

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
REGULAR MEETING  
MAY 27, 2016**

**APPROVED 07-08-2016**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Mr. Don Fujimoto, Chair, at approximately 1:00 p.m., Friday, May 27, 2016, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Island of Maui.

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

Mr. Don Fujimoto: Call this meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency to order at 1:00 p.m. So --. So present are Carol, Jonathan, Frank and Ashley, and myself, so we're all here. Public testimony, anybody from the public? Close public testimony. Approval of the March 28, 2016 meeting minutes. Mr. Starr?

**B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY - At the discretion of the Chair, public testimony may also be taken when each agenda item is discussed, except for contested cases under Chapter 91, HRS. Individuals who cannot be present when the agenda item is discussed may testify at the beginning of the meeting instead and will not be allowed to testify again when the agenda item is discussed unless new or additional information will be offered. Maximum time limits of at least three minutes may be established on individual testimony by the Agency. More information on oral and written testimony can be found below.**

**C. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 28, 2016 MEETING MINUTES (Transmitted to members via e-mail)**

Mr. Jonathan Starr: Move to accept and approve.

Ms. Carol Ball: Second.

Mr. Fujimoto: All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

**It was moved by Mr. Jonathan Starr, seconded by Ms. Carol Ball, then unanimously**

**VOTED: to approve the March 28, 2016 meeting minutes as presented.**

**D. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Creation of a Temporary Investigative Group (TIG) established pursuant**

**to Section 92-2.5(b)(1), Hawaii Revised Statutes, to research and provide recommendations to the Maui Redevelopment Agency regarding an organizational structure that would enable the Maui Redevelopment Agency to fulfill its authority as envisioned in the State enabling legislation, Chapter 53, Hawaii Revised Statutes. Invited guest and redevelopment specialist, Paulette Wood, will be available as a resource during this discussion. Action may be taken to create the TIG.**

Mr. Fujimoto: New Business. Erin?

Ms. Erin Wade: Thank you. New Business, Item D-1. In past years, we have talked extensively about how to convert the MRA into an autonomous, semi-autonomous redevelopment agency as was envisioned by HRS 53. This item 1 is regarding that and suggests the creation of a Temporary Investigative Committee to do so. I did invite to participate in our discussion today Ms. Paulette Wood. She's here in the audience. She worked in redevelopment for many years, starting in Philadelphia, and then in three different cities in California, large and small. And she's here to be a resource for you in our conversation today. And we've had the opportunity to sit down with her a couple of times, but now it's been very beneficial to us to sort of sort through the possibilities.

So just by way of introduction, the investigative committee is a requirement of the open meetings act so that if more than one member is going to discuss board business it's required that we agendaize the creation of the committee and authorize that this board authorizes them to discuss board business outside of the regular agenda. The creation of the committee can happen today, and then following the creation, the meetings can take place with the group. And then after that the group would need to make a formal report back to the committee, and the plan -- the MRA won't be able to act on that report until the following meeting. So just for understanding of the process; and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have about the process.

Mr. Starr: Just to add one thing. While the TIG is empowered, and empaneled, and functioning the body can't have any agenda item that relates to that subject until the report comes back. My question is that...I would assume that this ties in to the legislative act that is ongoing to revise this. There was kind of a . . . (inaudible) . . . effort this last session. I was in one of the joint committee, senate house committee meeting on this and they had some good ideas and some not so good ideas, but I was wondering whether the TIG would also be able to look at it legislatively because I know the legislatures that had put it forward last year are looking forward to putting it forward this year and maybe we could come to them with some recommendations. Not the TIG, but the body after deliberations.

Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr.: Do we have any record of what they actually produced from the committee? I would imagine there is something that the TIG could look at in terms of what was being proposed, good and bad.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, the bill, and I believe there was HD1 and SD1, like that, and there's one that went through a couple of committees. So we could, we could get that either off the website or from the legislative reference bureau. It came out of Jonathan Dela Cruz's committee.

Mr. Fujimoto: Anything else?

Ms. Wade: Could we ask Mr. Hopper, formally, if we can add the review of the state legislation to the work of the temporary investigative committee?

Mr. Michael Hopper: Well, I think it's broad enough to include that in other matters. The only questions to the body would be -- this something that definitely that you could do, but is it, is it of the nature that you wouldn't want to just have this as a regular agenda item, and actually discuss as a full body? That's also an option, just to let, you know, everyone know that. If it's the type of work that the members think would require or benefit from a TIG that's, that's fine. But it would as Mr. Starr pointed out, it would limit your discussion while the matter was pending before the TIG, and it wouldn't allow all the members to participate. The advantages are that you don't have to schedule meetings every single time you want to discuss an item or meet with somebody. So, those are the other issues. But just as a, you know -- just to think about is this the type of item you want to form the TIG or is it an item you're comfortable scheduling on your agenda and taking the time to actually discuss the matter before you. That, that's up to the body. That's a policy question, but it's a --. But, I think, it says an organizational structure that would enable -- to review an organization structure and so I think you could review a variety of matters. And so in giving your, the group the authority, you could spell that out and be more specific. As long as it's within this item that was agendized today, you can outline those items or even be as broad as the items that you agendized today and then have that discussion. But again there's a relatively formal process for how that has to happen so...for the body to consider.

Mr. Fujimoto: Frank?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I would support the TIG at this point because I think there's a lot of concentrated work that needs to be done first, and then presented to the body. And for us to try to discuss this at every meeting and try to come up with a structure and some proposals, I think, would be a little unwieldy at this point. So I would support the TIG.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, Jonathan.

Mr. Starr: Carol first.

Mr. Fujimoto: Oh, Carol. Sorry.

Ms. Ball: Well, I'm not really sure...having the option to...to not have the TIG. I somehow got the impression when you initially described that it was mandatory, or at least a natural adjunct to this. But hearing Mike's...description, I'm not really sure whether we want to add something else. I mean, it might be perfectly evident for you and maybe others who understand the complexity of it, but, you know, it just seems to have more layers of...groups.

Ms. Ashley Lindsey: I agree with that...definitely.

Mr. Fujimoto: Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: And TIGs are really useful when you have, you know, a long document or such as this, or rules or you want to review a bunch of different documents and take pieces and meld it together and then make the recommendation. I'm trying to visualize a TIG for this body, though, because since our quorum is three. A TIG is two, and two, two members can get together to discuss board business without a TIG, so I'm wondering whether it really does much for us. Maybe having two members could go and could work on it any way.

Mr. Hopper: I mean, if it plans to do extensive out of meeting work with two members, a TIG's probably a good idea just because you wouldn't be constrained by the limited interaction. Although, you're correct that two or more members, or two or few members -- well, two members --

Mr. Starr: One.

Mr. Hopper: Yeah, that's what the language says, but you're right. If it's less than quorum, but, you know, two. Yeah, you're right, two. But for that group to -- for those two to get together there may be further limitations on what they could do that the TIG would just totally take away that question. I mean you make a good point if it's only going to be two. But I think if there's going to be extensive, out of public meeting work that you envision with this, then, yeah, I think the TIG is maybe a good idea. If you think you can do most of these work in open session, then I think, then that's, that's another option for the group.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I, I still think that TIG is a good idea simply because there is going to be a lot of concentrated work. You're going to be dealing with structures, making changes to the law or the ordinance, or how we're structured at some point in terms of our support. It seems to me that it would be violating the spirit of the transparency of, of the...the law to, to have two people working on it to sort of informally and without having a TIG. That's, that's my opinion at this point.

Mr. Fujimoto: Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Yeah, yeah, I look at what could be done with this kind of as a two stage thing. And one is to figure out what would be...what would be most beneficial in terms of a framework for the organization to morph into what that it best could be.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Mr. Starr: You know, and what powers, what --. You know there are bonding powers here, but there's no way to pull the trigger.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Pull the trigger. Right. Exactly.

