

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 29, 2018**

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr., Chair, at approximately 1:02 p.m., Friday, June 29, 2018 in the Planning Department Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Island of Maui.

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

Mr. Frank De Rego, Jr.: I'll call the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. We have everyone here who's on the board present.

Public testimony, is there anyone who wishes to testify at this moment, at the beginning of the meeting, or would you rather wait for when specific, specific items come up?

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.

Mr. Jonathan Starr: I'll testify.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Mr. Starr: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan Starr, Wailuku property owner, and, I just want to really offer support for the, the efforts for all of the agenda items. I think things are moving along really good. I think the zoning will be really helpful in bringing Wailuku to the next level. I think it's pretty much got it right. You know, if I had one thing to, you know, to think might be slightly improved is the, the setbacks which are a little bit kind of anachronistic, you know, in that they're kind of set piece, I think they call it wedding cake, where the same thing happens, you know, on all sides for, you know, every, every building. Whereas there's maybe there's a way to make it a little more flexible so that, you know, the, the function is still the same. In other words, it's still, you know, the same amount of light transmitted, and sky view, and open space, but it can be varied or, you know, a stage in different parts of the lot or something like that. But otherwise, it's doing great. Appreciate your service.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Anyone else? Okay, we'll offer public testimony on each item as we go along but we'll close this public testimony without objection. New business, Erin?

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Presentation of the proposed amendments to the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning and Development Code, Article II Zoning Districts, Section 30.03 Commercial Mixed-Use District. Changes include updates to the permitted uses and performance standards, changes to the development standards based on block face. [DRAFT ORDINANCE AND CORRESPONDING MAP](#)**

Ms. Erin Wade: Okay, good afternoon. So to share with you about the commercial mixed use district --. You know what, I need to pass out a map so you can look at it. Okay, I apologize. So if you can see in the dark, everything in red on this map is zoned commercial mixed use district. This the community plan map, but it also by in large illustrates the zoning district for commercial mixed use in the redevelopment area. And you can see the redevelopment boundary also in black on the plan. So essentially this encompasses the core of what the Wailuku town commercial district. It is where we have some of the taller buildings today, and it is where the majority of the businesses are located. There's also a business multi-family district, and you'll notice the river side of Vineyard Street is primarily the business multi-family. And heading down towards Mill Street on Market even is that business multi-family district. And then, so it's predominate -- the area that we're really kind of focusing on today is what people sort of casually refer to as the uptown area between High Street and Central, Vineyard Street and Wells, so it's the core of the district.

So moving just as an introduction, there are some use changes that we recommended. One of these is the adult establishment. This is typically when people read adult establishment they're thinking of something other than a bar or tavern. So that is one of the uses that I think would be appropriate to adjust both here and in the definition listing, and then replace it here with bar or tavern. My numbering got a little messed up here but so it's more specific.

The next change in the ordinance, again, bar or restaurant on Maluhia. Maluhia does have special, special requirements for additional review in for several use types. This is one we had discussed several times. This is under Section C, Administrative Review Permit. We had talked about adding telecommunications and broadband broadcast -- or broadcasting antenna to administrative permit and removing it from MRA Use Permit. This is the thing that requires us to do the public hearing every time there's a cell panel replacement. We could break this up and say any expansion of telecommunications facility does require an MRA Use Permit, but replacement of existing facilities could be administrative. Right now it's everything. So I put that there because that is actually the majority of the permits that we've seen recently.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Has been replacement, right?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Right now, MRA Use Permit says eating establishment, fast food requires the MRA Use Permit, but it didn't say why. There was no condition triggering that.

Something like Subway which is probably considered fast food doesn't have any other negative impact beyond just a restaurant that might be in the district is probably the drive-thru access that was conceptualized when this was put under MRA Use Permit. So I've added "for uses requesting drive-thru access." I cut telecommunications and broadcasting from that section.

And then we get to development standards, so this is really the meat of the adjustment that have been made and what we've been discussing. For the majority of the district, these standards are prohibitive at this point in time. 4,500 square feet is about the average lot size in the redevelopment area, so there's a number of lot that's much smaller than that. Minimum lot width, typically the majority are 45 feet, but there are some that are as small as 22 feet. And those are the ones that are the historic buildings typically, and so not being able to meet the minimum lot width is prohibitive for them coming in for renovations and things. Even though -- even though there is a clause in here that states if it's existing non-conforming it's allowed to remain that way. They still have to get all the way -- when they're pulling a building permit -- they still have to get all the way up to MRA for a review for the building permit to get, and a response, for the MRA permit to get issued. When really what should happen is it should be allowed, in my opinion, because we know we're going to allow it anyway. So not having the -- and not having a minimum lot width is probably appropriate.

And then just as the testifier expresses, there is this minimum setback and I wanted to do, show some really kind of crude graphics for you but of what is possible. So currently if you're looking in plan view -- so if you're looking from the air, down in top of a building space, this grid represents a 60 foot frontage by 80 foot building length to the back, okay. And what would be required then is these first 10 feet along the road. On the third floor you would step back, and then the first 20 feet, so in total 20 feet. At the fourth level you would step away from the street creating essentially this type of a view from street level. So if these two boxes on the ground represents cars, you would have your first two floors that can come straight up, your third floor that ducks in by 10-feet, and then your fourth floor is set back, again, another 10-feet.

In reality this is what it plays out look like essentially. This building is in San Francisco but it has the ground floor commercial, second floor office, and these are almost as the same frontage. This does have the...the little bit of an overhang but it's similar to what a canopy or awning would do here in Wailuku. And then this trellis reflects quite well where the 10 foot setback would be, and then this upper level residential would be illustrating more like the fourth floor setback. So this is essentially how our -- this existing pattern kind of plays out.

