

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 23, 2017**

APPROVED 08-25-2017

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Ms. Carol Ball, Vice-Chair, at approximately 1:05 p.m. Friday, June 23, 2017, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Island of Maui.

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

Ms. Carol Ball: It's 1:05 p.m. I'd like to call the meeting of the MRA together, to order. We have the minutes of the last meeting that I'm sure you reviewed. Sorry, I'm going out of order. Public testimony. We can hear public testimony now or if you have something to say particularly about a particular piece of business that's being presented you can wait till then. Whatever you'd like to do.

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.

Ms. Teri Edmonds: Aloha MRA members. Hi, nice to see you guys again. Thanks for volunteering. Again, you know, I appreciate volunteers. So, I'm just here to give a little bit of input just on the parking issue that's going forward, and the only thing that I would like to suggest as -- I'm Teri from If the Shoe Fits, so I'm right there on Market Street. And I love the new loading zone that they've put in. People love quick stop in and go, and so my, just as a suggestion was that maybe you ought to take the right side of the street and maybe turn it into 30-minute parking for the next, you know, maybe a couple -- however long the parking center takes to develop, but at least allowing some, some quicker use on that street. I think two-hours is great. We've got that or, you know, around in the back parking lot and stuff, but I thought it might be nice. That's all.

Ms. Ball: Thank you. Any questions? Yes Jonathan?

Mr. Jonathan Starr: So, you think 30-minutes is better than 15-minutes?

Ms. Edmonds: Yeah. Because I think just the delay, you know, trying to -- if it's a long line at the coffee shop. For me, in my shoe repair shop, it takes about 15 to 20 minutes to process and if I've got somebody in line.

Mr. Starr: And how many spots like, like that do you think would, would makes sense?

Ms. Edmonds: Honestly, I think the whole side of the right side of the street.

Mr. Starr: The whole --

Ms. Ball: The whole side, meaning from where to where?

Ms. Edmonds: From the loading zone all the way down to Richard Dan's spot, you know, the last part of Market Street and Vineyard. Just the whole right side.

Mr. Starr: So all the way down from -- all the way from Main to Vineyard.

Ms. Edmonds: Yes. Yes. Thank you.

Ms. Ball: Anybody else?

Ms. Edmonds: And thanks again for all of your hard work. I really appreciate it.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, thanks for coming up.

Ms. Ball: Thank you to you Teri. Anybody else like to participate in the forum? Otherwise, we'll wait for the topic is presented. Yes, Mr. Dan.

Mr. Richard Dan: Aloha. Thank you all. I appreciate your volunteer work very much also. My name is Richard Dan. I'm the owner of 98, 92, 52, 50, 46 and 42 North Market Street businesses and or tenants and or physical owner. I also own a retail that's been on Market Street for 37 years. I'm also a -- I live in Wailuku. I've come to many of these MRA board meetings, and I appreciate everybody's hard work. Before I get into my testimony, I want to respond to Teri. I think making shorter parking on Market Street is a great idea. I don't think that we'll get as many spots if we make the whole thing one long loading zone. But if we take the existing structure and make that shorter parking, I think that's great. I don't know if 30 minutes a really smart answer. It takes a little bit more time for someone to go buy a coffee these days with the lines at the coffee shop. Go into my store and go buy something quickly. So I think maybe an hour, but I absolutely agree with it. I would also like to say I would love to see metered parking on Market Street. It would be great.

Now, the reason I'm here. I'm here, I'm here because First Friday attendance is going down, down, down. We all know this. It appears the WCA which is unresponsive to its members and never answers questions has made a strategic decision to change First Friday's from a local venue design to promote local merchants into an island wide food vendor display. I have been with First Friday from the start, but now I am almost the only Market Street merchant still trying to have sidewalk sales. First Friday, one reason is the offensive, unhealthy smoke from the food vendors. When Yuki was running things, I complained that the smoke was making my worker sick, clouds of smoke keeps the attendees from shopping and stopping. Also the smoke also causes additional, gigantic cleaning expense. Cleaning

my store fronts after First Friday food smoke is over \$460. Please reimburse me. I think you guys should. You authorize First Friday, it costs me money, it costs the way they're doing First Friday now. It used to be they keep the vendors in the, the food vendors mostly in the banyan tree park where the smoke wouldn't get on everybody's stores. Now it's getting everybody's stores. We got to clean our windows, we got to clean our buildings, our employees are standing there with lots of smoke, customers can't shop because their eyes are burning from the smoke. This doesn't make sense.

Things improve for a couple of months, but now the WCA who knows the history is putting smelling, smoky, greasy, offensive food vendors next to my sidewalk sale, and my webcam operation. I also maintain Wailuku . . . (inaudible) . . . on every First Friday since the beginning where we publish what . . . (inaudible) . . . First Friday. I have Harry Eagar and Jason Schwartz to kind of...news celebs for a lack of a better word, interviewing everybody from...politicians to anybody else as they come down Market Street for First Friday. Attendance is getting less. Okay, I'll be almost finish.

It makes my workers so ill it will not stay. The last time my sales dropped, the last time they had a smoke vendor next to my store, from \$500 the month before to \$5 because the customers can't shop with smoke in their eyes. One of my workers got sick, she lost three weeks work from the smoke when, against my request, the WCA put a popcorn vendor right next to my sidewalk sale. They can't look --. People can't look at my stuff with their eyes burning. The food vendors are no longer at the banyan park. They are on the street, on the street corridor in between buildings. Can you answer a question? Will you answer a question or will you continue to blow off the merchants? Is First Friday intended to benefit the Market Street merchants or is it to benefit I don't know who, a few food vendors and --

Ms. Ball: Excuse me, Mr. Dan? Are you asking these questions rhetorically?

Mr. Dan: No, I'm asking --

Ms. Ball: If you're asking to take it up today, we cannot because it's not an agenda item, and your three minutes have been up. Could you please finish up, and thank you for your testimony.

Mr. Dan: Yeah, I'm on my last paragraph. Right now it's unpleasant, dangerous, unhealthy, and it may be violating Department of Health regulations by exposing my retail workers, my two web cast interviewers, by exposing them to greasy, thick, awful smoke. And I'm certainly running up expenses because I have to power wash the grease off my store front, clean my windows every time. Please, please, please turn First Friday back into a celebration of the Market Street businesses.

Ms. Ball: Thank you. Thank you for appearing.

Mr. Dan: Okay.

C. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR FOR THE 2017 – 2018 BOARD YEAR.

Ms. Ball: We're on to the --. With no other forum items, we can go on to Item C, election of Chair and Vice-Chair for the 2017-2018 board year. Are there any nominations?

Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr.: I nominate Carol Ball for Chair.

Ms. Gwen Hiraga: Second.

Ms. Ball: It's been moved and seconded that Carol Ball be elected Chair. Are there other nominations? Hearing none, we're ready for the vote. All those in favor of Carol Ball being Chair say aye. All those opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much for your vote. I gratefully accept.

It was moved by Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr., seconded by Ms. Gwen Hiraga, then unanimously

VOTED: to elect Ms. Carol Ball as Chair for the 2017-2018 board year.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Congratulation Madame Chair.

Ms. Ball: Thank you. The other is the Vice-Chair. May I hear nominations for Vice-Chair please?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I nominate Jonathan Starr as Vice-Chair.

Ms. Hiraga: I'll second.

Ms. Ball: It's been moved and seconded that Jonathan Starr be nominated for Vice-Chair. Do I hear other nominations? Hearing none, we'll have the election. All those in favor of Jonathan Starr for Vice-Chair please say aye. All those who opposed say no. Jonathan Starr is Vice-Chair. Congratulations Jonathan.

It was moved by Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr., seconded by Ms. Gwen Hiraga, then unanimously

VOTED: to elect Mr. Jonathan Starr as Vice-Chair for the 2017-2018 board year.

Mr. Starr: Okay, we'll have to work as a team, and it will be a great year.

Ms. Ball: Thank you. It will.

D. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 21, 2017 MEETING MINUTES (Transmitted to members via e-mail)

Ms. Ball: The next item is the approval of the minutes. You all had a chance to review them. Is anyone --? I mean, can someone make a motion to approve these minutes?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I make a motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

Ms. Ball: Do I hear a second?

Mr. Starr: Second.

Ms. Ball: It's been and seconded that the minutes be approved. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed? Motion carries, the minutes are approved.

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

VOTED: to approve the April 21, 2017 meeting minutes.

E. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Presentation by Rector Craig Vance on future plans for Good Shepard Church and the surrounding properties owned by the Episcopal Dioceses of Hawaii. (No action)**

Ms. Ball: New business. Item No. 1 is the presentation by Rector Craig Vance on the future plans for the Good Shepard Church and the surrounding properties owned by the Episcopal Dioceses of Hawaii.

Rector Craig Vance: Well thank you. My privilege to be here. Craig Vance, I'm the new rector at Good Shepard Episcopal. I'm Canadian, and showed up here from Vancouver; a long story. A long and thrilling story, but it started by one day I was saying, you know, God -- if I could refer to him in the most neutral and inclusive way per it, in the most inclusive possible -- you know, I'd like an adventure. I'd like to go anywhere in the world to serve you anywhere. It just never occurred to me I'd end up in Hawaii as many people jokingly say, yeah, how did you pull that one off? But it's been wonderful to be here. Yeah, sort of an understatement; it is wonderful to be here. And it's also wonderful to be in Wailuku. I live in Lao Gardens. I'm kind of an urban person. When I was in Vancouver, I was involved in planning issues and I was an affordable housing developer and have the scars to be prove it and before I went into this. And then as I applied for the position they said oh yeah we've got these lands and these buildings, and they're getting old and we should do something. And I keep running into Erin I think at every First Friday thing, every planning thing you do. So, and then she said, well you should come and tell us about your exciting plans for your

development. And I said, we don't have any exciting plans for our development. But what we have is we've started saying we want to do some development on our property, really early days. And so I think this is a great opportunity for us to get some feedback. You know, I know a little bit of the development world and planning world, and looked at the zoning and have some ideas. And you know there are some things we'll run by you and see what you think, but also finding out what makes sense for Wailuku. So if I could ask, introduce Peter Lee who is my rector's warden and longtime -- he'll tell you about it and he'll talk a little bit about the church.