Mr. Starr: And the second phase which is kind of intertwined with the first is to work with the legislators. And there are some other different groups that are working with the -- the legislators already. And, you know, those, those include. . . (inaudible) . . . organization that does the TOD centers on Oahu. That includes the construction alliance...that we're pushing for. That includes, you know, some of the individual senators, there's CIBA, and of course, the Maui Senate in house delegation and so on. So...there's, you know, kind of all that, all that stuff, and I don't really know.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Well you break it into chunks, I mean, you know, and I think what you said, you're right, there are two phases to this. But, you know, if we bite off one chunk with the TIG in terms of getting the basic structure down, then we feel it would get us where we could exercise the powers that we actually should be exercising at this point but can't because of the way we're structured. Then getting somebody to work on that because that's going to take work with Corporation Counsel, it's going to take up making up the ordinances that would, you know, actually put that into law. So it seems to me getting that work done, getting it done as quickly as possible, getting two people concentrating on it, and then bring it back to the group, and then discussing it. Because it will create a baseline for discussion and that's, that's the only reason why I think the TIG would be important.

Mr. Fujimoto: Erin and then Carol.

Ms. Wade: I just wanted to make clear what we expected when we said maybe that the TIG was the right way to go. Essentially because the redevelopment agency today operates as a board and commission of the County, it doesn't have any independent authority of its own. Most redevelopment agencies are incorporated independent of the County, and then operates under a, by a resolution and with a cooperative agreement to do redevelopment in the area. So the question for us at this point is how do we create those connections in a way that works in the State of Hawaii because it hasn't been done before. And because HRS 53 is extremely vague about how those mechanics are suppose to play out.

Mr. Starr: It calls for a government -- it could be a government entity specifically.

Ms. Wade: Yes. Which is --

Mr. Fujimoto: Hold on; let Erin talk.

Ms. Wade: So, I did pull and, and -- whomever gets, becomes part of the TIG, and even I can include this to the other members as well, but I did pull several both resolutions, articles of incorporation and cooperative of agreements in different communities. So you can kind of see that is probably the work that's going to get done first is how to create that structure. But then it's gonna leave exactly as Jonathan is saying, several things hanging that HRS 53 does not make clear. The biggest one is how does it get funded. You know, none of that is clear right now in HRS 53. It talks about fees, and revenues received, but there is no formalized structure for specifically the Maui Redevelopment Agency to receive funding. So that's where HRS would come in.

Mr. Fujimoto: Carol?

Ms. Ball: Well, perhaps with this dilemma, Ms. Wood could tell us what she has done with other groups, and then we could say, oh, that sounds like us, or oh that doesn't sounds like us at all.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, sounds good to me. Ms. Wood?

Ms. Wade: Paulette, would you like to stand at the podium or I could turn this mic on?

Ms. Paulette Wood: Thank you very much. It's an honor to be here, and thank you for inviting me. Before I get started I just wanted to compliment all of you on your direction and...appreciate what you're trying to do for this community, which I am a -- my husband and I are full-time members now, and full-time residents I should say. You have an outstanding staff, but then again I'm sure you know that.

But, you know, I've tossed this around a couple of times in my head. You have to understand that I worked for both large and small agencies, redevelopment agencies, that were already set up. So I've never got to the spot where we're to the point where we had to set it up. In talking to your staff, I think the TIG is probably the better idea. And I think it can work if we structure it properly and give you enough to -- enough meat to, to proceed in different directions all within the law though. I, I'm looking at this as coming up with a check list or a number of ways, and giving you the options to choose different means of how you're going to be independent. And believe me, I think, at this point, in your, in your history, in your life as the MRA, you should be independent. I think it has a lot of...of reasonable -- well, there's a lot of reasons why you should and I think you already recognize that. So how do we get there?

I think you should set -- my advice to you is set up the TIG. I don't know how you want to structure it, and how many people you want to structure. I'm not familiar with that. That's something you would have to come up with yourselves. But, you know, the people that

should be in the TIG should have a variety of experience to know how to get through the County system. And also, the end result should be a, a report that gives you the option of choosing the direction that you'd like to go. Not be something that's so cast in concrete that you either reject all at once, or you know, have to accept all. So, I mean, to keep it as broad as possible, but to also give you the options to use your best judgment as to which way you'd like to go and get this. But, but the bottom line is, in my opinion, for whatever it's worth, you should be independent. You have a lot to go. There's a lot of benefits to that, and I think that's the way I would recommend that you do that. But, who am I? I'm just a new full-time resident. I don't know if that answered your question. I'm sorry.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Why don't you share with the Board your experience.

Ms. Wood: Oh, God it's longer and older than I care to admit. I actually started when I was five. I had a history of about -- my experience has been 26 in redevelopment. I started at very young age with the City of Philadelphia Redevelopment Agency, which was the largest at the time. It was a separate agency from the Philadelphia City Council, and I served as staff in a number of positions for 14 years before moving to California and worked as a redevelopment planner for the City of Glendale, California; redevelopment specialist for the City of Garden Grove. I served also as economic development advisor to the County of Board of Supervisors for LA County before I left to go into the private sector. And I always stayed in development though. It was always something that I felt comfortable with. So that span of time was 26 years; longer than I care to admit, but I enjoyed every bit of it. And the only thing I can tell from my experience is that no one has all the answers. But we can take the, the experience that we've learned everyday, and the skills that we've learned everyday in redevelopment and try to apply them. And you do learn everyday, and I continue to learn everyday. But when you have a basis that you love the community as much as all you do and you want to do the right thing to guide development, I think...I think that you have the basis to begin the process. And I hope that answered your question, but I was kind of a convoluted way of telling you that I'm older than I think I'd like to admit.

Mr. Fujimoto: Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Could you give us an idea of what some of the, the projects that were successfully done in the redevelopment agencies you've participated in to give us an idea of what's, what's possible because this is new to us.

Ms. Wood: Well, you know, we talk about redevelopment, and there's a big umbrella of redevelopment. Under redevelopment, there's urban renewal, which is the knock down, bulldoze old stuffs, make way for the shopping centers or the multi-story office buildings in center city. But also under the umbrella there are other things like downtown business districts. There's facade renovations projects, and...kind of like revitalizing downtown Wailuku. So redevelopment has a large umbrella. I was once asked by a city manager who was trying to hire me at the time, as to whether I was the, quote, the urban renewal type. Well the urban renewal type in his mind was the bulldozer type, you know, you knocked

down everything, you start new. But redevelopment has other phases. It has historic preservation. It has, it has, you know, revitalization of business districts, and formulating a number of financing mechanisms that would assist your downtown business people. Also, you know, in the, in the broader sense, when you talk about the larger projects, yeah, you sometimes in the urban renewal kind of the thing, there's the big, the terrible word eminent domain, but it is effective in some instances. And that makes way with the participation agreement with the developer where sometimes, you know, the cities will agree. If they agree with the development, and it's inline with their, their direction, they will agree to do off-site improvements or infrastructure improvements to assist the developer to build that shopping center, or that hotel, or that...office building that may not have ever come about without the city or the county's participation.

So under the guise of redevelopment or it's a pretty big umbrella, it actually means a whole lot of things. I mean, you know, the knock them down, put them up, sort of speak. It means the revitalization. It means, you know, infusing money to assist your business district. It's all of those things. Did I answer your question?

Mr. Starr: How, how about funding, funding mechanisms?

Ms. Wood: Well, funding mechanism, it was different in different locations. In Philadelphia, obviously, we received a big chunk of change from the City of Philadelphia, but also it was mostly the tax increment that was accrued from before the development to the new development. And that served as a basis of, of funding other development. And some of the cities that I worked with were very small cities, after. And I didn't mention the City of Brea, but the City of Brea, California was a very small redevelopment agency, but we had \$10 million in tax increment, which, because we built a, a, regional shopping center on vacant land, that maybe we just assembled a few parcels, but most of it was vacant. So, you know, maybe the assessment on the property at the time when we got \$10,000, and all of sudden we're getting millions. So that was the funding mechanism for -- to do other things. And also there were bonds...you know, that we floated in a number of agencies. But you have to, you have to pledge....to repay those bonds, you have to have sufficient funds in order to do that, and that has to be established from the very beginning. So whether that's infusion of money, or whether that's tax increment financing, or whether that's revenues with some other source, you have to pledge that in order to repay the bond debt.

