia Murison, and then we have a structural engineer from Nagamine Okawa Engineers, Cody Aihara, and then we have a civil engineer and, I guess, Tyler Fujiwara and Eric Takamine, they're the civil and traffic engineers from Austin Tsutsumi & Associates, and, of course, we have Ferdinand Cajigal, from the Maui District, State DOT office, that we're acting on behalf.

And just to give you a brief summary. This is a second round of meetings and the reason why we couldn't go before the Hana Advisory Committee last summer, at the onset of the project when we introduced this project to all the community associations, the four Aha Moku Districts across the Hana Highway Historic District Highway, was because you guys weren't meeting for that time, but Ward has been gracious enough to allow us to consult with him all this time, because as everybody knows, Ward is, you know, he's a great researchest for these Hana bridges, and with this, I'll turn it over to Tonia, who will start the presentation.

Ms. Tonia Moy: Hi. Thank so much for having us, and I will try and make it really fast. I know you guys all have the powerpoint presentation in front of you, so I'm going to skip a lot of slides because what we're doing right now is we're asking for comments, so, you know, you can go back and you can give us comments later. I understand everybody has to get out of here in like 45 minutes so -- and it's a 45-minute presentation, but we'll make it fast.

So, basically, I'm going to give kind of the overview of the project, and then after I'm done, Virginia's going to kind of give a little description of the project but you'll have to probably supplement that with what's in your handout and also what's in the report, and then Alison is going to give our kind of overview of our recommendations, and then Cody's going to give our structural, kind of a more of a structural analysis of what goes on under the bridges.

So, briefly, this is our team. So you introduced most of us, but we also have electrical engineer, and then we have an archaeologist onboard too, and so they gave some basic recommendations on how to treat the bridges. So the overall project purpose is a preservation plan. This is, you know, for HDOT project, this is the state portion. I want to emphasize it's the state portion of bridges. That it's a preservation plan, so because DOT gets federal funding, they have to always have Section 106 consultation, which is the National Historic Preservation Act, so our job was sort of to get like context sensitive design in there, we're trying to get like preservation issues worked out. And so, just as a reminder, this is not an actual construction project. This is just a preservation plan. So if they were to have a construction project, they would come back to the community and go through it in much more detail. This is just an overall guidance.

So the reason why we're here is, I'll just kind of highlight our second one, which is to get the community feedback. It's very easy for us to sit in our offices and sort of like dream up what we think should be done, but it won't do any good without getting the community feedback since you -- since the community is the one who has to actually use the highway, right?

And so just to go over this really fast, like Charlene said, the beginning, we went through like a summer -- like last summer, we went to all the many different communities and we go their -- it was just to get the feedback. We had nothing in mind. Now we have a 75% plan, and we want to get the feedback from the community for what we have so far. So I know you guys weren't -- we didn't meet with you guys last time, but just to let you know that the initial -- the first meeting, overwhelmingly, the community wanted basically one lane, keep one lane, keep it very rural, don't straighten the highway, and then the other thing was they really wanted to have the Hawaiian names put back onto the bridges, and so this is going to be, you know, one of the things that we want your guys' feedback on especially.

So I'm not going to go over this. I think you guys are probably familiar with where the Hana Highway District is, the historic district. This just shows you that we're just doing the state portion. The county already has a preservation plan. Just a closeup. This one is just -- you can, you know, it's just to name all the bridges. You have it in your handout. And then this is just to -- we are basically trying to find a plan that meets historic preservation rules, or the Secretary of Interior Standards, while still maintaining public safety. So that'll just wrap up that whole thing right there.

And I'll just go over this one a little bit because since you guys haven't been through the first meeting, or some of you have I think, but anyway, how to use the report. So the report's basically in two parts. The first part, Section A, is sort of the why. Why, you know, the regulatory reasons, goes through the Secretary of Interior Standards, what they mean, the guidelines we're following, kind of how we were thinking about, you know, doing overall guidelines, and then while we do have a -- we do have another section that we added, this Chapter 6, because, overwhelmingly, the community kept talking about traffic issues, or, you know, like other issues, like rock fall mitigation, and all that stuff, which really didn't have anything to do with the bridges themselves, but there were overwhelming community concerns every time we went to a different community, so we added that chapter to sort of put all the community's concerns, noted, you know, like have driving etiquette put in to something, you know, and all that kinda thing, so that's where Chapter 6. And then the B and C chapters are going to be where the chunk of information, every single bridge is going to have the recommendations, it's going to say something about archaeological inventory survey should be taken before you undergo, you know, you have to get the potential effect, the area noted, and, you know, it's going to list everything so that the designer can take

that chapter and go on to the next step, you know, just kind of start working with some planning, basic planning in mind.