Mr. Peter Lee: Good morning. As far as --. I'm Peter Lee, I'm the senior warden which is like the lay leader of the church and the Episcopal Church, and my family has been here on Maui and part of this development at least, from our recorded history, from the early 19th century. My great, great, great-grandfather worked in the Grand Mahele as an engineer and surveyor with Mr. Bailey when the properties were being surveyed, and then with Good Shepard Church in particular my grandparents were the first couple married in the new building once it was blessed in 1911 or 1910 actually, that's when they were married. I've - - although I was born in Honolulu, my family has been very much a part of Wailuku starting from Waihee coming this way. And so the history of the church is that this property was granted to then the Episcopal -- we'll we weren't Episcopal, we were still Anglican in those days -- was given in 1866 and we still sit on that same footprint to this day, 151 years later. And what was starting off as a fairly rural piece of property on the other side of the Wailuku River was a church and enough property for the rector to have his own pasture, a gem farm and be self-supporting. Now it's right in the middle of Wailuku. And so we're sitting on this very value piece of real estate and we're looking at where can we go, (a), as a church, and (b), as part of this community. Thank you.

Rector Vance: So again you should be quite familiar to at Main and Church Street, the building and then we've already referred to this. First feral concrete building in Hawaii built in 1911. Interestingly, they used beach sand which had salt in it, so we've been having to do a lot of work of spalling and replacing decaying rebar. People are nodding. This is not the only building to have this problem. So, as far as we can tell, it's not falling down. All the people are said, no, it's not falling down, we just need to do a little bit of spalling from time to time. A view from Main and Church. The aerial view, and this was actually quite helpful to me --

Ms. Erin Wade: You can take the mic with you.

Rector Vance: Hey, don't give me a microphone, I might start doing a collection or something. So, you know, the church property here is well known. We own the McDonald's as well on a long term lease, and we are very happy about that. We've got our office and classroom complex here, Queen Emma athletic club which serves, you know, local youths and a weight lifting club is there. Our cup of cold water ministry van for the homeless has parks here and has their storage here. And then it kind of disappears, but we've got this large 20,000 square foot property in here, and a number of, you know, little cottages that were moved there, built in Second World War, moved there in the 50's. And so it's just shy of two acres. The

commercial property as I call it is about 20,000 square feet, the McDonald's is 17,000 square feet, and the church and office complex is about 47,000 square feet. Okay, that one didn't work. Oh, we've got a theme.

I told Erin that whenever I do power point presentations it always ends up with somebody saying, oh, so sorry the technology doesn't work, anyone knows how to work this. Oh, there's one. Okay, it's an interior of the church, beautiful stain glass, fairly typical Anglican neo-gothic construction. We've got some significant stain glass. Not a lot of people know this, this is a William Morris window. In England he is as well-known as Tiffany; significant arts and craft artist. And then a large Good Shepard window by the Zepler fabrique in Munich also, and we have two major pieces and two small pieces from them. There used to be a lot in Germany, they -- it didn't survive. And we're actually thinking this window needs to be restored because the wood is failing and we've got a huge -- \$35,000 to restore it to get a new metal frame done on the mainland moved out here. So we're thinking of talking to them and see if they want to help restore one of their windows.

And again, looking from Main, looking to the parish hall at the back, and the remembrance garden to the left. The -- note the historic river rock wall along Church Street. This is taken from the McDonald's parking lot, and it's partially to show, remind us how ugly it looks. And we're talking about re-landscaping the lawn because it looks really nice from the other side but not from this side. That's just showing the office complex. You can also see One Main Plaza in the back, so we'd like to put up a 20-story tower and destroy your view if that's okay. A cup of cold water van. The parish hall was built in the 30's by donation by Mr. Lufkin who was one of the old family banker, and he funded that. You can see we've got a commercial vent there for our commercial kitchen where we do a feeding program on Sunday's afternoons, a free community meal.

I guess we like the rock walls. And then looking across the street. The Wailuku Executive Center is spelled wrong. And . . . (inaudible) . . . and that, I believe, is a pro-type of what the present zoning would envision in terms of massing and height. You know, three stories, 40-feet on top of a parking podium. Is that language we use? Okay. That's the parish hall with new roof going on it for PV that's going on right now. And the parish hall, parish hall. I guess kind of what we're saying is our parish hall isn't very pretty. It's built in the 30's, it's concrete, we don't consider it as a significant building. We will not weep if the redevelopment results in it no longer existing, although it has -- you know, we use it a lot. Another picture of the parish hall. Building on Church Street, hallow tile. That's the one building that has the most -- is not in eminent danger of falling down. Concrete, poured concrete and we have some number of good tenants in there. Hidden back in the property, we've got some lovely landscaping. This is a low key aesthetics and they've got -- done lovely things with their lanais and very nice, tropical vegetation, and one residential cottage. So really eclectic and it's just kind of a throw in together and the church needs some money and they found these and they threw these up. But they are -- well, I'll refer to that.

So while we're thinking about development, our church is full which is a lovely problem to have. Our sanctuary seats 170. We have an average attendance of 150 and three service.

At Easter, attendance of 370, with 270 in one service. And the physics and math does not work there, I do not understand it how a church that holds 170 has 270 on Easter. But I think it's all the doors are open and all the kids are running outside, but. And it's vital with young families, children and youth so we need to consider a larger worship space. Commercial properties past their primary. This is just an understatement, I mean, we were just looking of something, a vacancy and it's like how extensive is the termite damage or is it the termite tubes the only thing holding the place up, right? It's not that bad, it's aesthetically nice, but we can tell that this is not a long term sustainable. And we're spending more and more money just keeping them up and rentable.

Some assumptions. Our church remembers garden and landscape lawn on Church and Main will remain essentially as is. We love it as much as the rest of the community. It's historic, it's wonderful, don't touch it. We do not want to sell land. Indeed our dioceses has a policy of not, not alienating land, but we want to explore development options on a land lease. And the McDonald's site will remain as is on a long range lease...which we are in now.

More assumptions. The commercial properties with approximately 30,000 square foot buildable, 20,000 square foot site, 1.5 FAR, if I got that right, could be developed as a standalone property and it is a standalone. It has its own TMK. It's a separate parcel. The church site is 47,000 square feet, 70,000 square foot buildable, and FAR 1.5. If we could take the unutilized density on the McDonald's site and transfer it -- and that's a question, I don't know -- there's a lot of square footage, potentially, buildable, developable there. And indeed that becomes a bigger problem because the bigger the project, the more challenging it is from a development and a management perspective. But there's potentially quite a bit of buildable square footage there.

So we wonder, so these are just intuitions at this point. Developing a mixed use development on the commercial property, possibly a standalone, but we need to have a longer range plan for the whole campus. Commercial, retail, office, service, food uses along Church Street with enhanced and attractive street frontage. And indeed, right now, the street frontage is broken up by a drive, large parking lot. Potentially the street frontage could be extended, you know, and then you've just got, you know, something entering the parking some place. We actually have --. Four.

Mr. Lee: No, just two on Church Street.

Rector Vance: Yeah, and four in total. We'll show that when we go back to the site. So a parking, you know, garage covering the main floor and then something above, and then residential on upper three floors. Residential would be what we would prefer for a number of reasons. One is there's nearly infinite demand for residential housing, and very finite demand for commercial in Wailuku. And then it creates, helps create a livable, walkable community. And, you know, sort of my, I think I started my comments on the parking structure like can you find a private party partner who would build residential on top of a parking structure. And it's, it's just want Vancouver did. It's how Vancouver renewed itself.

They went into it in a big way and all of sudden downtown is walkable. Like when you talk about numbers going down at First Friday, if you've got another 100, 200, 300, 400 people living downtown, walking to First Friday. Well, you guys are planner, you know this, right? So we'd love to be a part of that, and we think our site could be a part of that.

We hope to have a long range plan for an enlarged worship space, and possibly expanding out of the north wall of the sanctuary. So the back wall of the Church, furthest from Main, we've looked at that. We could remove the stain glass, blow out that back wall, build the new sanctuary worship space out the back, and incorporate it -- I'm not an architect, we haven't hired one -- but that's our best guess. That would be the easiest way for us to expand our worship space. And then possibly putting a new office and parish hall complex with mixed use, with other uses above, in the back corner closest to Maui Medical back there. And a new worship office and parish hall is beyond our financial capacity for the foreseeable future. You know, 10,000 square foot facility, 400 a square foot, you know, that's \$4 million. We don't have \$4 million. The value of the commercial property, the tax register says it's valued in the million dollar range. So even if we sold off that parcel it's not generating the sort of income that we would need to do a new church.

Exploring options. From a planning perspective our site could be one of the few that could be considered for height relaxations, with higher density sites neighboring us on the west. This isn't a plan. It's not even an ask, it's just an observation that if there's any place in Wailuku where you could consider a height relaxation, we already have six, eight, 12, 10, 12-stories stuff -- not 12 -- 10 story around us, concrete. And it would be possible from a planning perspective to mask the density on one part of the site and relax it. It's not an ask, and I know it's sensitive, but I'm just making the observation.

I wonder, could a drive-thru on Church Street be a possibility as part of a potential food establishment. That's not a big thing. It's just one of the...possibilities. And then, you know, so we need to find potential partners in a development because -- although I've done development in the past, I have a day job and don't want to do that again. We wonder is rental housing financially feasible. And we know that there's, you know, there's been an announcement of a rental housing project out by Foodland, you know, so if people can help us connect with those people, people who might be willing to share their numbers, right? Because if rental housing is feasible, that would be like almost a slam dunk, infinite demand, nearly infinite demand for rental housing. And I think lots of people would like to live in Wailuku. It's not everybody, but for a certain sort of person living centrally and walkable, it's lovely.

Is there an institutional partner who would be interested? I don't know, County of Maui. You know, I don't know, medical health? So we don't know. These are things we don't know. Would our site be acceptable for a boutique hotel for Wailuku? We saw that in the report, and said, hum, I wonder if our site might be, actually, a place that could work for that. Because if there is a partner, right, then -- particularly if it's a well healed partner from the mainland with lots and lots of money, who can pay for all the consultants, you know, then something sooner could be potential.