Mr. Fujimoto: Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Yeah. Yeah, I understand how TIF funding works, if, you know, say you're going to do streetscapes, or add, you know, underground pipes, or, you know, a park for amenities. But I never have been able to grasp how it works if we're gonna use TIF to build a shopping center. Is that -- how does the private side of that and the landowners and then the funding agency and the municipality, how does -- what do their roles become with the TIF and projects?



Ms. Woods: Well, essentially in the State of California, you had the owners that would have been displaced, or part of a project would be offered in owner participation. And it's more or less like a share, like shares that you buy in a company. They pledge their property's worth, or even if they can come up with extra money. But assuming that there is no owner that wants to participate on this parcel of land -- go to your question, how do we build a shopping center, how do we participate? Well, obviously you go out to bid, and the developer will come up with a proposal and they'll say they're short so much. And so there's ways the agency can help. They can help by doing the infrastructure. They can help by even infusing money, doing public improvements, doing roadways, doing...doing a whole lot of other things that are permitted by the law.

And I've always been successful. As I mentioned to your staff, in those instances where there's an initial cash outlay to assist the developer, if I could show the agency that the pay back would be over a certain many years, either through sales tax, or property tax, or whatever. And that's how you facilitate. And also it puts you in a better position to demand a better quality of development if the city or the county's participating, and it's participating and it's backing up its, its participation with money. So you actually get a better product, or a bigger product, or more what you want. But that's kind of how we, we kind of did it. Remember all of these were agencies that were well established when I, you know, when I began working with them. That isn't to say we didn't have other project areas that we started from scratch.

Mr. Fujimoto: Anything else?

Ms. Wade: I'd just like to ask -- so one of the things that Paulette -- I've met with Paulette a couple of times now, and one of the first things she said after we kind of laid out the situation with the law and with the way that we operate now is she said the first thing you have to do is separate your books. And then as I've gotten into what does it mean to separate our books, like, how do we pull away financially from the County and then still do the work that's in the redevelopment plan for us to do, that's the big question mark for me. It's how we make that --. And I think that sort of gets to the root of the matter of the TIG is, you know, how do we pull away. And pulling away, legally, you know, through documentation I think is pretty easy, you know, and there's a path for that. But the financing piece is going to be something that we're gonna have to spend a lot of time figuring out.

Mr. Fujimoto: Frank?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Can I ask one more question, Paulette? What was the relationship, like, in Philadelphia, between the City Council and the independent redevelopment? What was that like?

Ms. Woods: The redevelopment board was actually appointed by the City Council. The CEO or the, or the executive director of the redevelopment agency was appointment also.

And it was a very close relationship because we realized, and they realized that one couldn't do without the other, as much as we wanted to be independent. But they were, they were pretty much -- the agency board was comprised of a lot of mostly -- a few attorneys -- but mostly large...I should say vested interests in the community. In the community, Philadelphia is pretty large. People that need development. People that actually...knew...hopefully and instinctively what a good deal was, what a good development deal was and what wasn't. There was, there was...even though the redevelopment agency was a separate agency, they still maintained a very good relationship with the City Council, and the direction was set generally by the City Council.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Can I do a follow up, Chair? In general, even with the smaller agencies, what was the financial relationships specifically? Were they all independent? Were there infusion of cash coming from the government, the Council side or from --?

Ms. Woods: Well, in the smaller California cities, the City Council was the redevelopment agency. They just wore two different hats. They also were the housing authority. And, but you have to remember also that these folks were not full-time City Council people. They all had jobs during the day, and, and basically were somebody else. But, I mean, they would -- for instance, you'd have a City Council meeting, they'd all adjourn the City Council meeting, and then they put their redevelopment hat, and they were the redevelopment agency. Sometimes they would hold joint hearings, depending upon what the law suggested.

But in the City of Philadelphia that was something very different. The folks that were in the redevelopment, the redevelopment agency board were, yeah, they were full-time people, but they also had their businesses elsewhere too. But they served at the pleasure of the mayor and the city council. It's sometimes not very clear. I know I'm not trying to be deliberately non-specific, but there is a relationship there, and it's a very important relationship.

And in, in suggesting to your staff, Erin, to separate the books, the reason I said that is because if you were going to go down the TIF road, you need to know, and you need to start to accumulate revenue. And revenue through TIF would be, it could be applied to either bonds, or it could be applied to other, other things that you'd like to do with the, development things that you'd like to do in the community. And that's why I said, I suggested to separate the books. It's a very delicate balance. I don't know, and I don't want to even pretend to know how the County Council would feel about that. And I'm not going to even go there, but you would know them better than I. But it's a very --.

You know, if you're getting huge amounts of monies that you're satisfied with...by County, from the County rather, then that might be another issue. You might just want to deal with it that way. But you do, if you want to create, if you really want to do things independently, you have to create debt. You create debts so that you can support bonds that can do other things. And doing that, yeah, you'd have to be a separate agency, I would think. I leave that to your Corporate Counsel to decide, but the bonds would be forwarded by the MRA,

and there has to be some sort of revenues that are pledged for the repayment of them. Where do you get that? I don't know if it would be good enough for the bond holders to say that, you know, we get five million a year. You know, that can change next year from the County Council. When you have revenues through tax increment, you can pretty much -- we spent countless hours in your step trying to figure out what our tax increment was going to be for the next year. But when monies pledged through a political body, that can change. And I don't know if that would be enough to support the debt on the bonds. That's something that --. I mean, it would be a concern of mine, but maybe it's a nonissue, I don't know.

Mr. Fujimoto: Any other? Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I really appreciate you helping us understand this. Would you be willing to help us further when we start to realize what the real questions are? Either in the TIG or when, you know, come back here?

Ms. Woods: It would be my honor to do that. As I said there, there's a selfish motive that I told your staff about. We live here. We live here full time. We love the place and we love Maui, and it's taken us about 20 years to get here. We had to both finally retire to do it. But, there's the selfish motive. We want to see the -- we want you to succeed. I mean I go downtown Wailuku, and I look around, and I see all sorts of opportunities that can happen, and I've got to get excited about. But, but, again, I don't have all the answers. No one does. But, we take just our basic instincts and our basic skills that we've learned every day, and continue to learn, and we try to, you know, we will try to help this community as much as we can.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay. Anything else? Carol?

Ms. Ball: So is our dilemma then with this...with this TIG, are we trying ascertain the --? I guess I'm really confused now. Is this going to help with implement our vision or are we focusing on whole new thing? And without, without separating, it seems to be what we're talking about. Will we still be able to implement our vision, and are we getting side tracked? Not to say we're getting side tracked, but are we by something else that looks novel that would help us be more efficient or whatever it is? But we're kind of bowling right ahead. I hate to see us have a stumbling block.

Ms. Wade: That's a very good question. So last year you folks had me look into creating staff, formal staff, for the redevelopment agency, which we worked with the administration to come with a program for how that would work. And we outlined a new division under the Department of Management that would become the MRA staff and work with their CIP program. And then as, once the time was to put that in the budget, there was a conversation about can we actually get support to add this number of positions. And then as other departments needed additional staff to complete the functions, like necessary, vital functions of the County that had to be added, the Budget Office decided there was no way

that the County Council was going to support new, new employed staff for the Maui Redevelopment Agency when they had an additional 26 other staff people that the County was asking for.

So the conversations began with the County Council about what they would be willing or members of the County Council about what they would be willing to see. And what keeps coming back to us is why doesn't the MRA operate as it's legislated to do in HRS 53. And the, the reason for that is what we're talking about now, which is -- is...it is not independent. It's a board and commission. It has no ability to fund anything on its own. So basically, honestly the MRA doesn't even sign off on any contract. It is the Planning Department that signs off on all contracts. So I keep getting back from Purchasing even, they ask, oh, you know, the MRA authorized this vendor for Clean and Safe, and they say, we don't care. Does the Planning Director like it, you know, which is not at all the position that the, the plan, the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan which is all of these tasks that are assigned to the redevelopment agency is not how it's structured to be fulfilled.