So next, Virginia will whip through those.

Ms. Virginia Murison: Thank you. Just to focus you on the report, because it is 700 pages, there's an executive summary, and you have a copy of that, I believe, as a handout today. This is the gist of where our recommendations are. We would very much like your feedback on this. This covers every single bridge, and the 12 historic culverts that are identified in the National Register Nomination. What I'm going to present to you is a very quick overview of what's in this executive summary.

The purpose of evaluating the bridges, we ended up identifying 17 bridges and 1 culvert, which have exceptional characteristics, and we designated them as exceptional. The other -- the remainder of the 43 bridges and 12 culverts on the state portion of the highway are considered contributing although all of them are contributing to the historic district. The exceptional ones, you can see in this chart, and I'm on page 12 of your handout, they're exceptional because they have historic date panels, they have unique features that's the oldest example of its type and so on.

We also were guided by some minimum requirements as we evaluated each bridge, which was a recommendation that the pre-passive travel be no narrower than 16 feet, and by federal highway code, approach guardrails and bridge railings need to be 27 inches in height. The -- and then we were also asked to bring the structural strength of the bridges up to accommodate 40 tons, and Cody will get into that.

We further divided the bridges into two categories of rail types because that's the most visible portion of the bridge. There are 31 open picket railings and 5 culverts. All of the open picket bridges, bridges with open picket railings, equal or exceed 16 feet in width, so none of the open picket railings would need to have the bridges widened. Within that, we have 11 exceptional bridges. There are 4 curved bridges, and there's a chart which will show you what they are, and you'll also see, when you get to the executive summary, we've broken it down into these categories. There are 3 arched bridges, the longest of which, of course, is the Waikani Stream Bridge, and then the closed span arched bridges. There are 2 bridges with exceptional -- of the open picket design with exceptional piers. Bridge 25, I'm sorry, my Hawaiian is not as good as it could be, is resting on a mid-span pier of a phenomenal lava rock formation, and Honomaele Stream Bridge, Bridge no. 40, has the oldest concrete pier on the highway, it dates back to 1906 wooden truss bridge, and you can even see in the detail -- well -- the Waikamilo Stream Bridge and its adjacent culvert were built in the early part of the highway, I don't have the exact date, I believe it was 1920. In 1937, several bridges and culverts were widened, and at the time, this one,

the solid panel railings, were replaced with this Greek cross railing, that is unique on Hana Highway, it's not unique in the state. In the mid-1930s, it was a popular railing design, but it's unique to the Hana Highway. And then the last bridge in the exception category of the open picket is the post World War II bridge, which is at the end of the Hana -- the Hana end of the highway.

Unidentified Speaker: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Mr. Murison: Yeah, you can help me with the names, yeah. Yes, we heard that name tonight. Then of the 31 open picket railing bridge types, 20 are contributing, not that they're not great bridges, but they don't have some of the exceptional characteristics or are not representative of one of a kind, like the ones we just looked at. And there are summaries in your handout.

The solid parapet bridges, there are 12 bridges and 7 culverts with the solid panel. An interesting part of the solid panels is they were all designed between 1908 and 1914, and at that time, the road was essentially wagon trail, it was not a automobile highway; therefore, the widths of these bridges are 12 feet, a little bit wider than 12 feet. These will all have -- require some form of adjustment either in widening in one direction or another in order to achieve the 16-foot clearance with one exception. So we have 3 bridges with distinct date panels, there is a fourth one, but it's been so heavily damaged, you can't even read the date anymore. So the 3 historic bridges with the date -- with the visible date panel, which is visible on the makai side or the downstream side, would be widened on the upstream side, and Alison will get to some specifics, but the scheme we've come up with is to provide a protective guardrail to protect the historic railing, which won't meet a crash test, but the protective rail within that railing would meet the crash test. So in the case of the 3 date bridges, we would install the protective crash rail inside the downstream parapet, protecting that parapet, and allowing the historic railing to remain, and then to widen the bridges to meet the 16 feet clear on the upstream side. This bridge is the one bridge that is the exception to just about everything. It is only 14.5 feet wide, therefore, we can't even install the crash rail on the inside of this one. It has -- the East Maui Irrigation, what we call the EMI, equipment attached to it that opens this loose gate and adjust the water flow, and we will be requesting an exemption on width for this bridge; also, it's a very unique railing design, it doesn't meet the crash level test that we need to meet for the road capacity and speed, so we're going to request that the speed limit at this bridge be dropped down and that the railing be then equated to the lowest level of crash test, that will allow the originally unique structure to stay in tact without any alteration. Bridge Mokulehua Stream Bridge, Bridge no. 40, is the oldest concrete bridge on the highway. It's 1 of only 3 bridges -- of only 3 bridges in the entire state. It's the first reinforced concrete bridge built on the Hana Highway, and the piers date from an even earlier wooden truss bridge, the only triple span solid parapet bridge, and it also features some exceptional concrete masonry work on the