And then the question, how can we serve Wailuku? So if we can provide 30 residential units, it means more people living, working in Wailuku. More people living, working, shopping, eating in a walkable, walkable, cyclable neighborhood. New commercial facilities could provide street level, retail, food, office opportunities. Right now, commercial, we know demand in Wailuku is weak. With the new parking structure that could change. Or as I've said to somebody, one of the conundrums is the first person to go is pioneering, right? And then it's like, oh, look at that, somebody did a development, it's successful, they made money, let's do it too. So as I said if we were first, it's like we're sort of, if you're playing poker, you've just left a lot of money on the table because we've raised the property values so that's things that you stay up at night wondering about.

More people living in Wailuku provides eyes on the street for enhanced security. That's, you know, a basic Jane Jacob's, you know, which all you planning folks know. And then we're going to continue to serve those in need. Queen Emma athletic club, Kau Ohana Kitchen, Cup of Cold Water for the homeless and I suspect that we will try to discern perhaps other ways that we can serve the community. You know, if, if we have the energy and the people, we could potentially generate another non-profit. That's something in the back of my mind that I wonder about if there's other ways that we can serve our community. And that's it. Thank you.

Ms. Ball: Great. Thank you. Anybody with any questions? Yes, Jonathan.

Mr. Starr: I have a couple, and I'm really happy with, you know, what we're hearing.

Rector Vance: Well, thank you.

Mr. Starr: A couple of comments. First of all, I don't know if you're aware, but there's a stained glass artist of, I think, fairly large experience that just moved into Wailuku and one of, became one of my tenants. I don't know their work, but I know they're doing -- they're working for several churches on the island doing restoration so --

Rector Vance: Because literally we just left the office and they were talking with somebody. I don't know if it's the same person.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I mean, this is over the last two weeks so -- I, I -- I'm glad to hear that people are talking about trying to create the body heat that will enable, you know, the type of walkable, thriving mixed used street, streetscape, you know, and I know you're, you hit on one of the keys which is density. There needs to be enough density in the core.

Rector Vance: I didn't use the d-word in public.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, but, you know, that's...that's where it's at if you want the . . . (inaudible) . . .

Rector Vance: Because if you say the d-word people hear Honolulu, right, and we're not

Honolulu. But you folks know you can do density without turning into Honolulu.

Mr. Starr: I know I've done a number of studies as far as rental apartments, and it barely works. You know part of the problem is if, if you -- you know, it works, it actually works best at low density kind of suburban type stuff which doesn't allow retail on the ground floor. You know that's the stuff that that at this time seems to pencil, pencil out but barely. To go three, four stories, it becomes too tall for wood frame with fire code, but it doesn't pay for the expense of --

Rector Vance: Concrete.

Mr. Starr: -- of concrete and steel, which, you know, takes more, so it kinds of ends up in a -
-

Ms. Ball: Thanks, thanks for your comments, and in this case, the angels and the details.

Rector Vance: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. Can, can I finish my question, Carol?

Ms. Ball: Oh, sorry, I thought you were.

Mr. Starr: No. You know, I was wondering what you're, what you're thinking of in terms of, of height and, and form that you think would work because you're, you're a professional in that field.

Rector Vance: Well, you make it pretty and not cheap. And there's a question then of, like, what we can work with. So the, the building across the street, Wailuku Executive Center, is a little square. Going to six to eight stories, I think, makes sense because it would also make more sense economically, like again, four stories frame versus -- is it five, at the fifth story you have to go non-combustible? Yeah, so if you're making that jump going to six to eight stories might make it pay for itself when it wouldn't when you're smaller. I like the idea of putting the massing towards the rear of the project, and then have a softer face to the, to the street where you can get like a two-story façade much like there is along Vineyard where there's, you know, nice -- you can mimic that appropriately. Like mean you can mimic it inappropriately, like, you know, architecturally you can get façade, right, where you're trying to pretend that you're cute Wailuku from the 1920's, but you're not fooling anybody. But you can still do something that that speaks to that. And that was my thought about a softer massing along the street level, get a nice street front, and then more density towards the back. But it's really an architectural and planning and economic question.

Mr. Starr: I -- one thing I heard that made me happy was that your sanctuary is busting at the seams and it's really, it's really thriving.

Rector Vance: Yes, that pleases us too. And then it's --. Studies have shown that the

church will grow to about 80% of its seating capacity which is at what we're at. And also the size that we're at studies show that there's a major inertia from just a human capital organizational development standpoint of where a church, you know, in the 150 range, once you break through into the 250 range you need a second priest, it costs more money, it changes the feel of the place, and the decision making matrix so all these --. So it's one thing to say that this -- we think that our church should be able to grow, but there's this plateau thing and it takes both human, and organizational, and spiritual capital to break through. And so the preliminary we're thinking that we need to make our existing structures work for us in the interim, so do some sort of development, keep doing a capital campaign, raising money. If we have a positive income stream, we can start putting away for a new church. But then we go to perhaps a fourth service, like on a Saturday night or a week night even. You know, I've got so many parishioners who say, hey Father, yeah, I haven't seen you for a long time. You know we work Sundays, you know, can't come to church, you know. And I'm going, yeah, yeah that's -- how you go to church when you're working two jobs in the service sector trying to pay your mortgage in Kahului with five other families as we know. Sorry, I digress.

Mr. Starr: Just a parting remark, you know, it seems, to me that means that you're really fulfilling your, your needs and your mission because you know there are a lot of houses of worship on this island that are not, you know, not thriving with a lot of people coming to services. And it would be really nice to see if you're able to expand if there are more people.

Vance: Yeah, we hope so. And there's the thought, you know, it's not just like church growth, bigger church, you know, all clergy like bigger churches. Those who don't are lying. But it's also what we can do as a church that is already serving the community. So we're going like, oh, what's the next thing, you know. Like, I'm going, how about a -- how about an arts academy for low income kids, partner with MAPA. I don't know. Sorry, I shouldn't say thing like that out loud. But it makes you wonder, like, what could we do to serve the community that we're not already doing, and then try to not let, you know, the tail with the dog with the buildings. And it costs so much money, good lord.

Ms. Ball: Thank you. Thank you Jonathan for your questions as well. Well, it sounds like we were really given a gift to have you come to Maui. Thanks so much for being here and . . . (inaudible) . . . your parish.

Rector Vance: Thank you. I'm honored.

Ms. Ball: I did have a question about your vision or your -- the church's vision for the residential portion of your plan. Had you targeted that group or the use for anything?

Rector Vance: There could be an argument for senior housing for aging in place. I've talked -- I live in Lao Gardens and I was talking to a guy in my rotary club, you know, a doctor who wants to down size. And he'd like to be in Wailuku and there's not -- you know, it's not a lot. And the stuff that is, it's sometimes substandard or not kept up. You know, so if we have something that's modern, granite counters, you know, sort of like condominium quality, I think there's a place for that. And then the economics, like I mean, push you far away from

affordable housing. Unless it's affordable housing and there's a senior level of government that's partnering and bringing in some money.

Ms. Ball: Your description and his of what I think Wailuku needs -- I'm from Wailuku, I was born there and the neighborhood fits right in there with, with what you're describing so it could work there.

Rector Vance: But I've warned my folks, like, I know we want to do affordable housing, but the problem with affordable housing is somebody has to be not make money and it can't be us. Alright, so then it's like is there a senior level of government that can partner, then yeah we can talk affordable housing but.

Ms. Ball: Well, something more upscale is not, not available on Maui and the people who are aging in place in their homes have outgrown that, that ability to, to maintain them.

Rector Vance: Thank you

Ms. Ball: Anyway, I'm not going into that. Sorry. Thank you.

Rector Vance: Thank you very much.

Ms. Ball: Thank you. Okay, thank you very much. We can move on now.

2. Update and discussion on the Parking & Events Facility design process and some preliminary observations about policy changes and incentives to maximize the potential for investment and redevelopment in the redevelopment area.

Ms. Wade: Thank you. Thanks for coming.

Mr. Starr: Good luck.

Ms. Ball: Number two is the update and discussion on the parking and events facility design.

Ms. Wade: Thank you. The update on the design is we --. Let's see, First Friday of this month, we opened the store front open house space, and I did bring updated newsletters for everybody if you'd like copies of those. The store front open house, this was an experiment because we wanted to repeat sort of the experience that we had with reWailuku and see how many folks we could get. The First Friday evening was so busy we couldn't even talk to everybody coming in the shop so that was a great problem to have I suppose. And then Saturday was, was especially interesting to me because we got a lot of folks who walked from Maui, Maui Lani and Kehalani. Like I guess that's their Saturday morning activity; it's really common that people will walk in from the neighborhood and get a coffee, and go to the Farmacy. And so that was the first time we've done sort of a Saturday morning open house

experience and it was neat. It was only about 25 people that came in for the three-hour period we were open, but we had very in depth conversations with those folks about what would bring them to Wailuku more regularly and the types of things they would like to see. There was a couple and the, the gentleman is a pilot for Alaskan Airlines, and the woman, I put her name down and said please call me to volunteer and whatever you'd like to do, I'm retired now. So the, the open house becomes not just an opportunity to get feedback on the sites, but I think also to build sort of the coalition, the Wailuku Coalition, which has been really positive.

The lunchtime open house was good. We got a lot of State and County workers come in for that, which, I mean, they're a huge part of the day time population so it was generally good. The things people expressed a whole lot of preference for were the things that involved families and children. That was one of the high priorities was, and not necessarily to serve their own personal children, but because they just like seeing them, more or less. Like in the outdoor plaza public space that there could be something, some kind of an interactive activity of some kind. And then the ongoing programing was what people were really passionate about. We did have a lot of the surrounding property owners also come in during the weekdays. I think...I think the turn out on daily basis during the weekday store front was about 20. It wasn't, it wasn't tremendous but we did get some turnover. And it was nice because we also had our archaeologist come and was in there. The cultural resources specialist, the structural and civil engineer, the traffic engineer, and the architects were all in the shop just to have dialogues with people.