So the question of is it a stumbling block? It think the stumbling block is having dedicated staff that's able to act on your behalf, you know, and authorize contracts which is what it says in the law you're suppose to be able to do. So getting to that, and as Don knows working right now on the parking and events facility, we're sort of having to go all around to be able to make that work because, you know, you don't employ a project manager right now, and you aren't relieved from certain procurement requirements as you would be if you are an authorized redevelopment agency, you know. So there's extra work we're doing now in order to sort of make it work the way it's been hobbling along for all this time. But this would set it up to operate as it's authorized to be.

Ms. Ball: How long would the process take if we were to undertake it...just generally . . . (inaudible) . . .?

Ms. Wade: By the end of Don's term. Can we say that? We gotta do it this year, I think. I think this is the year to do it.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yes. Do it. Yeah because we really need to have staff if we're gonna move ahead with the parking structure. Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Yeah, well, I think that what we're looking to do may require legislative work which, you know, we may be good enough at it, and I think we're probably fortunate and then Honolulu is at the point where they need it too.

I know that every time we, we've had a consultant or, you know, whether it's Brad Segal or whether it's Fruedenberger or, you know, the people we talked at IDA and ULI conventions, every single one of them has said you need a CDC or a bid, or a improvement -- neighborhood improvement districts, or one of those functions to be the, the entity. You won't succeed doing it as a core limb of the County government. It, it doesn't happen.

There needs to be -- it has to be separate. So, I mean, in the past you've tried to do stuffs through non-profits, and you know, use you know, Tri-Isle and other entities to create some separation, but to really do the, the grand stuff that's kind of not --

Ms. Ball: So is this TIG then is going to tell us how to do it or are they gonna --?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I would imagine it would --. I'm sorry. I would imagine they would give options for the committee to consider.

Mr. Fujimoto: I guess basically how I see it is the TIG would come up with what the organizational structure would be for this entity. And so --

Ms. Ball: And how, and how to accomplish that?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. So, I think, my personal feeling is that, prior to forming the TIG, I think we should have checklist, you know, of how we can go about doing this because I'm at a lost. I mean, I don't know how to start, or I don't know what all the...

Ms. Wade: What the questions are?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, you know, all the concerns that need to be addressed in terms, even from Corp Counsel side or from the legal side, you know, for everything. So maybe if we can have like a checklist of things that this TIG should be addressing, then at least it maybe a little efficient in formulating the organization.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And chair?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And maybe also a list of the personnel and expertise we might need to be able to accomplish that as well; it might be a part of that.

Mr. Fujimoto: Right. Yeah. So --. And I know we're not meeting, right, next month?

Ms. Wade: That's still left on your agenda, but it's proposed that we don't.

Mr. Fujimoto: But any way, I think, it's a whole bunch of stuff that we need to consider, or at least, that the TIG can consider. And, you know, maybe it is, like -- and I don't know if it's available but to have organizational docs from other...you know that we can...that may be the most efficient way to copy somebody else....or refer us to it.

Ms. Ball: So it's your feeling that we have to accomplish this before we get any farther, is that correct?

Mr. Fujimoto: I think at this point we can do some stuff, like, in terms of selecting the architect or, you know, stuff like that. But once we get into the real nitty gritty of it in terms of the construction and going out to bid, and even managing the consultants, I think we're gonna need somebody that we can hire or --. That's my main concern. The -- because without the proper management, I mean, the project's gonna die. Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: I, I have a different concern...which is the kick top regarding the legislation. Because that, that process is running. There are meetings being held on what this bill is going to turn into. What it was proposed to be last year would have made us -- would have disqualified, I think, all of us from serving on the redevelopment agency and would have made, you know, our agency de-funked. And the senators and legislators didn't even know that this bill was being used. That there was a redevelopment agency. They thought there was none. So it kind of...you know, the clock, to be able to get what we need out of the bill beginning of August is when that work is gonna start happening in the Capitol. And we should really be there with, with some kind of idea of what we need. And I think that if we are, there's a very a good likelihood that we'll...we can get it because we can help support what the Honolulu guys want and, you know, we can get them to help support what we need out of it too, that's, you know, just nuts and bolts.

Ms. Ball: Okay, so we're saying that the plan that we originally had, as you described, has been forwarded to some extent so we're going to try something else? Is that it or what?

Ms. Wade: The staffing plan that we had.

Ms. Ball: The staffing.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, right. So we're not going to be able to do just an in house within County government staffing, which frankly was only a band aid as well. It still doesn't get the redevelopment agency to the point where it's sort of calling the shots on what happens in the redevelopment area, which is what the legislation envisions. So this, this new, you know...let's just authorize or create a mechanism by which it can be a true redevelopment agency, that does fulfill the law, and it does fulfill the expectations of the Council. Which has been sort of batting back and forth for a couple of years, do we just get rid of the redevelopment agency because it's the department that's executing any way, you know. Which I don't think that that's -- I don't --. There is no department that prioritizes Wailuku above our department. You know, that is not the business of any other department. And so I think Wailuku would suffer if that was the case, if it was just eliminated. And so this, this allows the redevelopment agency to take the authority that it is intended for it.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yes, Ms. Wood.

Ms. Wood: Thank you. If I might add. In listening to everybody I kind of go back a little back in my years of experience were in some of the redevelopment agencies, I was planning staff much like Erin, and that's fine when you don't really get busy. To put it just

mildly, when you start to have projects that have deadlines, and they become sometimes also high profile projects, it's very difficult working as part of the planning staff. Especially when the planning staff has other, other important business they'd like to take care of. It's fine when you're just starting. You can separate your time and you can devote 20 hours of time in, to planning, and so many hours to redevelopment. But when redevelopment takes off, gets off the ground, that becomes very difficult to maintain staff, and they just start fighting over projects and whose priorities should, should --. It's a battle on every front because your priorities as redevelopment are different than what the County's priorities are for a number of reasons. And they're not bad reasons, they're all just everybody's priorities are priorities.

If you separate the staff, you then have dedicated staff and you don't have to fight over different things, and you have dedicated staff that's going to do the job, they're going to be there 40 hours or 60 hours a week and it's going to be devoted to you. But when you get in a fish bowl with everybody else, and your projects are in the fish bowl with everybody else's projects, you're going to come up with the short end of the stick. And what I'm saying here, and what I'm hearing, and what I'm reading for many years, you are getting very ambitious projects. Your direction is clear and I know where you want to go, and I think it's admirable, you're not going to get there if you're part, if your staff is part a fish bowl of the County. It's just the way it works. So I don't know if that helps you any.

I remember in the City of Glendale I was part of the, I was part of the Planning staff. City of Glendale was willing to dedicate 20 hours for me in the redevelopment, then it became 30 hours, and then it became 40 hours, and then they funded two positions. But we had an understanding that that was separate from the city's activities. When that redevelopment agency, and the projects took off, and we had 15 at the time, we became a separate agency. We broke away from the -- we broke away from the planning department and we were separate. Yeah, we, we had some growing pains, and yes, we made some mistakes. But just this is part of anything else, any other up, up start. But I don't see that way. I mean, I think you're way ahead of where you, where agencies are usually at your particular point in time. You're not in your infancy, but your staff is. Your staff is, is being confined by the bigger issue, and so I can't emphasize enough, if you really want this, your plans, and your hopes, and your dreams, and your direction to take off, you need some staff. And it needs to be dedicated, and you need some sort of independence. It can be monitored, obviously. You always have somebody that's going to monitor your activities and your monies and whatever. But that's my suggestion. I think you really can take off after that. But if you're part of the planning department, it's a fight for every, everything that you do. That's my opinion.

Mr. Fujimoto: Thank you. Anything else? I'm going call a short recess; five minutes.

*(The Maui Redevelopment Agency recessed at 1:53 p.m. and reconvened at 1:57 p.m.)*

Mr. Fujimoto: What is your preference? Should we -- is there more discussion or --? Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: My...my preference would be to make sure we have another MRA meeting set up in the not too distant future so we can take a step to proceed. I don't want to leave it for two months. I do feel this is compelling, it's kind of everything is pointing towards some path like this.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay. Carol?