abutments. The recommendation is to widen this bridge on the side that is the least visible from the highway, and we're verifying that.

Then we also have one distinctive pier bridge in the solid parapet railing design, and this one happens to be that distinctive railing is on the upstream side as is the pointed feature of the masonry pier wall, it's the only masonry pier wall along the highway. So in this one case, we're actually recommending that the downstream parapet be replaced, the bridge widened in the downstream direction; that parapet is not original anyway and it will help the curve coming around. It's near a park.

Then there are typical solid parapet railings, there are 6 contributing bridges, and 7 contributing culverts, and I should have mentioned this at the beginning, when we talk about the 12 historic culverts, we're basically talking about short bridges. Federal highway defines a bridge as 20 feet or longer, these culverts are -- they just look like mini bridges, and you've seen some, some of them are really cute. So of the solid parapets, there are 6 contributing bridges parapets, and 7 contributing culverts, and they will require a variety of widening, for example, you'll see the bridge on the left, the great unknown no. 1, which has already had its parapets replaced, so it's not a big historic issue with us. And Bridge no. 9 on the right is the one that actually had a date panel but it's been so badly damaged that it's no longer evident.

And there are summaries and your powerpoint. Again, strongly urge that you look through our executive summary and respond to our recommendation. We're looking forward to your input.

Ms. Alison Chiu: So as Tonia and Virginia both mentioned, for each bridge, there are recommendations in the executive summary table, and the recommendations for each bridge are different because we wanted to look at each bridge in a unique site specific context but then, also, comprehensively since they're all part of the historic district. So I'm going to talk a little bit about the treatment approaches that are team came up with, and tell you a little bit about our reasoning behind these treatment recommendations.

Wherever possible, we hope to retain the existing historic parapets, which are a very important character defining feature of the historic Hana Highway district. DOT has requested railings that meet the current safety codes, so we're looking at a couple of different options here. First, in order to retain the existing parapets, as Virginia mentioned, we could add the protective interior crash tested railing that meets the code, and beyond meeting the code of the interior rail, it also provides protection for the historic railings so they would not be damaged in the event of a crash, and we also wanted to avoid altering the view of the historic bridges, so by adding the crash tested rails to the interior side of the bridge, we would hope to keep the same view plane of the historic parapets as people drive

along the winding road on the way to Hana. And our team is still researching inappropriate interior rail that would both meet the code and also be as compatible as possible within the historic districts.

Some of the bridges, as you know, are very narrow. With the addition of an interior crash tested rail for protection, we would need to set aside a -- we would need a set amount of space between the original railing and the crash tested railing on each side, which accounts for deflection of the railing in the event of a crash. Since we need to meet the 16-foot minimum width criteria for a one-lane bridge, that would mean that some of these narrow bridges may need to be widened slightly to accommodate these required dimensions. So for the bridges that have the original dates inside -- into the makai parapet, that's the 1911 or even 1912, the top right diagram right here illustrates the recommendations for these bridges. So from the left to right, we have the original makai parapet, which would remain in place, and then we have the required deflection space right here, which would be dependent on which interior crash tested rail is chosen. And just for clarification that this drawing is not to scale so the space right here is not a walkway and it's not a bicycle way. And then the interior crash tested rail would be added for safety, and then we would have the 16-foot minimum width between the crash tested rail and then the new mauka parapet, in blue that you see here, that would be replace in-kind with a solid crash tested parapet. And then the bottom right example that you see here shows a situation where both of the historic railings are kept, and the interior crash tested rails are added with a slight widening to accommodate the cars, and this would be the proposed option for the historic culverts, which are less than 20 feet long, and which we believe can be widened -- can be moved for the roadway to be widened without damage; this way, we would be able to retain the historic rails, and we can also ensure that the structures are safe for everyone traveling along the road.