So the next steps and I think I also brought draft schedules. Yeah. So for what's happening coming up. I'll pass these. Two, three, four. So, what's happening, we have our meeting today and we're going to talk primarily about the, the economic development notes that were sent by the consultant. Next week we have the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) that's going to be sort of calling through the comments that we've received from the workshops, that we received from the community meetings and working towards defining which elements the designs are essential and what would just be also nice to include where we can. We will have cost estimates at that point which will allow better decision making. The designers will do a refinement and the advisory committee will have a second meeting. And then we will be back to the MRA at the regularly scheduled meeting in July with the sort of a preferred alternative, and it's still a draft. It will still be a draft, preferred alternative, at that point, but we'll do kind of a workshop discussion with the MRA at that point.

Moving from MRA, we'll do the second round of pop up planning, same kind of a First Friday with the store front open house for the following week, and then back to advisory committee meeting. After taking the preferred alternative to MRA and the community, we'll be taking it to the Budget Committee at the County Council because they are the ones controlling the contract and it is still in committee. The contract is in committee. So, just informing the Councilmembers of what the status is on the project. And then back to MRA for what the -- where we're at with the preferred design. And hopefully, at that point, we'll be able to be real close at preferred and we'll be able to launch in the EA when all of these other extenuating activities occur. Are there questions on the schedule?

Ms. Ball: Jonathan?

Mr. Starr: Yes, I'm really glad to see it moving along and it's all really good. I do...feel that it's really important for the MRA to be able to have a workshop where we can ask questions that are more in depth and take the time to get that understanding or to make suggestions to the design team. It's an MRA project. I felt at that last meeting we were not given time, and we're being cut off from asking questions and I don't feel that that is really in order since it's our project. So I feel if we're going to do it at the July meeting on the 28th, that's fine, but I want to be sure we have enough time to ask all the questions we want and have all the discussion and, you know, just maybe ask some what ifs and, and look at different, different things. I feel that's part of our duty. So, I know we had another meeting scheduled, special meeting. You know, if we're going to do it on July 28th, that's fine, but I just want to be sure that there's time for, you know, us to be able to try to pick it apart.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: And, and try to improve it and understand it because we're the ones who are going to have to be able to defend it and to go out and help convince the community, and also talk to the Councilmembers and so on. So we need to have that space to do that.

Ms. Wade: Right, and you know, we had set the special meeting for August 4th. I had asked if you'd be available for August 4th, but I think we're going to be able to move it up and do it at the July 28th meeting instead.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Unfortunately I won't be here.

Ms. Wade: On the 28th?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: The 28th, I'll be in Washington D.C.

Ms. Wade: Okay. You will had your say already if you meet with them.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I would have had my say, yeah.

Ms. Wade: So --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: But we won't be making any decisions on the 28th meeting. It will be just a workshop and people putting input.

Ms. Ball: Are you thinking Jonathan that that would be appropriate for what you're thinking because by then we're going to be discussing the preferred design concept. I mean, we're going to -- all those options will, will be ready it looks like. So, you want it then or . . . (inaudible) . . . ?

Mr. Starr: Well, frankly I'll be upset if it comes to us as a fait de complis. Well, here it is, you guys can rubber stamp it.

Ms. Ball: It doesn't say that.

Mr. Starr: You can take it or leave it.

Ms. Ball: What I'm suggesting is that since we'll have options then what are these options? We'll have to know in some --. I mean, I'm hoping that it's not -- they're not going to require all these questions at that time. That they will have come before somehow, I mean, it's what I'm thinking. Maybe I'm wrong. What do you think? What are you thinking?

Mr. Starr: I mean I prefer if it were, if it were before and you know it was really workshop mode.

Ms. Wade: That's the unfortunate part, which is probably the reason we created the advisory committee is because it's a little difficult with the MRA and the, you know, the formal minutes taking, and we can do to the greatest extent that we're allowed to, by sunshine law, to have that kind of a workshop experience. I'm more than happy to stretch that to the extent we can. But like the, the...the back and forth dialogue where people are trying to sort of riff off each other's design ideas is difficult in the setting. But to the extent that you guys are willing to go along with making that work, I'm happy to do that.

Ms. Ball: How about at either of the -- well, the 28th is right away, but how about at the 14th, could you because it's not an MRA meeting, could we be present or couldn't we more than two of us to be there?

Ms. Wade: I have time to publically notice it, but again everyone will have to be mic, we'll have to take minutes, you know, as an MRA meeting if it becomes a full board attendance at that meeting. Unless Mike has a --. Mike, do you have a suggestion for how we could do --?

Mr. Michael Hopper: If it's board business, and you've got more than two members then that is generally considered a . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Ball: What is "business"? What does that mean?

Mr. Hopper: That's items that the board has jurisdiction over, has supervision or control, and will come up on a future agenda.

Ms. Ball: Well, that precludes any of our participation with more than two in any of this, this preliminary . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Hopper: I mean, you could have a meeting, and if you just have two, that's fine. But if it's more than two, then you're already at a quorum at that point. And so, yeah, if you're

there, it becomes board business, it's supposed to be a meeting.

Mr. Starr: But why don't we make, why don't we make the July 14th the meeting, a meeting, notice it and have our process to have minutes and then we can participate in that discussion.

Ms. Ball: Let's hear from Frank, and then we'll --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, my understanding of the process, and correct me if I'm wrong, was this was actually suppose to be a help for us, the kind of not just win or down possibilities, but at least look at in the much more open and free way to be able to look at processes and also concepts. And it doesn't mean that we're --. That's why I thought we had the original presentation was to give us the full scope of what they were looking at in terms of the low, high and medium. And then at some point the PAC would come together, they would come up with what they considered, this is like the same with the Wailuku, the Wells Park thing that we did, with what would be, what they would consider a preferred design option. But I don't think that precludes us from making changes. You know, we could disagree with what that group says with, says would be the preferred design option. We would have had the original presentation, and you know, could still make changes from there. So, I...I don't think it precludes anyone from making any changes or input because we do have to own this. I do agree with you. We do have to own this. My, my concern still is costing, right. You know, we still haven't seen any numbers yet for any of these things. I'm hoping we're going to see it at the next PAC meeting, but I should read that e-mail you sent because maybe it's in there.

Ms. Wade: It's not on there. No, it's not.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: But, but...but, yeah, that's my reflection on this.

Ms. Ball: Okay. Thank you. That's helpful to us. But so are we not expected at the July 28th meeting to have --? See discussion on preferred -- I would guess because they're preferred they've been somewhat discussed to the point where --. We got to move -- I want to continue to move ahead with this, and we can't be having all these little, oh well, let's not do that, let's do this. Somehow all that happened between now and then, right?

Ms. Wade: A series of things are going to happen at the PAC meeting and that's, that's what this shows. They're going to look, they're going to look next week at the community feedback, they're going to see the cost estimates and the true parking impacts for the various features. And then they're going to discuss what's critical and I'm expecting several of the uses are going to drop out completely at that point where they're going to say, you know, the children's discovery center just doesn't make sense because of the parking demand or whatever, I'm just -- as a scenario, you know, that that kind of conversation will happen. And that, that discussion will get reported to you folks. You know, here's what the, here's what the advisory committee reviewed and identified as probably not workable solutions for the preferred scenario. Here's what they really feel that are priorities, and here's a way that -- then the next meeting they would actually have a design drafted up by the design team. So then on the 28th you folks would review both of those things. You would see their

conversation that occurred to sort of vet out. And then you would see what got mixed and matched in terms of arrangements and design preference.

Mr. Starr: I still have a real problem here and I can see it heading to a point where I'm going to have a very big problem because it looks like by the time we see it again it's going to be fait de complis. And it's going to be, well, sorry, it's too late to make changes, it's too late to ask questions, it's too late to make suggestions. And although, you know, in all honesty I'll probably go along 100% with what they...the PAC recommendations are if given the choice. If I don't have the choice, I'm going to object to the whole process because we are responsible.

Ms. Ashley Lindsey: I, I agree with Jonathan. I kind of do feel like it would be an end of the, end of the road kind of, yay or nay situation, and I would like to see . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Ball: Well, it does sound like that to me too. My fear wasn't that, it was that we're going to start snipping away at it because we are not passive people and say, yeah, okay then we'll just go with that. And then the whole thing, we'll have to start from square one again, and I don't want to see that because it's been dragged on far too long. So I'd like to see a more, a more efficient -- efficient is not the right word.

Ms. Wade: What if as an alternative because you're going to meet with the design team when they're here on the 28th too with adjoining property owners. Could, could we do that where you get time to sit specifically with the design team and talk through some concepts, and so do Ashley because these two are already get that chance in the Project Advisory Committee conversation. So if -- does that that they're getting your one on one input in advance of them pulling together the preferred design?

Ms. Ball: See because the design committee are the ones who are going to implement whatever we say. We just can't all get together and say it at the same meeting.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Ball: But if we meet with them separately and tell us our concern, tell them our concerns. And your concerns are going to be different than mine, and Ashley's and so forth. They'll get it and their ability is to put together our vast. What do you think of that?

Mr. Starr: I'm still not happy.

Ms. Wade: Tell me how you'd like us to do it.

Mr. Starr: I think we should have a meeting earlier that is full on workshop that's noticed for the MRA when we have an opportunity to have a spirited discussion, ask questions of the design team, and --

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Ball: What was your suggestion earlier about the July 14th?

Ms. Wade: I was, well, I answered my own question as I was saying maybe we could notice this as PAC combined meeting with the MRA. And then I realized that logistically that wouldn't work. You know, I just don't know how we would make that happen.

Ms. Ball: Okay.

Ms. Hiraga: Do you suggest that we have a meeting, a special MRA meeting, between the 28th and 14th? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Starr: You mean, the 28th of --

Ms. Hiraga: June.

Mr. Starr: June. Yeah, okay.

Ms. Hiraga: Between June 28th but before July 14th?

Mr. Starr: Okay. That would work, or is it possible for the...to do it on the, on the 28th, early in the day?

Ms. Wade: We can't. I can't notice in time for that.

Mr. Starr: Okay.

Ms. Lindsey: I would be fine doing the one on one meetings to comply with the sunshine law.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Ball: Could they go to the 14th, and then Jonathan go on the 14th because Frank and I are going on the 28th.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Ball: And then you and Ashley go on the 14th, and you'll hear what was discussed and how they, they're kind of considering it, I guess, and then you can say whether you like it and you have some other thing. How does that sound?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Chair?