Ms. Ball: I...I guess I'm still troubled because I was -- maybe I had a total misunderstanding of what we were supposed to be doing. And one of the things that I liked about what we were on the path to do was to fulfill some kind of vision to, to improve Wailuku. Previously it seemed as if our body, or our group, our Agency, did nothing more than approve parking variances, and as a result, I was ready to leave it. I didn't realize that there were other impediments other than our own agendas, and rather I don't mean our own personal agenda but the agendas of our meetings that would have prevented any kind of a thing that we have envisioned at this particular juncture. And I'm rather shock that there are those who are talking about doing away with the MRA, obviously they have no idea. The same vision that I have for it, and I guess I didn't have a real understanding that, and in fact, we're powerless, we're seemingly powerless according to what we really want to do and make some impact in helping our community. So I don't know who can help me with that.

Mr. Starr: I mean we've been hearing this for, you know, for 10 years that if we're really going to do...big items...it's almost impossible to do it as an extension of County government, and you need a big CDC, improvement district, something like that, to do it. And you know, I think we're at the point where we're realizing why everyone was telling us that. I never really got it until now.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. Frank?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I've got a question. So are we at a point where are we going to -- and I would hate to delay it as well because we, like, as Erin is saying, we're in the sweet spot right now, that we need to get ourselves organized to a point where we can actually take action. So I'm gonna go ahead and just, up or down, I'm going to make a motion that a TIG be appointed by this body and with further direction from the body on that checklist for what they should be investigating.

Mr. Fujimoto: Any second?

Mr. Starr: I'll second it.

Mr. Fujimoto: And then discussion.



Mr. Starr: You know, I, I think we, we should, we should start, but I also think we do need a mechanism for more input from the body. And I want to ask Michael how we can...how we can do it because once a TIG's appointed it's kind of creates a wall around it, yeah?

Mr. Fujimoto: Mike?

Mr. Hopper: I mean, it's hard to sort of have that cake and eat too type of situation. I think it's -- you can either leave it as an open agenda item, and have another meeting or discuss it more as a group, or expeditiously have, have some TIG meetings, figure out what the action for it is, have another MRA meeting, and then after that MRA meeting, take action to implement recommendations. If it's a situation where you really think you still need all five members contributing to the discussion, then you may be thinking about having longer meetings where you discuss that, that as a group, as an open meeting. Otherwise you're going to have two members, and there may be a concern that those two members will want to get input from the other members, if that's what I'm hearing, and then there will be some impediments or at least some questions to whether they could do that. So, you know, I think you could expeditiously have that meeting and then have it back on the MRA's agenda if that's at all a possibility, is one option, or to leave it as an open agenda item, and have, have a discussion as a, as a full group in this setting. You don't necessarily have the impediment of, you know, large amounts of public testimony that other boards may have where you've got to wait two hours in each of your meetings and things like that. So I mean, those are, those are a couple of suggestions. But yeah, I think, OIP is, the Office of Information Practices, would generally say that once the item is given up to a TIG, there shouldn't be a fully body discussion until that TIG makes its recommendations.

Ms. Ball: Mr. Chair, and for that reason I would really be concerned about voting for this measure. And without having any direction for this group, for that group, I just am highly concerned that it would indeed have a life of its own and we would have --. Well, I mean, that's suppose to be our job to . . . (inaudible) . . . in that direction.

Mr. Starr: I am thinking of doing the, doing the TIG process in steps, in that if we wanted to get things going, but we know that the first step is to create a frame work and a list of what we need out of it, I would suggest that perhaps our Chair and Frank constitute the initial TIG and meet from now until our next meeting together and develop the list of tasks and what we hope to achieve. And then at that point that can come back to us and then we can have an MRA meeting where we discuss that list and we add to it or amend it. And then another TIG can be formed to actually create some how to achieve that list.

Ms. Ball: But we could have an agenda item and discuss it as the five us, right?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah.

Ms. Ball: The direction that we would want this TIG if we were to have one.

Mr. Hopper: The challenge with the TIG is that --. I guess, the bonus between now and your next meeting, you can have a discussion between two members that really forms that, forms that. The only drawback is that at the next meeting you would generally need to have that presented, and you couldn't deliberate and discuss until the next meeting. I think what has been done before -- and maybe we could check on this -- is that you have a meeting agenda for 1:00 p.m., and then at 2:00 p.m. you have another meeting agenda with a separate agenda that deals with the discussion and deliberation and decision making. I don't know if that's something that's okay with OIP. You might want to check with them on them on that. I mean the sunshine law talks about you have your TIG appointed, the TIG makes its recommendations at another meeting, and then you can't deliberate or even discuss until a subsequent meeting. It actually references a subsequent meeting. Well, technically that is a subsequent meeting, even though it happens later in the day, and so I think you are complying with the sunshine law. But the idea would be is that, I think, it would potentially save time in that you have that discussion between now and the next meeting that otherwise you couldn't have. But at your next meeting you won't be able to discuss the item. You would be able to give the recommendation from the TIG, but you wouldn't be able to actually discuss or take action on the item.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So you would just create...two separate meetings.

Mr. Fujimoto: Frank?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So you would just create two separate meetings basically? One to discuss the item and one to vote on it?

Mr. Hopper: I would want to check with maybe look at whether we've done that before and check with OIP on that. I think that's technically a second meeting, so it is a subsequent meeting. But, you know, it's an hour later, and I don't want to suggest that that's the best way of going about things because I think normally they want to be able to have public testimony and digest everything that you're discussing before the next meeting. But it does say at a subsequent meeting is, I think, the wording. But it would give you the ability to discuss the item between now and the next meeting rather than not being able to do that, or be limited to the two members where you can't really advocate a position or potentially go and talk to other people about it. So that would be the benefit of doing it. You'd want to still give a definition of what you wanted from the group. And then at the next meeting you could have a presentation of what the items would be. And even if you couldn't take action at the next meeting, I guess the consideration is, is that better than waiting until the whole next meeting before you even discuss the items that you want to actually take action on at all because you'd have to wait until then anyway.

Mr. Fujimoto: Carol?

Ms. Ball: Nothing would prevent two of the members....right, talking about it without a TIG is that correct?

Mr. Hopper: You could talk about it, but you really couldn't come back to the body and make recommendations at that point. That, that's a little bit...that's a little awkward there. So you could have, you and Jonathan could discuss something, other two could discuss something. You can't discuss it with another person, and you can't discuss a, a commitment to vote a certain way or to advocate to vote a certain way. So that would be your limitation over a TIG.

Mr. Starr: I think that a simpler mechanism for this first stage might be for us delegate the chair to devise a list of...of, of desired deliverables and steps, and other ideas. And chair can work with staff, and also can, you know, have informal conversations with, you know, say Frank for example, and also, you know, we could present our ideas to staff. And then at the next meeting, chair can present that, that list of stuff. We can chime in and amend it. And then we can form the TIG to go and work on how to accomplish that.

Ms. Ball: Either that or he can delegate that job to one of the members.

Mr. Fujimoto: Paulette?

Ms. Woods: I may be totally off base here because I'm not -- I haven't worked with your sunshine laws. I know of them. Would be anything be precluded in your sunshine laws if you had a workshop with all of you?

Mr. Hopper: That would be considered a meeting, so you'd need to agendize that. That's basically a separate meeting. If all -- if more than two of you are in a room discussing board business, that's considered a meeting. I mean, you can have a workshop, but it would just have to be an agendized meeting like this one. And if that's an option then, then...and that would help, then that's absolutely something you could do. It's just that it would be an open meeting.

Ms. Ball: He could, he could appointment one of us who wanted to volunteer to make some kind of list for the next time, right?

Mr. Hopper: If someone --. It can't be temporary investigative group, and that's less than a quorum making that recommendation. That's not what it is. I know that the chair and a member, I suppose, could develop -- you're essentially developing an agenda item where you're saying this is what I'd like to discuss at the next meeting, and I'm going to work only with myself and the staff. And I think that's been done before. It's not really the same thing as a temporary investigative group. You're basically formulating an agenda item and I know chair people do that from time to time in developing the item. Again, they can't discuss it with anyone other than staff prior to the meeting, so it would be presented at the meeting. But it's a, you know -- but that's -- that's what would be, that's what it would be, kind of formulating the next agenda item. But yeah, you would not want to involve any other

members in it. You could maybe have one member, and they working themselves working the staff, but that's about all that you would have.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay. Anything else? We still have an action on the floor.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah. I guess I should --

Mr. Hopper: And the only motion available today as an actual item is it says "action may be taken to create a TIG." That's all it says. Now, if you want to say just for the next agenda item -- for the next agenda we'd like you to come back with this as an agenda item, then I think that's fine. But as far as actually taking a motion and voting, this said, you will consider a TIG and action maybe be taken to create the TIG. So I wouldn't look at any board action to, to do that. I think you can say, if the chair is going to say, before the next meeting I'm going to get this together, I think that's not a problem.