The second option that we're looking at is where railings need to be replaced to meet code. We would like to use a similar design compatible with the rest of the bridges within the historic district. So this diagram that you see here shows the location of the existing rail and an example known as the T-411 railing, which has a similar profile, which its slightly more rounded at the top of the opening, but it's very similar to the open picket historic rails on both size and proportion. And some of the bridges are currently at or near the 16-foot width right now so if we were to add the interior rails, it would make the lanes for the cars even narrower, so the benefit of using a replacement in-kind option, like this, is that it eliminates the need for widening the road. Similarly, for the typical solid parapet bridges, which could be replaced in-kind with a solid vertical railing to match the existing. And then for the current approach walls, which are the short walls with the lava rock cladding that abut the ends of the bridges, those also need to be strengthened for safety, but we want to do this in a sensitive manner, and so we would like to retain the look and feel of the lava rock cladding as a character defining feature of the historic Hana Highway.

So shown here are a couple of examples that meet the safety code. They would be 27 inches high, and we can adapt them to the Hana setting by cladding them in lava rock, so it would be very similar to what's currently here now. And the options that we've just discussed here, for the railings and the approach walls, are all just potential options that based on our team's extensive visits to Hana and our research, can meet both the safety criteria and the compatibility with the historic bridges. So this is just a really good opportunity for us to ask you and encourage public and professional feedback to help us refine the recommendations that will affect the entire community. And I'll turn it over to Cody who will discuss our structural.

Ms. Cody Aihara: Shown here is one of the options that we are proposing for increasing the capacity for load carrying for the bridges. Right now, we do have some bridges in which the -- in which the girders are currently unable to carry the increase in capacity, so we are looking at a proposal of, one, removing bridges with the excessive asphalt build-up from years of over-pavement, topping, and in addition to installing new concrete girders between the existing, and we are mindful that we do not want to go -- protrude below the existing girders so, therefore, keeping in context with the driving around the bridges that they will still have the same outer appearance and character.

Another proposed improvement for the bridges are a lot of the CRM abutments, the mortar has either disappeared or was not in existence in its current construction, so to keep and retain the historic craftsmanship of the CRM facade, we are proposing to right actions of the future team that they are to document, both by recording the rock placement and photographic records, and removing the facade, rebuilding the actual structural to code abutment behind it, and then restoring the facade to match the original condition before it was disassembled.

In addition to the historic bridges that were listed in the HAER report, the DOT asked us to research the hillside bridges. There are a total of seven hillside bridges along Hana Highway. These seven bridges were built between 2001 and 2004, therefore, they meet all current load criteria and, therefore, don't need to be widened or strengthened. The reason they're called "hillside bridges" is because the slab is actually being cantilevered off of the highway, so when you're on the highway, you actually don't see any part of this extension, but on the other side of the guardrail, you can see that there is a thickened slab and, in some cases, there are piles for these bridges.

Found culverts. With the addition of the hillside bridges, we were also provided the as-built drawings for the entire Hana Highway, and we were asked to find as many of these culverts as we could along the highway and upgrade the railings or any portions of it that protrude above the highway to meet current code. So there were a total of 45 culverts that we were able to find along Hana Highway, as we were driving. A total of 19 were reinforced

concrete pipes; 20 were reinforced concrete or rock box culverts; 5 were corrugated metal pipes; and 1 we had to categorize as unknown, we were told that there were supposed to be a pipe inlet here but, as you can see, when we got over to the other side of the wall, there was no inlet for the structure, so what we are proposing is, as Alison mentioned, to bring these current rock walls up to T-02 standard and clad them with the lava rock so the appearance is still maintained along the highway.

These are just examples of some of the culverts, so these top two are reinforced box culverts, this one on the bottom is rock box culvert, and a corrugated pipe box culvert along the highway.

So even before we presented ...(inaudible)... for your review, hard copies were provided at these locations, and if you were unable to reach the four locations to look at the hard copies, we do have an FTP site available for download that you can review the report at your leisure.

Contacts, for your comments, that we really appreciate on the report or any additional information that you can provide to help us elaborate on the information we did have, you can write or call Paul Santo or Charlene Shibuya and they will get the information to us so we can incorporate it into the pre-final draft. And again, when we do the pre-final draft, it will be issued again to the communities and we will have a third round of these meetings to get more feedback from your before the final is actually completed. And with that, are there any questions?