Ms. Ball: Yes?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I'm a little confused right now about process. Okay, I saw the PAC

meetings is just preparatory, you know, that the MRA was always --. That 28th meeting I thought was where you could actually, you know, maybe it's the words that are being used. Maybe it's MRA discussion on PAC preferred design concepts. It sounds too final in this right? It sounds like it is the preferred design concept option, but it isn't. It's the PAC's that they came up with all their meetings, and meeting with them. But it doesn't mean the MRA is not going to have the final decision. This is why I'm a little confused because if this was the case, then we should have never had a PAC. We should have just have the MRA meet the whole time and do this process because it looks like we're reproducing what the PAC is doing.

Ms. Ball: Yeah, and you're right. And I think having the PAC was well guided because you can't have the whole group always in on everything. We have these people who are, who are not restricted as we are with whatever, and they can, they can fine tune this thing so it's something that we can understand and say, yes, we like it, or no we don't like it and so forth.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, Chair, one more comment. So to Jonathan's point, I'm not seeing this being a fait de complis. In fact, we could not like it and tear it up as much as we want. I mean, that's, that's my idea of what would be happening on the 28th. Unfortunately, I'm not going to be here, but you know, I would have been involved in the process beforehand. It would be interesting.

Ms. Ball: Right, so you'd know.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I'd know, but, but I would also like to be in if it's going to be torn up, you know, that kind of a thing. But, but I think you still get your say on what's going on. And obviously if you're not satisfied with it, you know, or if we're not all satisfied with it, you know, after talking among ourselves, then it can be, you now, changed anyway the way we see or the body thinks.

Ms. Ball: But what's wrong with your going on the 14th?

Mr. Starr: I'm happy to go. I'm happy to go on the 14th. I just want to be sure that on the 28th, it doesn't come, well, you know, it's too late to make any changes, it's too late to ask any questions.

Ms. Ball: Well, I don't think so. It's never going to be because we're the ones who decide.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Ball: But what we don't want to do is keep throwing it back because we don't like the comma at the end of the thing, you know. But and I think it give us an opportunity to see it before it comes before us.

Ms. Wade: And actually the design team has about an hour on the 28th when they come on Wednesday if you want to meet with them then too. So they're flying in an hour before the

meeting at 10.

Mr. Starr: Okay. So I'll plan on coming on the 14th. I plan on meeting them on the 28th. And then we'll have a meeting on the 28th.

Ms. Wade: Okay, so hang on because just to clarify you can't attend the PAC meeting unless one of them does not. So, I just want to make sure because we when established the PAC we identified it as these are the folks that are moving forward as the Project Advisory Committee meeting, or committee so --.

Ms. Ball: Because Frank is already on the PAC then I'm going to the meeting.

Mr. Starr: So if we do that don't we have to authorize them? Doesn't the MRA authorize them as it would be a, a TIF?

Ms. Wade: What's that? I've lost you. I don't understand.

Ms. Hiraga: You're saying a temporary --

Mr. Starr: An investigative --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: -- committee.

Mr. Starr: A TIG.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: In other words, you would be attending this as a fact finding.

Ms. Wade: So you authorized Frank. Well, it was asked who from the group wanted to participate on the advisory committee, and the group said Frank. And that time Gwen wasn't a seated member of the MRA. So now she's a seated member so she's still on the advisory committee. So it didn't -- I mean, at the time it didn't have to be an investigative committee. I mean, we could have done it that way. We still can if you want to go through the process. It's just that they're already meeting.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I'd rather, I'd rather not. I just want to be sure that -- you know this is the first time we have had this discussion and at the last meeting I was lead to believe that, oh, you guys are just kind of along to, you know, look at it, you're like the rest of the community. And I got, I came away from our last meeting frankly feeling there was something really wrong with our process.

Ms. Ball: Well, you know, and to speak in favor of it, I like that process because otherwise we would just be meeting and hashing over it. I mean, having this special committee is important. It's important to our moving things along. I really do.

Mr. Starr: Well, that's fine, but, you know, I will never go along with the rights of our members,

us being members of this organization being able to ask questions, being able to make comments and, being able to be the decision makers on that which is our purview. And it is, you now, we need to make sure that process is followed that we're able to ask questions or without being pressured or without being told that, you know, it's not our duty.

Ms. Wade: I think something that would be very constructive and I think we can do it even within the agenda item we're discussing right now is to identify what priorities this group has for this project that you want to make sure that the advisory committee is taking into account as they're doing their work too. Because, you know, we've had sort of higher level conversations about the design and what should come out of this. But now that there are some designs, you know, that we're reflecting upon, I don't know that we've had that conversation. And I do have, I do have all of these miniature versions if needed. If you wanted to do, it's up to you Chair.

Mr. Ball: Yes, please.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Okay. So just to, just to sort of formalize, are there things that you folks have either seen in this design that you think are priorities or that you feel like there are priorities that are not going acknowledge that we should be -- that the advisory committee should be cognizant of?

Mr. Starr: Okay, these are new that we have not seen yet, right?

Ms. Wade: No, these are the ones that were shown to you at the last MRA meeting.

Mr. Starr: Okay.

Ms. Wade: So these are publically available; they're on the web. They are however not the updated versions so it's mislabeled. It's supposed to say Executive Center. Those are now corrected on the web and they're publically available.

Ms. Ball: I wanted to just bring something else up that I heard you say. So is, are both Gwen and Frank on the --

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah, I wanted clarification.

Ms. Ball: Then I can't go to it, is that correct?

Ms. Wade: Right. You can go to the meeting with the property owners that we're having that you called for the adjoining property owners.

Ms. Ball: Right.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Ball: But I can't go to the -- to that?

Ms. Wade: The advisory committee meeting, correct.

Ms. Ball: Okay, alright. Thanks.

Ms. Hiraga: So a question to Jonathan, you, you would not -- your preference is to not meet with the consultants ahead of time, like on a one on one, like Ashley is going to do?

Mr. Starr: No, I'd like to do that.

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: I just don't want that to be in lieu of the body having a --

Ms. Hiraga: Oh, no. No, I don't think so.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And that's what I see the 28th is being actually.

Ms. Ball: What? The what?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: The 28th being where you kind of look at what has been distilled, but if you don't like it, then change it, you know what I mean? You know that's --. But that's, that's my perspective, that's my view how this process is working so I just want to lay Jonathan's fears that this is going to be kind of railroaded over the MRA. And I, I -- from the beginning of this process I never got that sense that that's what was being done. So, but if you have that fear I wish we could knead it somehow because --

Mr. Starr: Yeah. At, at the beginning I, I, I didn't, and I, you know, I was really happy that you, you were, you know, meeting on the PAC and that Gwen is, was part of that. But I did have some concern over the last month or so.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Mr. Starr: You know, should we get into actual --

Ms. Wade: Priority?

Mr. Starr: Yeah, more priorities?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: I think that we need to have a discussion about what the purpose of this is because what we're looking at now and what we looked at a few weeks ago is very different from the priorities that we had set out to create. And, you know, whether they're, they're rightfully part

of it or not, I don't know. But we don't have enough information to decide. Particularly the inclusion of County office building into it without know what the...ramifications of that will be both in terms of parking load, in terms of the planning perspective of having a 9 to 5, or 8:30 to 4:30 population that empties out and goes dark at 5 on the site, and you know, whatever, whatever else. We've never had that, that -- it's like you know, stick in these offices and someone needs to discuss it and own it. That's...the...first one.

I think that the definition of the, of the envelope for the parking we looked at massing studies very early on. And then we had kind of new massing studies brought in with a set of drawings, and they were tied to three alternatives. And somehow I didn't really feel like the way it was being presented was, was really a consistent thing. It was like, well, if you have, you know, the, you know, the larger building for the tax office, then the parking garage has to go deeper underground which is going to cost oodles more, but it will lower the site lines. And I was hearing three different arguments, and I didn't understand what one -- what those arguments had to do with each other. In other words, maybe there a discussion that needs to be had regarding, you now, the horizontal massing and there needs to be a discussion regarding the vertical...massing. And then there needs to be a discussion regarding density or intensity. And to have them, you know, you get to choose A, B, and C, but without having those discussions...I don't really feel like -- I feel like we're being excluded from the discussion of what's going on. I tried to ask questions about that at the last meeting, and I was kind of told that that's, you know, there's no -- it's too late, there's no -- you know, there can't be a third or fourth alternative.

Ms. Wade: Right. Well, and that wasn't necessarily like, you -- there can't be a third or fourth alternative. It was just --. There, there will probably a fourth, a fifth, and maybe a seventh, as we keep moving. It was just for that moment in time before we went public with three potential options. That was -- but the fourth --. You know, you were saying I'd like a combination of three, or two and three and how could, you know, we add another level and all of that is absolutely possible. And actually one of things they did is on the most intense one they showed an additional deck of parking sort of ghosted in above like what this could look like if that was added.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I mean, from my perspective I didn't even need to draw it out at that point --

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: -- or present. I just wanted to be able to have a discussion of...of what, what if, and maybe either we can understand it or perhaps we can help it.

Ms. Ball: Thank you.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Chair?

Ms. Ball: Yes, Frank?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, if you remembered that discussion, I actually agreed with you at that point. And I didn't think we needed to go underground at that point. I didn't -- I thought we needed to -- this is getting back to the priorities, right?

Ms. Wade: Yup, exactly.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Cost is a priority for me. You want to write that down. That needs to get through Council. We need to maximize parking. That's why #2 was very attractive to me, but it didn't preclude --. But #2 meant going a little bit underground. No, let's do #1 because I don't think we're going to be able to absorb the cost of it being unground at this particular point. So this is the mixing and matching that we were doing. And okay I can understand for their, for their valid, from their vantage point they wanted to present to the Community -- this my understanding Johnathan -- of the options that we saw, and then gather all the information together and then let us have it after the PAC got through it. But I, I agree with you totally. There's certain things that I already have set in my head unless someone convinces me otherwise that I have -- I personally would suggest to the, the members that would be priorities for us, that I would love to discuss, you know, in terms of, you know, cost, in terms of maximizing parking. I agree with you, the discussion of the purpose of some of the space. Purposing of some of the space is something that may or may not be out of our control because it may be something that the funder wants at this particular point. But we can make our arguments about that, but I think there's sort of a -- if you want to talk about a fait de complis, you know, I think there's possibly something that's already there that we're going to have deal with as an MRA because the funder wants it there. You get what I'm saying? So I'm supporting what you're saying in the sense of having at it.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I think we're on the same, the same wave length where, you know, kind of #2 but raise six feet or something.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Mr. Starr: But I also think about the, you know, the use portion. I think there are many ways to deal with a fait de complis, and one is to look at short-term and long-term goals, and short-term and long-term uses. And I know, you know, I have questions about putting the tax office there, but I have much less questions if I know that that tax office could be reconfigured without huge expense when you know departments move and --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay. Yeah, right.