Mr. Fujimoto: Can I still do that if there's a motion out?

Mr. Hopper: The motion pending now?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I can withdraw the motion if that is necessary.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So Chair, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I withdraw the second.

Mr. Fujimoto: Thank you.

Mr. Starr: And, and, you know, I'm hoping that for our next meeting chair with the help of staff is able to develop agenda items so we can be ready to move forward.

Mr. Fujimoto: Sure. So, and we'll discuss at the next meeting further down the agenda.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay, moving on.

2. **Discuss the possibility of creating Downtown Hospitality Guidelines that would seek to create a balance between protection of the high quality of life of Wailuku Town residents and fostering appropriate, safe entertainment and music activities in Wailuku Town. No Action; board may direct staff to follow-up.**

Ms. Wade: The second item of new business is the possibility of creating a downtown hospitality guidelines. Essentially other communities have these and in 2010 when our Market Base Plan consultants came there was discussion that if we were going to encourage dining and entertainment in Wailuku we want to be thoughtful about the types and how we want to behaviors to occur in Wailuku. So I did provide for your information a sample of a hospitality guidelines from another community. And this was -- this has been done recently -- well, 2012, but since the original -- what downtown were calling it was a good neighbor policy when there were several or series of bars or restaurants in a small area; a good neighbor policy. Now they're calling it hospitality guidelines. But we do have two applicants in for liquor licenses right now on Market Street. So as that moves forward, and you know, we want to kind of anticipate well what's this going to do to Market Street and how do we ensure the quality of life in the area.

So I did reach out also to Liquor Control. As you probably know they did recently appoint a new department head. So that department head doesn't start until June 1<sup>st</sup>. Even though I've reached out to Tracy, she said you've gonna have to wait until the new department head starts. So I don't have an answer if they're even willing to participate in the conversation about this yet or not. But --

Mr. Starr: Who was the department head?

Ms. Wade: Glenn Mukai. So I'm just trying to get some direction from you if this is something you would be interested in, in part because I expect to get routed the liquor applications for our review and comment. And it's a lot easier if we have consistent feedback knowing that we're going to have maybe, you know, at least two right now and more coming. I think we want to have consistent feedback for what we feel is appropriate and what's not, and this would help us to do that.

Mr. Fujimoto: I think that this calls for a follow up.

Ms. Wade: It does. Well, we can't adopt this.

Mr. Fujimoto: Board may direct staff to follow up.

Ms. Wade: Yes. Right.

Mr. Fujimoto: Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I'm speaking in favor of this concept. I attended International Downtown Association in Charolette a couple of years ago, and then got to, sat through several hours seminar on entertainment district management and realized that those communities that had it, it functions smoothly. The big issue is closing time. And, then I was in Milwaukee, and I spent closing time on a hot Saturday night in Milwaukee with the business

improvement district hospitality crew, and it was really interesting. But they kept the police from having to get involved. They made sure that there were taxis available, and there was a food truck available because people walking out of bars at 2:00 a.m., if they had something to eat, they were okay, and if they don't, they tend to...bad things happened. And, I just heard a lot of stories about how they're able to work with the bar owners, work with the police, work with the liquor control, and just head off 90% of the problems. And I think it would be a great thing if we can lay the framework for this for all of Maui in Wailuku.

Mr. Fujimoto: Anybody else? Frank?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I agree. I think there needs to be a little bit more follow up by staff on this. But I, I'm taking into consideration that Wailuku is a very small place. So it's not like we're going to have an entertainment district like Sixth Street in Austin, Texas, and then, you know, an arts district, you know, which is on a different street. You know, we're a very confined space, so like you said, this thing has to be managed very, very closely if we're going to have some mixed use going on in terms of, you know, look at what we have here, creative place making, murals, the whole thing, you know, trying to bring the arts in. We don't want these functions clashing or these opportunities, let's put it that way, clashing, but we them to sort of blend together and make for a very enjoyable experience for being in Wailuku and growing the economic opportunities that are there. So that's my only comment, Chair.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay. Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Erin, do you need any additional guidance or resources to be able to take this to start to localize the concept?

Ms. Wade: If you'd like to work with me that would be great if that what you were thinking.

Mr. Starr: I'd be happy to.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, that would be great. Thank you.

Mr. Starr: You know, I'll just be conceptual.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Lindsey: I'd be willing to help also. I...I...these limitations, like, it's good on one level, and bad in another. It's kind of -- I live one block out of our district, and I regular Wailuku town weekly, nightly. At night I walk probably two days a week the entire town and there's nobody there. And limiting -- limiting it, which is -- this, I feel like is a little bit too limited on top of the liquor laws. I don't know. It's something worth doing, but not too much of a limitation that it limits, stops people from counting and wanting to do things.

Mr. Starr: I, I think the idea is to encourage in such a way that it doesn't hit against the community, or hit against the police, or hit against the obstacle.

Mr. Fujimoto: Good.

Ms. Wade: Okay, great. So what I will do is I will follow up individually with the members who have indicated they have some interest, and maybe craft an outline of what we feel like would be priorities for Wailuku policy and bring that back to you at the next meeting.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay.

**3. Review and approval of scope for Developing a Public Arts Program for Wailuku Town. (Action may be taken)**

Ms. Wade: Okay. The next agenda item, Item 3, is to review a scope of work for developing a public arts program in Wailuku. This -- because I'm not sure what the dollar amount would be for this, I just developed it as a Request For Proposals. There's a possibility it won't actually have to go out for an RFP if the dollar amount is less \$25,000. But I figured because we had talked about it enough I should lay out the specifics, what the scope would include.

The introduction just essentially describes why we felt that arts and entertainment is important for the revitalization for Wailuku town. And the scope includes the creation of a public master plan and a one year pilot arts program. And then it talks about reporting on who's attended, and what was involved, and what were the costs and things like that. So it can essentially give us a indicator of if we did this in future years what would the cost be, and what would the needs be, moving forward, and then target dates.

So I did want to go over the scope of the plan, a little bit, just to be clear what we would hope to accomplish with this plan. First is to identify the assets for creative place making. I provided you this guide on creative place making that I felt like was a good sort of tutorial on what to do. Identify the assets and key features, places, and players and stories within the community which is one of the big things they talk about in creative place making. Discuss the opportunities for enhancing and building upon existing assets. Identify and define core values relating to creative place making and the arts. Identify opportunities for interpretation and telling the story of Wailuku town. Opportunities -- identify locations and opportunities for public art. This is a big one that actually Ashley and I have been trying to work on with this mural where we have this willing artist and a willing project, and yet knowing the right place for this particular project is -- requires more than just, you know, a couple of us deciding if it's okay or not. You know, it requires a plan so that's a key piece of this, and evaluate it relative to visibility, historical significance, and the environment of each space. Identify additional tenants and partners to recruit which starts to add to the tenant -- you know, the tenant mix defines a place in a lot of cases as a creative place. Evaluate the

benefits of various arts and cultural program opportunities. Determine whether public art should be codified in the Wailuku Redevelopment Area. And by that I mean in a lot of places when a significant investment is made, either an onsite public art piece or a contribution to public art is a requirement. And I do have some ordinances that talk about that, but this plan would allow us to have that conversation in the larger context. Provide guidelines for incorporating art pieces in public places. Provide recommendations for Wailuku arts agencies to collaboratively manage resources. This was one of the things that came out of International Downtown, our follow ups, in one of the first low hanging fruit that should happen. Make recommendations for marketing strategies and outreach. Create an implementation plan with action steps and then the pilot program.