Chair Carvalho: Ward?

Mr. Mardfin: I mentioned to Charlene a couple minutes ago, when I went through here, through the thing that got sent out to us last week, that we got last Friday, I could be wrong, but I think some of the bridges are misnamed. I've done quite a study of the bridges myself, I helped put together this little --

Ms. Moy: And, actually, that's great. If you can -- we've passing this out to all the communities and through like several other contacts that Charlene had to try and make sure that everything is correct. If you have that sheet, we have a sheet, a separate sheet that has all the names --

Mr. Mardfin: This one?

Ms. Moy: So if you can just even just mark it up, that would be great. We're going to try and have to work with, you know, if there's anything conflicting where, you know, we might -- but --

Mr. Mardfin: What I did was I, and I talked to Charlene, I'm going to email here about it, but I looked at some pictures, the picture that you had and the name you had below it, and I -- most of them were right, but I think there are three or four or five of them that are wrong.

Ms. Moy: Yeah, and, yeah, that I'm sure that at 75% draft, we probably have quite a number of -- so we're working on --

Mr. Mardfin: Okay. So I'm going to get together with other people because I only know what I know and I have photographs of lots of them, and so I'll meet with some -- probably Melody and Kau`i, and we'll work them out.

Ms. Moy: And another thing that actually was just brought up, we went to the CRC, the Maui Cultural Resources Commission just the other week, last week Thursday, and one of the things they brought up, and this is the first time it was brought up to us, and so we're going to start putting it out to the community, is Ms. Salazar highly recommended that we don't put the `okina and kahako. She said because the original language didn't have it and that, as Hawaiians, you're supposed to know -- I mean Hawaiians know how to pronounce it, that they don't really need it, and like when you go to a foreign country, when you go to Japan, they don't tell you how to read their language. But I mean so this is something that, you know, it's the first time anybody ever mentioned that to us so, you know, and we've been to all the communities, so we just -- we are kinda concerned that that's going to be an issue, so we wanna kinda bring that up with you guys now, so you guys are the first community group we've seen since that meeting with CRC so --

Mr. Crawford: Owana? Owana Salazar?

Ms. Shibuya: She's a member of the Cultural Resources Commission.

Mr. Mardfin: They recommended that you not use `okina and kahako?

Ms. Moy: Well, her. She's, yeah, she was the one who recommended --

Mr. Mardfin: I -- when I was putting this poster together, I got different views. I asked Kau`i first, 'cause she lives right across from me, and she said if you're not sure you got them all right, don't put any of them on. And then I went and saw Melody Cosma-Gonsalves, and she and I worked together, and we got as best we could, and found some mistakes, like Waiopai is misspelled, out past Kaupo, and stuff like that, but I think the community can be split on this. We ought to find out what the community wants.

Ms. Moy: Yeah.

Ms. Murison: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)... the research we've done and, in some cases, there are three different ways to spell that stream name. So, again, circle the one that you think is right or that you have some historic evidence of or that you have oral history of that you know is the correct one.

Mr. Mardfin: Well, I could start off with one, on page -- the thing that got sent out to us, somebody referred to Wainapanapa instead of Waianapanapa.

Ms. Murison: Okay.

Mr. Mardfin: It sounds like the same thing to you maybe, but it isn't.

Ms. Murison: No. We're trying to be very careful. There have --

Mr. Mardfin: It's on your executive summary, the fourth line down.

Ms. Murison: Oh, okay. Alright, we'll note that.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Ms. Aihara: Yeah, we are working with our traffic consultant on the approaches as well, so that is also going to be considered, but our limits, I guess, of the project scope is not to do the whole highway, but we're just at the bridges.

Mr. Tom Hoeffken: I understand ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Ms. Aihara: Right. Yeah, we talked to DOT and, in some cases, it will be a private property issue; in some cases, it's a DLNR issue for land acquisition, but we are trying to fix some of those that we noticed there's a lot of scrapes on the downstream parapets because it's very narrow on the turns, we understand, and so those are some of the bridges that they don't meet the 16, we are, you know, considering which side, you know, we're going to widen, especially with the railings, and then also the approach and such.