Mr. Starr: -- and the community might need more meeting rooms or theater space. And if there's an ability to do that, to me that mitigates that. But I want to be able to have that, have that conversation and make sure that there's not pillars, you know, put in a place that would obviate that type of use flexibility.

Ms. Ball: So, I guess...I -- it occurred to me that one of the major uses of this parking, I want to call it shopping plaza, are the adjacent owners on Market Street because they directly

access this. And none of them are interested because they think, they think it doesn't affect them. I am shocked. I have spoken to them and they are, the ones whom I've spoken to, they're, they're indifferent. And if it were my property and my business I would be all over it because here this amenity is coming up right next to me and how can I utilize it. So I can't help but feel it's not indifference, it's ignorance. So that's one of the reasons why I'm trying to get them to come to meet with the design group so that they can give their input as, as what they feel as the prime people that, to whom it will, businesses that it will impact right there in their, in their back or their front if they want it to be. And it's just -- so there are all these things, but I, I guess that I thought that that project, whatever you call it --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: The Parking Advisory Committee.

Ms. Ball: The Parking Advisory Committee, I thought that's what's that was for, for things like this. I didn't think the MRA meeting was for that. And, you know, Jonathan, you probably are like I am, we're used to being in, on boards and commissions where you kind of rubber stamp things that have been done in the background. Not because it's a big secret, but there's so much detail involved that we would be here many more times than once a month and much longer than a couple of hours to hash this all out, to have it what we want it to be. And that's what I thought that that Project Advisory Committee was for.

Mr. Starr: I don't think that the Project -- in fact, I very strenuously feel they're not there to replace us as a decision maker. And, you know, we certainly are grateful to have them, but, you know, this is the first and maybe the only large project that the MRA has ever done. This is the first time when the MRA is really doing what it was created to do, and, you know, it really behooves us to spend the time. And if it means to do an all day workshop, we should do an all day workshop, you know, and go walk around the site and whatever else, whatever else is, is useful. That's -- I mean, that to me, that's what I signed up for. I signed up for trying to use all of my life experience to try to help make, you know, make it right and ask any questions that come up. And, you know, then take 90%, 95% from what the, what the advisory committee and the designers have, have given us. But, I mean, this is, you know, this is why we're here, this, this thing. Not, you know, to tell someone whether -- what color of beige they should paint their building which is frankly what the MRA was doing when, when I got on board.

Ms. Ball: Thank you. Yeah, nobody doubts your dedication, and I thank you for it. It's just that we have to -- I think that we have to move along with these things, and we have certain people, certain groups that have certain jobs and I want to let them do their job. At the same time, if we have any concerns, because we're in this, this position we would like an opportunity, which I'm hoping, which I think we've been given now to make our, our ideas known.

Ms. Wade: Yes. I just --. Could I just follow up because when we, when we bid the project, we said our expectation is that the project will have a parking facility, and community public space, and a community building, you know. So I just want to make sure we're all okay with those functions and then the question of what detail goes into them all is what we'll determine

over the process. But I want to make sure we're not going backwards to even questioning what got bid.

Mr. Starr: So, wait, what were the three?

Ms. Wade: The parking structure.

Mr. Starr: Okay.

Ms. Wade: The community public space, and a community building.

Mr. Starr: Yes.

Ms. Wade: Okay. And they all have all of those things. That's, that's basically option three. Three options with -- all three have those three things in various levels of intensity and opportunity basically.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. There is another thing going in there though.

Ms. Wade: There is.

Mr. Starr: And we should be cognizant of it, and we should be examining the impacts of that.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Ball: Another thing, what do you mean?

Ms. Wade: He means the real property tax.

Mr. Starr: There's an office building.

Ms. Ball: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Well, only in one of them is it an independent building. In the other two scenarios, it's just a floor in the community building.

Mr. Starr: Okay, and I also heard that at the last meetings that there's going to be a service center.

Ms. Wade: No.

Mr. Starr: A service desk --

Ms. Wade: A one stop payment desk like a --. Which I think is going to end up being based on how they're changing their bill pay, like kind of like an ATM like you have at the, at the post

office.

Mr. Starr: I'm really gun shy of mission creek, and you know I was sitting down in the, on the Maui Mall at the service center and imagining this thing after another decision is made outside of our purview to move that service center into there and exactly what it would all look like.

Ms. Wade: Meaning we build the facility with a great plan and then the Council decides to just inhabit it with a service center and not utilize --

Mr. Starr: And not bother to build? Because that's the last remaining thing that's going to suppose to get built on that new property that was purchased.

Ms. Wade: The A&B property.

Mr. Starr: It was supposed to be for the tax and finance department plus a service area, the service center. So I kind of see the next steps being well let's just move the service center there. I don't know if that's good or bad. I don't know what happens with traffic flow. I don't know what happens when we're utilizing every single parking space for the new service center and tax office. And, you know, what happens to the community? I mean, I may be being paranoid, but I just see it moving that way because there was just a tax office, and now there's a tax office with a service center window, and --

Ms. Wade: And maybe then, option 1 looks real good where its design is just an open pavilion space on the downstairs and the upstairs is the RPT office. You know, but then, it's not -- it doesn't have space for the other ideas that we've had, but it's, you know, you're not going to turn the open pavilion space likely into service center space. It just wouldn't be designed to allow for something like that really.

Mr. Starr: Well, I mean, the community meeting space is like something that's -- it's really needed and it will really enhance Wailuku.

Ms. Wade: Okay. So by community meeting space do you mean the new public hearing room or the opportunity for conferencing and classroom space?

Mr. Starr: The, the...the meeting room.

Ms. Wade: The public hearing? Like replacing this? So there's all three alternatives. There's one that has the public hearing room moving down to that building. And then there's one that has also community, like, space for board meetings and that kind of a thing; like a conference room facility. And then there's classroom spaces. And all of it's needed. It's just --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: That's the high intensity.

Ms. Wade: Right, but that's the high intensity one. It's has the whole thing.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I mean, we never really had that discussion about, about those spaces. I mean, we started out with kind of a generic room that could be used for public meetings and then in the presentations it's being shown as a wedding, a wedding mill.

Ms. Wade: As a – like the photo.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. So, I, I, do think we need to have some more discussion and clarity on, on that.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: So the graphic that shows the cross sections, shows the events facility and sort of where each, each use might be located or could be located. So...they're on all three different color ones. So on the low intensity one like I said just community reception space and real property offices above. On the...I think medium is the teal. It has community classrooms fronting the plaza, and then it's labeled as MRA offices but it could be that or just building management offices. And then a community public hearing room on the ground floor with RPT upstairs. This keeps it basically all community, county, slash county function in the medium scenario. And then the third scenario, the green one, it has -- it says events, but this was the space that we talked being children's discovery center, kind of an activity, visitor interpretative. The hearing room again is in this, just upstairs on the second level. And then there's the offices combined with the high tech conferencing and there's still a community reception space up at the top.

Mr. Starr: I mean, that's a lot. I kind of feel like maybe that's a lot.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, that's 10 pounds of rice in a five pound sack.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: You mean the high intensity?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, it really us, but these are all things the community said they wanted to see so I said, hey, let's show, you know, let's show how it could work.

Mr. Starr: I mean, I know that, you know, I think kind of the uses on one, you know, might be, sufficient. But I kind of like the layout of the plaza area on --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Number two?

Mr. Starr: Is that number two or number three where it was kind of turned?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah. Number two

Ms. Wade: All doable. We can totally combine those two. That's, that's a mix and match possibility. So on the teal events facility, is that the, is that the facility you prefer or did you

prefer the low intensity orange facility? By the way, community classrooms can also be public reception event space. It's one that can be split up and broken out.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Chair?

Ms. Ball: Yes?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: It seems to me a lot of this is going to depend on what decision we make about digging down or staying on the level. I think that's got to be a basic decision that we're going to have to make here because, you know, a lot of this, on number two and number three, is going to depend on how deep you dig, okay, which is going to increase the cost. And, and I don't -- I like -- like Jonathan, I don't see the problem about providing this other functionality that's in either two or three without having to go underground.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I mean, I don't know if we're properly agended for it, but if we were I would be willing to vote on that right now.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: I just see multiple problems with going deeper than we need to.

Ms. Wade: Well, there's no scenario that can't be lifted out of the ground either by the way. So they can all just kind of be brought to grade level.

Mr. Starr: I mean, I feel like that should be a starting point. And it probably should have been the starting point, and that it kind of created a bunch of red herrings, and that's false expectations because --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, I agree.

Mr. Starr: -- you know. I mean, we know the ground is full of bones. We know that --

Ms. Wade: We don't know that. For public record, we do not know that. But we're expecting to find something.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Something.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: And, you know, just out of respect but also, you know, cost, I mean, that just seems like something that we should have or maybe we should shortly --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Set as a parameter. Yeah.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. And then everything else starts getting, gets one, one level simpler.