So that's essentially what the scope would be for this project, and in part this is because our focus, this year, is, I believe, going to be primarily on the parking and events facility, and on the, the developing the MRA in a way that's active. And up until now these last few years we've shown a lot of programmatic activity, you know, and I think people are starting to get use to the fact that there's things happening in town. But these other two things are probably going to take your existing staff's entire capacity, and programmatically I'm not going to be able to be working on changing banners and, you know, doing town clean ups, and the stuff that we were doing before. So this would assist and it also takes the town in a direction that we discussed after International Downtown Association is something that we would really like to invest in. So that's the reason for the RFP, and I'm happy to take any questions or revisions to the document.

Mr. Fujimoto: Should there be like minimum qualifications?

Ms. Wade: Absolutely. It sounds like a good idea. We have, in terms of the criteria, on the back where you see the chart, experience and professional qualifications relevant to the project.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay.

Ms. Wade: I wouldn't know what to put in terms of minimum qualifications.

Mr. Fujimoto: No that's fine. So we would just create them according to this?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay. Any other questions? What do you need for this one? Action may be taken. So are we okay with scope?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I make a motion to accept the RFP.

Mr. Fujimoto: Second? Second by Jonathan. I'm sorry, was that a question?



Mr. Starr: No, I'll second it but then I do have a comment.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yes, discussion.

Mr. Starr: I think that there's a few places where there's still some vestiges from the clean and safe thing.

Ms. Wade: Oh, in the document?

Mr. Starr: Yeah. Including like in the front cover.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Starr: So, you know, just make -- understand for us.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Accept it with . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Fujimoto: Any other discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

**It was moved by Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr., seconded by Mr. Jonathan Starr, then unanimously**

**VOTED: to accept the RFP.**

**4. Potential revisions to the 2016 meeting schedule in consideration of conferences and other conflicts. (Action may be taken)**

Ms. Wade: The fourth item of new business today is potential revisions to the agenda, or to the regularly scheduled meetings. I am going to be off-island the month of June, during the June meeting, and...which is why I suggested that we cancel. There isn't another date in June that I could make. I'm gone from the 10<sup>th</sup> to the 30<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Fujimoto: So how are we going to come up with a check list for the TIG?

Ms. Wade: What I can do --. I've already honestly gone through it line by line, and highlighted points where we're going to need decision points, I think. And so, I think, that can be a start, and then we can go through together, you know, what has to happen.

Mr. Starr: Can we put in, put a meeting in early July?

Ms. Wade: Leilani, could you check the conference room schedule?

Ms. Ball: We leave just right after the last meeting in June.

Ms. Fujimoto: So after the 5<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: After the 5<sup>th</sup> of what, June?

Mr. Fujimoto: July.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Mr. Starr: Perhaps the 8<sup>th</sup>?

Ms. Wade: July 8<sup>th</sup> is a Friday. It's the second Friday of the month. Is everyone okay with that?

Mr. Fujimoto: Sounds good to me.

Ms. Ball: Yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: July 8<sup>th</sup>, yeah, looks good.

Mr. Fujimoto: Good for you Ashley?

Ms. Lindsey: Yes, good.

Ms. Wade: Okay. Thank you. Can you book it? Yeah, thank you Leilani. And then the second change was September 23<sup>rd</sup> is the date of the HCPO conference and at least two of you will be invited to attend that, and your staff is already going, and so three of you could show up if you wanted. But there was the September 30<sup>th</sup> was available if that works for everyone...the fifth Friday. Happens to be a month where there's a fifth Friday.

Mr. Starr: So can we reschedule the 23<sup>rd</sup> to the 30<sup>th</sup>?

Ms. Wade: Yes. Does anyone want to make a motion on this?

Mr. Fujimoto: I'm sorry. I'll entertain a motion for the changes.

Ms. Ball: So move.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Second.

Mr. Fujimoto: Moved by Carol, seconded by Frank...any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

**It was moved by Ms. Carol Ball, seconded by Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr., then unanimously**

**VOTED: to amend the 2016 MRA meeting dates as discussed.**

**E. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**1. Updates**

**a. FY17 Budget results as presented by the County Council at their May 20, 2016 meeting**

Ms. Wade: Great. And while you're all entering it into your personal calendars, I'll give you a short update on the budget results for FY17. The MRA budget itself came through at \$183,500 which was what was requested. What we're doing is encumbering \$100,000 of this year's funds and \$100,000 of next year's funds for the clean and safe, so that will give the Board essentially an operating budget of \$83,500. However, Wailuku First Friday events we're taking out of MRA's budget so we don't have to worry about paying for that security anymore with the redevelopment agency budget. The Planning Department has that as a separate line item; it will be managed as a grant so that's a plus.

On to capital improvements, we actually didn't request any additional monies for capital improvements, but were given some anyway again so that's fun. And I'll tell you too this gets to the meat of why the structural change is required to be honest with you. When we only had \$83,000 to spend, that's not really a big deal, and it's easy to do. When you're given \$7.4 million to spend, that is a lot of work. I'm surprised how hard to spend \$700. So, and now we've been given another \$2.14 to add to that which we did submit requests for some property acquisition for that, and to lease some lands for parking management essentially. So during, during construction activities and associated with construction activities, now, we'll be able to use this money to acquire additional property or lease additional property.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I've got a question because when I was looking through the budget I also noticed they took out from the various pots that were in the Department of Management, as well as Public Works. I noticed they zeroed out the infrastructure improvements on Vineyard Street, and they also took out the transitional parking for...down on Wells, I guess. Was the --? The off street parking, there was like \$1.5 million in the, in the Department of Management that was suppose to help with transition as construction was going to begin and those kinds of things.

Ms. Wade: Yes, I apologize for that. We did ask for that and it was put in under Department of Management but instead we got the \$2.1, so --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So --

Ms. Wade: -- we can use the \$2.1 for that.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: That one for that. Okay. And what about the infrastructure improvements for Vineyard?

Ms. Wade: The Vineyard Street was cut, so during the budget deliberations they specifically asked Public Works about Vineyard and they explained that it's going to be a requirement of being able to move forward with our project. And then they asked Public Works, did he need the full \$1 ½ million to move forward this year, and he said, no, we could probably move forward with \$600,000 and get through the planning phase. I think what's going to -- and they didn't actually fund any of it.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yes.

Ms. Wade: But the \$7.4 is enough for us to take that on if, if we can clearly determine in the design phase that that's going to be necessary for the completion of the design of the parking and events facility. So that is enough to actually not slow us down at all. We're just gonna have to go back and justify; that's required. Yes?

Mr. Starr: Two, two things we've been talking about. One is to do a...an infrastructure assessment of points of adequacy, for pipes and et cetera. And the other is a...I forget what's it's called -- a multi-modal circulation study. And I know at one point we were questioning whether we could do some of that with the money we have now since that -- if we don't start with that, it will all come to a halt at some point.

Mr. Fujimoto: Can that be put in as part of the EIS?

Ms. Wade: Yes. The -- certainly the multi-modal circulation because that's going to have to be part of the traffic report and we can certainly raise the bar because we're the developer in that phase.

The infrastructure adequacy surrounding the parking structure I think is totally defensible and we can do, but I know that we want to do more than that. So what we might have to do is determine where we're at in terms of remaining funds once we get through the EIS process and then just extend that contract which we could do. Because we'll do -- we'll have an infrastructure adequacy study for the EIS for the parking and events facility, and then we could always go back and extend the contract for the rest of the district.

Mr. Starr: Okay. And so can we start to develop those components and then...add in?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah, that's part of the work that Erin is doing in terms of coming up with the

RFP for the parking structure. As part of the RFP is the design as well as the all of the EIS stuff, yeah, all that studies and all that.

Mr. Starr: Is that thing done by Munekiyo or with what's her name?

Ms. Wade: Munekiyo.

Mr. Fujimoto: Well, Munekiyo is coming up with the RFP. Yeah, as far as who the person is, we're not sure yet.

Mr. Starr: Okay. I didn't know who it was, Munekiyo or...who was the other?

Ms. Wade: PBR.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, PBR.

Mr. Fujimoto: So that's kind of in the works already.