Ms. Moy: Yeah, and the community is very strongly wanting to keep kinda the traffic calming that happens because the skinny bridges, so they actually like that, so they don't, you know, they -- we are very mindful about widening, but not too much, and, you know, so make it -- they like that it's difficult for the traffic and the tour buses that come in so just a little bit of our -- oh, and the other thing that I don't think we talked about is that we are going to make it -- the requirement, whenever they rehabilitate, this is going to be like a long, long project, I mean they're not going to be rehabilitating all the bridges at one time, this is going to take like decades, so but when they do rehabilitate it, they want it to be a

40-ton capacity bridge, but the whole time and I think community has expressed desire to keep it posted as 10-ton so that you don't have the fully loaded concrete trucks coming, you don't have, you know, big, big -- except emergency vehicles who will know, they'll have to get a permit to cross.

Mr. Mardfin: Until the last one is built --

Ms. Moy: It will be at that --

Mr. Mardfin: The lowest capacity bridge rules.

Ms. Moy: That's right. That's right.

Ms. Aihara: But if you have any additional comments that you think of afterwards, please, please, please, you know, call or write to either Charlene or Paul, and it will get to us.

Ms. Shibuya: It's on the last page of --

Ms. Aihara: Yeah, your handout.

Ms. Moy: Who has to leave? Nobody? Oh, okay.

Mr. Crawford: I just wanted to thank you all for coming out, for having so many of you here to present to us and coming all the way out to Hana because it is important, you know, important work and I appreciate it, and also for being able to adjust your presentation to fit into the time window and still make it clear and understandable, so I appreciate it.

Chair Carvalho: Thank you so much. On behalf of this board, thank you. Actually, we have to --

Mr. Mardfin: We need to set the time for -- we're not adjourning, we're --

Chair Carvalho: No. Let's move on to agenda item G.

Mr. Mardfin: Oh.

Chair Carvalho: And, with Clayton, and we can work through that. Go ahead.

G. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Scheduling of other Hana Region Applications

2. Discussion of Future Hana Advisory Committee Agendas

Mr. Yoshida: Well, I guess for the Committee's consideration, what if we had the next meeting on March 17, which is a Tuesday, probably 4:00, here, if we can reserve that? March 17th, St. Patrick's Day, 4:00.

Mr. Crawford: The only item on the agenda would be the continuation of the item, item E?

Mr. Yoshida: Right. Yeah.

Mr. Crawford: Yeah.

Ms. Oana: I just wanted to let everybody know how this investigative committee report will go. So under the Sunshine Law, basically, they're going to go out and do the site visit, they're going to come back to you folks at the next meeting and present their findings. And then it's only at the next meeting, where you guys can make any decision on their findings and vote on anything. Basically, it's to give you folks time to digest whatever they're reporting back to you. It's just the way the process is.

Mr. Mardfin: I'm sorry, would you say that again?

Ms. Oana: So they're going to come -- they're going to go do their, you, go do your investigative work, come back on March 17 and present to the board your findings. No action will be taken on that at that meeting. It has to be a next meeting where any action's taken. It's under the -- it's under HRS.

Mr. Mardfin: Can we give a report to Monday -- or prior to Tuesday?

Ms. Oana: To the board?

Mr. Mardfin: So we can act on Tuesday?

Ms. Oana: No. You want to have another meeting, and then act on Tuesday, that's another way to do it, but it's either Tuesday and then another meeting, or we fit something in before and then the Tuesday meeting is where you act on it.

Mr. Crawford: So you're saying we have to have two more meetings, and everybody has to come out here two more times just to finish this meeting? Yeah, I wish we had just passed it but --

Mr. Yoshida: So do you want like a 2:30 site inspection and then a 4:00 meeting?

Mr. Crawford: Do we need to have you present for the site inspection? Because we're talking about trying to do the site inspection --

Mr. Mardfin: If you do the site inspection with everybody you mean? That has to be noticed to the public and our Corp. Counsel thought that it was dangerous to take that many people on because it would have to be open to the public.

Mr. Crawford: Right. So what I'm talking about is the investigative committee that can just be the committee members, we don't need the department --

Ms. Oana: No.

Mr. Crawford: Corporation Counsel there. So we can just schedule that on our own in between now and next Tuesday. But at that next Tuesday's meeting, we would basically just be giving a report, we wouldn't be allowed to take any action.

Mr. Ballantyne: I mean could we have a report for the investigative committee at 4:00, and then a meeting at 6:00 to discuss the recommendations?

Mr. Yoshida: Well, again, if the state is going to do repairs on Hana Highway, then we probably are limited as to what time we have to get back to --

Unidentified Speaker: Go Ulupalakua.