Ms. Wade: I just wanted to, you know, mention originally the sketch that was done and has been out there had a, had a partial below grade. This is the one that showed you going in underneath the plaza space. And sort of the magic of that was that the connections with at grade were so beneficial from a pedestrian perspective that it was very walkable and easy to get from like Main Street to Vineyard through the project. And that's one of the things Carol has been very concerned about and has called me to bring in, you know, how do we interface with these property owners better and make it more, more like a shopping center. So you feel like as you're accessing the property you're coming out onto this very welcoming space no matter from what angle. And I think that was the goal of basically this graphic, but also kind of got lost as we started representing the spatial breakdown. So --

Ms. Ball: I, I think we have to look at this, this, the plaza as part of the entire area. And, you know, we think we are but we're not because we're focusing on the design of this facility as opposed to how this space integrates with the rest of it because that's what's going to make it work, I think. People are not going to come to visit the parking structure, but they will come if these other businesses will also amp up their space and they will want to, to integrate it to whatever is built here if it lends itself to it. But it becomes an afterthought, like, oh yeah we should have thought of that because look we could have done this. So I think that I would start there myself rather than with the design of the facility. How is it going to be -- how are we going to integrate it with the rest of the existing properties that need upgrading and how are they all going to be doing it in order to utilize the space, not the structure, but the entire space?

Mr. Starr: I agree, but I think that that is up to having a genius whose design, you know, designing the product.

Ms. Ball: I think the designers can do it. We just need to tell them what we're thinking.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I think we need to tell them that we want that to be really -- we want to be really accessible and livable.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Star: And walkable.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: But on the ground level.

Ms. Wade: And on the cheap.

Ms. Ball: Yeah, within our budget. Within our budget of course, but if they --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: The last thing I'm concerned --

Ms. Ball: But if they know that that's what our goal is rather than making this wonderful

structure. I think we were all focused on the way it was going to look.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Ball: Not how it's going to function.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. And the thing -- you know, it is a sloped site so, you know, whether it's here or whether it's here or whether it's there, and that's kind of moot point because, you know, the whole thing is slopping down. It's just how well it's, the site is integrated into, into the design and the space.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Well this is really good too because it helps me maybe reframe how we have our PAC conversation next week too and that I want to make sure we express the priorities of the MRA right at the get go to the PAC and make sure that there's consensus on, you know, these are basically the founding priorities that we need to move forward with and then are they going to -- how do we do the mix and match. But frankly I didn't hear anything here today that made we feel like the PAC is operating on different assumptions. I think this is all very consistent. I do think we're really challenging our, our design team.

Mr. Starr: Yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: I think this is a first for them to do such a community based process and...and it's a lot of, it's a lot of new stuff for them so --. But they're definitely up to the task and we'll, all long term, get a fantastic product, I have no doubt about that. It's this sort of back and forth that has been interesting.

Mr. Starr: It's, it's good and as long as it's part of the process, it's, it's all fine.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. I'm grateful to have such a positive group of architects. I've never worked with an architecture group that has had so little ego invested in it where they're very willing to try all kinds of different things which is hugely to our benefit so I'm grateful for that.

Ms. Ball: Okay great. Thank you. Anything else?

Ms. Wade: Did you want to take the time to go through the notes that were sent by the...Economic Development team or would you like to save that for another meeting? I know you only got these a day ago, but I did want to get them to you. This is, this is not work that is finished by any means. These are the things that they've identified with their visit here that could possibly be --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I've already have some highlights.

Ms. Ball: Okay, good.

Ms. Wade: Alright.

Ms. Ball: Okay, good.

Ms. Wade: So these can be opportunities to use for economic development incentives for mitigation. Do you need a copy? And that frankly are going to end up getting built into the environmental assessment in the economic section. That was one of the biggest criticism in 2012 when the parking structure project moved forward was that the EA did not address the economic impact of the project during construction. So the goal of this is to not just address it for the EA, but to truly solve some problems that may arise. So I'm happy, Chair, to take your direction if you'd like to go through it or --

Ms. Ball: I would. Are you all ready to do so or at least some of it?

Mr. Starr: I spent time with it. I already sent Erin my comments which turned out to be pretty manini.

Ms. Ball: Did you have a chance to at least look at it, Gwen?

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah, I looked at. I don't really have anything to . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Ball: Okay. That's alright. Let's go ahead and discuss that.

Ms. Wade: Okay, so the first, tax abatement, and I will tell you we talked with real property tax and with the Mayor about priorities. They're both willing to do at least the 50% abatement for MRA. We discussed up to 100% abatement during the time of construction primarily because the real property tax base in the MRA district is less than half a percent of the County's overall budget so it's barely a blimp on the radar. But, you know, I sent you copy also of the tax code that allowed for the abatement previously in 2006, and Chris Hart & Partners was the only property that took advantage of that at the time. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't try again I think.

Mr. Starr: Can I make a comment on that?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: You know, I was surprised. This was actually brought to my attention by Danny Agsalog and he said, oh, there is, you know, there is an existing tax abatement for the MRA. And I, I -- I mean, being a property owner, I never knew it. I was never aware of it and it wouldn't have mattered if I was because the time when it occurred, you know, the economic conditions were such that nothing was happening. But my understanding is what this is is basically just to change . . . (inaudible) . . . and it's basically just to change the effective date

of the ordinance which is still on the --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: In the books.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, in the books.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, one of the things that's being floated is do we do sort of a core area with 100% abatement and then an outline where it even goes all the through the MRA district, you know, into Happy Valley that allows for an additional abatement. Do we just do the whole district? So, if you're okay with moving forward with an abatement, I'll have them write up a draft and then that will come to you as an actual agenda item.

Mr. Starr: Okay, we're not voting on it now.

Ms. Wade: We're voting on nothing now. I'm just -- I'm looking for direction from you for what to authorize the consultants to move forward on.

Mr. Starr: I want to disclose that I am a property owner that would likely be affected by that and I'm going to look towards Chair and Council's advice on whether I need to recuse when we do get into a condition that requires a vote. I, I love that look.

Mr. Michael Hopper: Well, we're going to need to evaluate that when . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Starr: Okay. Maybe we could, maybe we could evaluate it beforehand.

Mr. Hopper: Right.

Ms. Hiraga: Should he see Board of Ethics?

Mr. Hopper: I mean, that's always an option. It's probably the best option.

Mr. Starr: I mean, if I recuse myself, then there's not a problem, right?

Mr. Hopper: If you recuse yourself then that's what you would do anyway if the Board of Ethics said it . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Starr: I mean, I can recuse myself from the vote, but I don't want to recuse myself necessarily from a general discussion, a general discussion of being able to attend the meeting.

Mr. Hopper: What I can do in the meantime is review any ethics opinions on that, on that general topic. I mean, being a real property tax owner who might be affected --. It's a pretty specific area. I mean, it's not like a Council member voting on real property tax in the County . . . (inaudible) . . . property throughout the County. It's a little more specific than that so recusal may be the best idea in this particular situation. It's certainly a way to guarantee that

there's not going to be a problem so I can look at that in the meantime, before the meeting that it comes up. Erin, if you could give a heads up.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Hopper: You send out the agendas anyway, so I'll check the agendas in advance.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I guess there's two issues here, right? Recusal from discussion and recusal from voting, so I guess Jonathan what I hear you saying is you would want to participate in the discussion.

Mr. Starr: In general discussion.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Discussion but not the vote.

Mr. Starr: Yeah.

Mr. Hopper: And we're also looking at an ordinance, right, so you are making recommendations to the Council.

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Mr. Hopper: So it's not an actual, you're . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Decision maker, yeah.

Ms. Wade: Not on the tax abatement. On others of this, MRA would be the final.

Mr. Hopper: Right. Yeah, no, for the tax issue I think recusal from the vote would be sufficient in this case.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Are you just looking for consensus here because I think tax abatement is in that area are always a good idea, especially if you're going to hit them into 18 months of construction, you know.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. It pushes us further out certainly from considering tax increment financing.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: And I think that's important to sort of understand that, you know, when we're abating 100% of the tax capture, we're not, we're certainly not establishing a TIF district, but I don't think that's a problem.

Mr. Starr: I don't think TIF is --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Isn't not going --

Mr. Starr: -- is going to be doable in the next few years.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. We've got at least three years before that's even a possibility.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: A possibility, yeah.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, and there are State HRS issues.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Okay, the parking space incentive this is -- and this frankly speaks to the total number of stalls we're building so I kind of wanted to get this out here now is --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Do we allow property owners that significantly upgrade their properties to secure dedicated parking in the structure? And they're suggesting a maximum of 30 of the stalls in the structure be identified for this and a maximum of six spaces per property owner. So I just wondered is this something we want to consider or is it not, and to supplement this I sent you the cash in lieu ordinance that was originally drafted but never approved. So the back, background on that, you know. There are three properties that did agree to pay portions of the construction costs in the parking structure in lieu of building parking. One of them is the Main Street Promenade.

Ms. Ball: So your question is what again?

Ms. Wade: So my question is, and this is totally like theory at this point, but do we allow up to 30 stalls to be dedicated to additional development to support uses that would be built around the immediate area? And I think he -- they suggested a distance. One block, within one block.

Mr. Starr: I'm little unclear about what's being suggested, about whether it's, you know, suggesting that certain stalls be labeled Main Street Promenade or whatever. Or, whether they're saying that the requirements for your development would be reduced. Which means that it really wouldn't have any effect on the retails and restaurants that we most want to incentivize because those have already been zeroed out.

Ms. Wade: And that doesn't necessarily have to be permanent either. You know, we, we waived parking requirements for restaurant and entertainment uses with the intention of bringing them in, but that again can be amended after this process is complete or you know.

Mr. Starr: But basically this would be exempting from parking requirements, additional office space or residential.

Ms. Wade: Well, anything but restaurant, you know.

Mr. Starr: Or retail.

Ms. Wade: No, we didn't, we didn't exempt retail. We only did restaurant and entertainment which is the equivalent of a bar.

Mr. Starr: Okay, yeah, that's right. So --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I always get nervous when you start dedicating parking in a parking structure where we don't even know or decided what's the maximum amount of spaces we're going to have available to us. So this one actually did make me very nervous.

Ms. Wade: I don't like to word "dedicated."

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. Yeah, that makes it sound like there's going to be plaque on it.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: I mean --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: You can have reserved parking spaces.

Ms. Wade: Maybe it's just something like their parking requirement gets reduced by up to six spaces, you know.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: But regardless, I'm wondering if there might be better incentives than the rapidly diminishing parking.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Parking. Especially if you're going to put a County office in there and there's always 60 spaces.

Ms. Lindsey: We don't know what's going to happen after the . . . (inaudible) . . . two blocks over might...create something.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, their own parking or something like that.

Ms. Lindsey: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: You don't want to start giving away spaces.