Ms. Wade: Which -- I guess we should transition to that. Did you have another question on this?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: No, no, no, I'm fine.

**b. Wailuku Town Parking and Events Facility project update**

Ms. Wade: So the parking and events facility update -- so we'll, instead of using the design build process we'll be using the qualified bidders list so this is a brand new territory for us. But what will happen is Greg King, from Purchasing, today, posted the ad. Each year there's an ad published that says what projects the county expects to undertake in a given fiscal year. Our project was included in that list. And the qualifications are required to come back by June 25<sup>th</sup>. So on that date we'll have the list of people qualified to provide the service of designing the parking and events facility. In advance of that I have cleared a selection committee list with the Purchasing Department, and that committee will be working to develop evaluation criteria. So that as soon as we have the qualified bidders list we can reach out to them and indicate that we have interest in hearing if they would -- how they would approach the project. And then we can use our selection committee to...hire a designer. Yes, so we're on track for this fiscal year.

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah. So we're on our way.

Mr. Starr: Good luck.

**c. Wells Park Master Plan**

Mr. Fujimoto: Wells Park?

Ms. Wade: Dave Yamashita's here to update you on Wells Park.

Mr. David Yamashita: Last time I told you that we were working on a contract and negotiation, so that's been done. So we have a fee with a consultant which is PBR out of Honolulu, and it's now -- the contract is now being drawn up by the, by Corp Counsel. That's where it is. And in the contract we have a year to do the master plan. And I just wanted to say a few things why MRA and why Erin and I are working on the master plan for Wells Park. And just to remind people that Wells Park is such an important part of Wailuku. And in places around the country, parks like that of that size are really important pieces of what makes the town special. And right now I think it's fair to say that Wells Park has a lot of potential. And so what we're going to try to do with the master plan is bring the park to life and make it a real part of Wailuku, and then restore it, too, I think to the status that it maybe once had. So that's why we're involved in this.

And the other part is that it's great to have another partner. Parks Department has been really open and really excited about doing this. And I think that they have the same vision that we all do in this room which is really exciting. So it's nice to kind of expand our team of people working on the redevelopment, to include another agency. So, so that's another kind of fun project that I think we'll start maybe, maybe in the summer.

Ms. Wade: You should, you should share about Portland.

Mr. Yamashita: Oh, and so the other part of it too is that Erin is going to be a part of this group. There's a small group of, I think, about five or six people who are going to Portland in second week of July -- from the 11<sup>th</sup> through the 15<sup>th</sup> -- and because I used to work there and lived there, I set up the schedule for these parks people and Erin to see what a really nice park system looks like and to get them kind of excited. And one day is going to be devoted to these downtown parks, and I just know that the things that people are going to see are going to be just really impressive. This is a whole other level of, of parks that most people don't see. So that's going to happen. So the hope is everybody comes back, and they're excited, and they have a new idea of what we could have in Wailuku and on Maui.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I, I'm glad to see, see that happening. Something that keeps reoccurring, to me, whenever I walk over to Wells Park, is that I feel like that there needs to be some kind of . . . (inaudible) . . . and interesting path corridor, pedestrian and bicycle that's kind of delineated and made to be real easy and fun from, you know, kind of Market Street over to Wells, Wells Park. And I feel that that could help to create, create interest and activity if there's that connectivity is part of the Wells Park project.

Mr. Yamashita: Yeah, absolutely. I mean, when we came up with concept, we developed a

concept years ago through reWailuku, the connections and the corridors were always a major piece of this. So you have these major, major places and assets like parking and events facility and Market Street, Wells Parks, but they need to be connected. So street trees, benches, interpretative plaques, things like that are all going to be a part of it. This is all of the stuff that you'll see in Portland.

Ms. Wade: Can't wait.

Mr. Fujimoto: Thanks Dave.

**d. Lao Plaza blessing, July 8, 2016 (tentative)**

Ms. Wade: Okay, the last item on Director's Report is the Lao Plaza blessing which this date had to be moved again. I tell you what, coordinating the County Council, the Mayor's staff, and our kumu for this has been really challenging. So right now it looks like July 27<sup>th</sup>. The plus of postponing it till then -- we were very disappointed at first that we're going to have to bump this back so far -- but the advantage is that the lights will be installed. That's something that's not going to happen until the end of June, so we knew those would be the longest lead time, so that will be complete. And the landscape will be grown in a little bit, so it will look better finished. There's a chance we might have some actual furniture between now and then, too, that the Lao is going to create -- or develop, use, purchase. So I will -- you will be getting invitations in the mail for this and I'll let you know when to save the date. Budget?

**2. Budget (Attachment A)**

Mr. Fujimoto: Uh-huh.

Ms. Wade: This is two weeks old actually, but...both the ADC and the trees and banners have now been paid as well, or are getting paid. Those two, we had noncompliance issues which are now fine. I had set aside the \$20,000 for the RFP that you reviewed today. Now that we're sort of straddling the budget year, I don't know if we want to...continue to identify \$20,000. \$20,000 was what I had thought was what the master plan would cost, but then we added the pilot project in. So we can either put it out for just the master plan and save -- and try to get to that 20,000 number, or we can bid it as one. I should have mentioned this during our discussion about the RFP, and keep the pilot project separate. I do not think we'll be able to do both of those for \$20,000. That would be asking too much. But I could get the master plan started for the \$20,000 if you would like me to do that now.

Mr. Fujimoto: Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: I mean can we pick a number out of the air and add it to it and look at it with the

pilot project as part of it?

Ms. Wade: Yes, except that if I don't encumber that \$20,000 from fiscal year 16 immediately we won't -- it will go away...and we'll have to look at just the \$83,500 in your, in your new budget.

Mr. Starr: So perhaps we just drop out the pilot project until the new, beginning of the new FY?

Ms. Wade: Sounds like a plan?

Mr. Fujimoto: I agree.

### **3. Open Application Report (Attachment B)**

Ms. Wade: Okay. Let's do that. Next item is open applications report. So...the Uptown Chevron is the one that should be moving and done at any time. Actually also the one that's mine, I already signed off on it. It just isn't showing up on the report yet because of our...the delay in our system. So the only one really open and pending is still the project at the corner of Vineyard and Central, and I think they're still kind of working internally to decide what they're going to do. So that's it.

Mr. Starr: Any word on the dates of the muni lot repaving?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, so right now -- they're there now. They're doing the curb and ADA access work which is going to take about two weeks. And they started it at the beginning of this week, and next week they should be done. And then the paving, we had hope they were going to do over the Memorial Day weekend, but it doesn't look like that's going to happen, so it will probably be the first week of June. Not this coming week, but the following week.

Mr. Starr: But it's, it's eminent, though, it's going to happen.

Ms. Wade: It's eminent, and you know, honestly, we had the conversation even of should we stop it because we're moving so aggressively towards the parking and events facility construction. But after talking with David Goode about that, he said, you know, they're -- because of the potential for continuation of lawsuits. They had a woman, I guess, her walker foot got caught in one of the holes and doubled over, and he just said, you know, it's better for us to keep moving ahead. Our contract has been issued, let's just complete it. Because it could be three or four years before we're under construction. We don't want to make it, let it be worse.

Mr. Starr: I'm worried about people not knowing or saying they don't know about the repaving when it starts to happen, so I hope that there's a good outreach that's really going



to kind of hit people over the head with the fact...one day.

Ms. Wade: Okay. I'll take care of that this afternoon. Alright.

**F. NEXT MEETING DATE: June 24, 2016 (Dependent on agenda item D.4)**

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay, next meeting date is July 8<sup>th</sup>. Anything else...before we adjourn?

Mr. Starr: Good meeting. We got some work done.

**The June 24, 2016 meeting canceled. A special meeting is scheduled on July 8, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Planning Conference Room.**

**G. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

**RECORD OF ATTENDANCE:**

**Members Present:**

Carol Ball, Vice-Chair  
Frank De Rego, Jr.  
Don Fujimoto, Chair  
Ashley Lindsey  
Jonathan Starr

**Others:**

Erin Wade, Small Town Planner, Current Planning Division  
David Yamashita, Staff Planner, Long Range Planning Division  
Michael Hopper, Deputy Corporation Counsel