Mr. Yoshida: Go Ulupalakua, yeah, and Kaupo, yeah. What time we would have to get back pass that roadblock?

Mr. Ballantyne: Yeah, I can't imagine it's going to take 3.5 hours again, but who knows.

Mr. Crawford: Yeah, but what is the required time period between the meeting that where a report is given and a meeting where we can take action?

Ms. Oana: Yeah, I'm not sure about that.

Mr. Crawford: I mean we want to try to expedite this.

Ms. Oana: Let me see if I can fine out really quickly. Okay, can you give me five minutes? Two minutes?

Mr. Yoshida: Can we -- can we --

Ms. Lopez: Chair, can I have a question to the Committee? Because point to` clarification regarding the staff's recommendation and report, I only heard conversation but I didn't hear a formal request being made if there was any -- that the Committee requested that the staff do any changes into the report. The only one change that I heard was, under planned development area, to make a point that the proposed area -- the proposed subject area is not in the development -- the planned development boundary. That was the only changes that I've heard and on the --

Mr. Mardfin: That's a factual issue.

Ms. Lopez: Right. No, so -- that you are requesting that the staff change in the report.

Mr. Mardfin: If it's in the minutes that it is in fact outside of it, I don't -- don't reprint the report, it's not necessary to do that.

Ms. Lopez: Okay. That's what I was asking.

Mr. Mardfin: It's not necessary to repeat that 'cause we've got that in the minutes that there was an error.

Ms. Lopez: Just to point to clarification 'cause when your Committee makes determination that your recommendation would then have to go in front of the Maui Planning Commission, so the report that will be going to the Maui Planning Commission is what the recommendation that the Hana Advisory Committee will make, so that is why I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Mardfin: They're going to see -- they get the minutes from this meeting, and if they care enough to read it, which sometimes they do and -- some of them do and some of them don't do, they'll get it, and maybe in the motion to approve, we can specify that, if I remember it, I'll try to remember to specify that it is out -- the area in question is outside of the rural growth boundary and I might remember that.

Mr. Yoshida: Well, I guess is the intent of the Committee to try to take an action at the next meeting or is the intent to have the investigative committee to do their site inspection and report back to he Committee, and then at a subsequent meeting, make a recommendation?

Mr. Mardfin: We would like to avoid that double delay. A one week, a seven-day delay is fine, but double delay more than we want to do if we can avoid it, legally.

Mr. Crawford: And two extra trips out here for you guys, we'd like to avoid if we can.

Mr. Yoshida: Well, what about -- what if we had the meeting on Monday, the 16th, would we have a better chance of getting attendance?

Mr. Crawford: The issue isn't attendance. It's just our legal ability to be able to make -- to receive the report and then make a decision at ...(inaudible)... meeting.

Chair Carvalho: We'll get a quorum either way.

Mr. Yoshida: But if we had a site inspection by the commission, then there's no need to have an investigative committee report to the Committee.

Mr. Mardfin: That's fine but Corp. Counsel is recommending against having a site inspection by the full Committee because it would have to be a public meeting, and she was concerned about -- and, by the way, if you have it, you might not get a quorum for the site inspection. I mean if you did it for the whole Committee, you might not get a quorum for that. We were counting up and there were only three people that were physically able and interested in going. So you might not get a quorum for it even.

Mr. Yoshida: Well, again, for the AT&T tower, we were going to have a site inspection at 2:30, and then a meeting at 4.

Mr. Mardfin: That's fine, if we could do that.

Mr. Yoshida: So the question is: Can we do that?

Mr. Mardfin: Well, it's not our choice. It's our Corp, Counsel's choice.

Mr. Crawford: Yeah, I mean the -- I guess the issue that was raised with that had to do with the fact that it would then be a public site inspection and they would be required to allow whoever wanted to join and come on to the private property. If that's an -- if that's not an issue, if there's no objection to that, I don't know if there's any other reason why we wouldn't want to have it be a public site inspection, but that's a question that, you know, the applicant needs to address if there's a issue with it one way or the other.

Ms. Oana: ...(inaudible - not speaking in the microphone)... for a second. I just talked to my colleague, Richelle, and so she also doesn't see a time requirement between the meeting where you folks will present your findings and the next meeting where you guys action on the findings. It just seems a little kinda weird that it's on the same day 'cause we never experienced that before. But there's nothing that precludes it, from what I've read and what she told me just now. So if you want to do that, it may help everybody.