Ms. Wade: Eventually we're going to need to revisit that cash in lieu ordinance. One, at least one has filed the unilateral agreement to pay and that's the MAPA building, so, and I know that Council is expecting to hear from the MRA on whether we're going to follow through on it.

Mr. Starr: I mean I see that as a, a driver for satellite parking.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: That if we say, you know, here's another financing tool for seed money to do the other several structures that are going to be required once Wailuku starts to --

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: -- to succeed.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah. Yeah, get it outside of that property and make it satellite.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Okay. Those were the two I really kind of wanted to delve into. I don't know if you'd like to get into the others. The liquor licensing is -- there just doesn't seem to be a good time to approach the commission about that.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, what does that mean? What does that mean? I couldn't --. I had to figure out what, what earmarking liquor license meant.

Ms. Wade: In a lot of entertainment districts they will identify a total number of liquor licenses available. So you'll have -- it's like setting a cap on short-term rentals basically.

Mr. Starr: Okay. But we don't have a cap.

Ms. Wade: We don't have a cap, but I guess it's an alternative. It's setting an available number so there's an expectation like there will be 15 available in Wailuku town or whatever the number might be.

Mr. Starr: But instead of a cap don't we want to encourage?

Ms. Wade: I shouldn't have said cap. I should have said, like, quota or something. But yeah that there would be set number.

Ms. Ball: Maybe he thinks scarcity will make people want it. I don't know, that's how people are.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, there are only three available so hurry up.

Ms. Ball: Yeah, so hurry up and get one.

Ms. Wade: That's actually a good strategy. Yeah, it would be -- it would be a number that are available. So hopefully creating a process by which the Liquor Commission understands we are inviting this use into Wailuku.

Mr. Starr: I mean, if we can make it so the Liquor Commission had to issue.

Ms. Wade: Right. Right. That, I mean -- I don't know. But then the process again that's a challenge, and then the property is. So I do think it might be worthwhile to identify properties, and that goes back to creating a dining and entertainment district where we, we set out to say, you know, this core area where there are entertainment uses and restaurants we feel like this is -- we'd like to ask Commission, Liquor Commission, to provide an . . . (inaudible) . . . process within this area.

Mr. Starr: Well, I, I joined a committee, an IDA committee on entertainment districts, and visited in Charlotte and Milwaukee and Chicago where they actively manage entertainment districts. And the BID's, Business Improvement District, staff does that and actually has people on the, on the staff who are out on the street when the bars are active and particularly at closing time. And they arrange to make sure that there's --

Ms. Wade: Rides home.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, rides home, that there's a food truck there at one or two in the morning because people drinking, they're much less likely to fight if they --

Ms. Wade: Are eating?

Mr. Starr: Yeah, have something to eat. And they intercede between the establishment and the police, and you know, they do all these different functions. Milwaukee is kind of like the --

Ms. Wade: They're the model?

Mr. Starr: The model for it.

Ms. Wade: It's a college town too which is part of it.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. But then part of that goes -- there's -- it makes it easier to get a liquor license in that area because it's, you know, the bars are being managed.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: But I think we're decades away.

Ms. Wade: Probably. So those were the three I think I really wanted to kind of get some feedback from you on initially to see if I should green light the consultant to work, and I'm glad I did on parking especially. The others, I think, we're going to have to have some back and forth with. The shuttle, several of you have heard me say, we're already beginning to work on that. War Memorial is going to be paved here soon, and now with the hospital transitioning to private, the contract that they have with the shuttle is up too, so there's all kinds of possibilities to create it more as a transit hub.

Mr. Starr: Wait, what? What is that? I didn't know this.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. So the -- a lot of the hospital employees park at War Memorial now and are shuttled to --

Mr. Starr: So it might be possible to --

Ms. Wade: Jump on the bandwagon, yeah, basically.

Mr. Starr: Jump on the band shuttle.

Ms. Wade: So, anyway, I think that our CIP monies can be used even there if, if that starts to come to fruition to build sort of a shelter for -- like a transit hub kind of thing and then run a shuttle up to Wailuku. So that will all be coming back to you though. Are there any of these other incentives you wanted to get into today?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: We can get to them later because it's almost time.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: I, you know, I always want to see us get into a design guidelines and Wailuku zoning and land use stuff that will promote, you know, active mixed use and body heat so.

Mr. Wade: Yeah. I should highlight that. So on page 3, the more conversations we have with the architects and planning team the more they feel like our design guidelines are an inhibitor and that they -- if we just follow the secretary and interior standards for historic structures which is really what we're trying to do is preserve historic structures with those

design guidelines that we would be a lot better off and it would allow more creativity with the new development. So I know that they are going to be coming and having conversation with you about what are your priorities in terms of what you see in the design guidelines. What do we need to make sure gets retained but then can we just eliminate that and incorporate it into the zoning and development code moving forward. So it's funny how with the intention of expediting, you build in additional problems.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, while you're doing an audit of Title 19 at the same time.

Ms. Wade: Oh, I know. Well, and that's the, that's the additional thing is that it would probably get pulled into... the Wailuku zoning. We've talked about this. It would get pulled into Title 19.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Ball: Alright.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, I think we should discuss these. My suggestion, Chair, is that we discuss these at another meeting.

Ms. Wade: One by one.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Mr. Starr: I have one more to add though.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Starr: Which is infrastructure.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Starr: Because, you know, that's something that will stop any major development in Wailuku town...the uncertainty and the inconsistency of...of infrastructure.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, my understanding was that this was going to happen in parallel while the -- while this thing was being built. All the infrastructure would be taken care of as well as that; a bad assumption.

Ms. Wade: For this facility and Vineyard Street that is a correct assumption.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Main still badly needs to be upgraded in every possible way.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So we're looking at the larger circle around.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Lindsey: And Church.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And Church.

Ms. Wade: So I'm sorry; Vineyard and Church will both get upgraded, but none of the, none of the utilities on Church will likely get upgraded. Or maybe they could. I'll check.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Yes, but I think maybe infrastructure CIP schedule that Council adopts would be --. Like a predictable CIP schedule Council adopts in advance would be a huge incentives.

Mr. Starr: And create an analysis to allow that to happen.

Ms. Wade: Yes. We're, we're 85% there.

Ms. Ball: Alright. Anybody else, anything else? Are we done?

Ms. Hiraga: I just had one question, one last question.

Ms. Ball: Yes, Gwen.

Ms. Hiraga: For the Wailuku zoning just based on what I read in the April meeting minutes, we're looking at having it as part of Title 19. I don't know if that's a good thing.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Hiraga: You know, and it's only because I think Wailuku should be separate rather than part of the comprehensive zoning ordinance, unless it's very clear that Planning Commission and other authorities, I guess --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Won't have a hand in it.

Ms. Hiraga: -- won't have anything to say about . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, I agree.

Ms. Wade: So retaining the power of the MRA to make the zoning and development decisions regardless of where it lies.

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. The issue right now is it's, it's adopted as admin rules so it makes it messier than if it was cleanly zoning potentially. I mean, but there's benefits and drawbacks so it's a good comment. I won't, I won't tell then the audit committee that we're assuming it's going to get pulled in. Although they've used it actually as a reference for how to do it better in the small towns; how to do zoning better in the small towns.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Can I personally welcome our new member --

Ms. Ball: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: -- Gwen Hiraga to the commission.

Ms. Ball: Yes, welcome Gwen. Thank you.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: To the Agency.

Ms. Hiraga: I'm happy to be here.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Thank you Chair.

Ms. Ball: Anybody else with anything else?

Ms. Lindsey: Will this be gone over at the next meeting or is this --

Ms. Wade: That's a good question. So would you like me to bring it back piece by piece as we have essentially policy flushed out and then you folks can review it or did you want to discuss it in like general terms, like this again? So basically I would either come back to you with a new updated tax abatement ordinance and I would wait until I have that done to bring it back to you. Or, we can, I can bring it back and we can have more general conversation before that time.

Mr. Starr: I mean, I'd be ready to approve it if it's ready for that.

Ms. Wade: Okay, so just wait until I have the tax available or something to review basically.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. And, and if you have stuff, you know, piece meal in the meantime send it to us.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. I, I --

Mr. Starr: And we can send comments --

Ms. Wade: Certainly.

Mr. Starr: -- you know, individually, not serially.

Ms. Wade: Very good. Okay.

Ms. Ball: Alright.

F. NEXT MEETING DATE: July 28, 2017

Ms. Wade: So I just wanted to confirm we're going to keep the current meeting schedule.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Okay. And then we will pass on the MRA priorities. We will also do a work session on essentially it will be a workshop style on July 28th for the MRA meeting. Do you still feel there's a need to have an additional meeting between the two Project Advisory Committee meetings, or will this be sufficient? What day do you leave, Frank? Frank, when are you out of town? Are you in town between July 4th and July 28th?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I'm out from the 23rd to August 1st -- of July.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Starr: I lost my schedule.

Ms. Wade: I think I have a second one. Here you go, lots of paper. Yeah, so I'm sorry, between the June 28th meeting and the July 14th meeting, did you feel we need to meet with the design team as the MRA between then or are you okay if we just bring back a design alternative on July 28th?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Do you want to --? In other words, the question is do we want to do a workshop.

Ms. Wade: Do you want a special meeting sometime between the 28th of June and July 14th?

Mr. Starr: I mean, if I can meet with the design team and just kind of --

Ms. Wade: Yeah, go over your priorities.

Mr. Starr: Kick some tires and go back and forth on the 14th or something then I'm okay with that if no one else has.

Ms. Lindsey: Me too.

Ms. Wade: Perfect. Okay, I'll set up those discussions with them.

Mr. Starr: So you want to meet with them too?

Ms. Lindsey: Yes.

Mr. Starr: We can meet with them together.

Ms. Lindsey: That's fine.

Mr. Starr: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Okay. I will let them know. Wonderful. I think that's all Madame Chair.

G. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Ball: Alright, meeting is adjourned.

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE:

Members Present:

Carol Ball, Chair
Frank De Rego, Jr.
Gwen Hiraga
Ashley Lindsey
Jonathan Starr, Vice-Chair

Others:

Erin Wade, Small Town Planner, Current Planning Division
Michael Hopper, Deputy Corporation Counsel