Mr. Mardfin: Let me make sure I'm clear. On next Tuesday, we, the three of us do the investigative site inspection, we'll make a report to the body, as a whole, and then we can make a motion to do whatever we want to do.

Mr. Crawford: We need to have an actual two separate meetings. We need to have one meeting, and we're setting the date and place and time for those definite now --

Mr. Mardfin: Ten minutes from now.

Mr. Crawford: So that after the report, on Tuesday, we can have one meeting where we can give the report from the site inspection; then we can take a recess; we can come back; convene a different meeting where we can take action.

Mr. Mardfin: If that's legal, I'm for it.

Mr. Crawford: If there's no reason why we can't do that, I don't see why we should have -- why we shouldn't.

Chair Carvalho: Clayton?

Mr. Yoshida: Okay, so we can have the next continued meeting on the 17th, and then you folks -- the investigative committee does its investigation prior to.

Mr. Ballantyne: Sorry, can I just clarify? Is it still a continuation of the same meeting, the second meeting? So it's all just two continuation to the meeting with a break? Okay.

Mr. Crawford: We are basically recessing so we could recess for five minutes in between the meetings, if we wanted, and then take action. So everybody can spend those five minutes contemplating the report from the committee, and I don't anticipate that that whole process should take, you know, more than -- more than two hours or whatever.

Chair Carvalho: So, as for the agenda item, we will defer it till next Tuesday, March 17, at 4 p.m., and based on the findings for that investigative committee, we'll have a additional meeting at 6 p.m.

Unidentified Speaker: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Mr. Mardfin: It depends on whether you have somebody like me asking questions, but since I'm out of -- if won't be from me, then it depends on how long John wants to ask questions. I think if we made 45 minutes total, half-an-hour presentation and questions, and then 15-minute break ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Crawford: So maybe the second meeting at 5:30?

Mr. Mardfin: Initially meet at 4 - meet at 5.

Mr. Ballantyne: Can I just ask a question? I mean is it possible if we changed the time of the meeting, I mean if we do finish up the half-an-hour, can we all vote to bring the second meeting forward by an hour?

Mr. Mardfin: That's the problem if you announce a time.

Ms. Oana: ...(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)...

Mr. Mardfin: Let's do 4 and 5. And you can delay easier than you can post things earlier. So do 4:00 and 5:00.

Mr. Crawford: That's fine with me.

Chair Carvalho: Let's amend the second meeting to 5 p.m. Anything else from Mr. Yoshida?

Mr. Yoshida: I guess are we deferring the other matters about future Hana Advisory Committee meetings, scheduling of Hana Region applications? Well, I guess the next item after this one, will be the Gary Stice SMA use permit for construction of his two houses.

Mr. Mardfin: At Koki?

Mr. Yoshida: Yes.

Mr. Mardfin: How did he get that through?

Mr. Yoshida: Well, it's a use permit so the Committee will hear the matter, conduct a public hearing and make a recommendation. It's not -- he wanted an exemption. It's not an exemption. It's use permit.

Mr. Mardfin: Right. It's not an SMA exemption.

Mr. Yoshida: Right.

Chair Carvalho: It's not available to us yet, that info?

Mr. Yoshida: Well, that -- probably now will be in May or June. Yeah, that's all we have.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Crawford: I move the adjourn this meeting.

Chair Carvalho: Do I hear a second?

Mr. Ballantyne: Second.

Mr. Crawford: I move to recess this meeting, excuse me. I move to recess this meeting until Tuesday, March 17, at 4 p.m.

Mr. Ballantyne: Second.

Chair Carvalho: Seconded by Ian. Let's put that motion to a vote.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Committee Member Crawford, seconded by Committee Member Ballantyne, then unanimously

VOTED: to RECESS the meeting at 7:41 p.m. until Tuesday, March 17, 2015, at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

SUZETTE L. ESMERALDA
Secretary to Boards & Commissions

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Present

Clayton Carvalho, Jr., Chairperson
Ward Mardfin, Vice-Chairperson
Ian Ballantyne
John Blumer-Buell
Ed Cashman
Scott Crawford
Anjoleen Hoopai-Waikoloa

Hana Advisory Committee to the
Maui Planning Commission
Minutes - 03/09/15
Page 64

OTHERS

Clayton Yoshida, Planning Program Administrator
Sybil Lopez, Staff Planner
Jennifer Oana, Deputy Corporation Counsel