Now knowing the cost the land and the cost of construction at this point in time, this can be a very prohibitive way to approach design where especially given that we're inviting and almost requiring the applicant to set the building up to the sidewalk. So because we're saying your foundation of your building needs to be way up here, but then you can't use that on the upper floors, it can be cost prohibitive to do that.

So in recent years, this is what some of the architecture has looked like at Honolulu at the

heights we have discussed so this is a four story mixed use building. And instead of having the kind of wedding cake effect that the testifier referred to, it allows the breaking up of the massing throughout the façade of the building so you can see where here it is brought in and away from the street. Here, it's done the same thing. And while it's not consistent to have this one does do a nice job of protecting a view, it opens up a view plain, places where there isn't that view to protect, this has the same effect of breaking up the massing. This could be an alternative.

This is another one, another couple going up in Kakaako right now. And this was actually one of my favorites that I saw recently -- I'm going to expand this -- because it has so much texture, it has so much design aesthetic to it that it really does offer a lot interest to the building. Unlike even when you go, you know, back to this, if these are just flat faces it's still not doing what we're kind of looking to do which is have more variety to the façade. So what we're -- what I'm hoping we can do this round is work to try to accomplish that, be more specific about that being the goal. Where this scenario might be important where there are important mauka to makai views. I think that that still could make sense, and that should be open for our discussion. But maybe on Main, maybe on Vineyard in a few locations that make sense. But certainly on the side streets and the cross streets there isn't the view shed to protect or to open up to which could allow for a lot more buildable square footage. This is of course the Ala Moana tower but as you've seen and when I get into the height bonus section, this kind of speaks to that where it has two levels on the ground floor, and then it has the six levels of residential above. This could be a possibility if like here Ala Moana there was 25% open space on the ground level where you could receive a height bonus if you're keeping green landscaped ground level. And what this does and you can it see preserves the view. Whereas if this building had been moved all the way over to the sidewalk, that view would start really be pinched in.

So just in illustration the -- I was suggesting potentially that instead of requiring the step backs that we start looking at a percentage clear sky. So for lots over 8,500 square feet we instead look for a clear sky requirement, and this has been done in several communities now. They've kind of moved to this. Denver is one of the leading examples. But what you would do then and that's why I'm representing these buildings in a grid shaped pattern is you identify 25% of the, the building's footprint and then make a reduction throughout the façade along the rights of way of 15% so -- of no less than 15% I should say. So that can play where the whole building get set back in this kind of a scenario. Or where like in the examples we just saw on one level there's pieces pulled back and then on the next level it's a variety so that it isn't necessary, it's just a flat wall. It creates some undulation and patterning. Or it could be a corner or a key intersection instead of us requiring it to be at one specific spot.

And then I just wanted to share some examples of existing lots that are potential redevelopment sites that -- and how the existing step back affects their ability to build. So this lot is currently the Crest, the old Crest Store. It represents the old Crest Store. The TMK goes all the way from Main Street through Wells Street. It has an 88 foot frontage on both streets. And then I forget what this length is -- 320. This is a 320 foot length. So effectively it's 160 square feet of setback required at the third floor level, and 480 square feet

at the fourth floor level, which represent at total reduction in building foot print of 21.1%. So where I'm heading with this is potentially allowing more buildable area and still trying to accomplish some clear sky. So right now it's 21% we would be looking to achieve or I'm suggesting potentially just the 15%. And the reality is the bigger the lot or the less the frontage, the less your building footprint is reduced. The more the frontage you have, the more you're penalized and your lot becomes less buildable.

So another example is the corner of Main and Church, right here, where they have 128 lineal feet on Church Street, 93 feet on Main which now, you know, this is a much bigger lot here right across the street at Crest Store, but this corner lot is required to give 2,210 square feet for the third floor, 4,420 feet for the fourth making it a 47.3% reduction in buildable area. So in terms of encouraging reinvestment this is certainly I think one of the barriers at this moment in time. And I don't know if the 15% is the right number for clear sky. I think the goal is being able to walk down the street and not feel like you're walled into a canyon of urban space and have some design flexibility. But what those numbers look like I think should be something that we talk about today. And then getting into and then once I complete this part of the discussion so this is what I was talking about is this table and building faces. And this whole new section on design requirements kind of moving away from the existing design guidelines and that's what this map is for too that I gave you. I apologize; I'll make a much nicer map once we're ready to put this into an ordinance.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: You've been busy.

Ms. Wade: But essentially what we're looking at here is three different block face types, okay. So (A) being the six story height limit, that's the green. I'm going to enter green right now here. I apologize. So because actually not all block face is the same and you don't experience all the block faces in the same way. So what, what this map represents is heading towards something more of a form based code, form based design code where on Market Street which I'm showing in orange and that's the one that's allowed to be the three-story so block type (B). That is more of our historic architecture. Those are the blocks that represent existing continuous historic architecture throughout so that would be --. No wait, I'm sorry, it's blue. It's the blue one. So that would be Market Street on both sides, that would be Vineyard Street on the river side, that would be Main at the corner of Market and Main on the Wells Park side, and then also down Vineyard would be -- remain as at the three-story, so that's the existing zoning for that block.

Then for the taller height would be the green. So green is the six stories, the commercial type (A) block face. Green would be on Main, essentially throughout except right there at the corner of Market. So at both corners of Market it comes all the way out to Main Street. So throughout it would remain the blue three-story height limit in this scenario. And then green all the way up Main and over Church Street because that then reflects the pattern like Wailuku Executive Center of development. And then also on High Street where we of course already have six-story buildings.

And then the orange is type (C) and that's a four-story height limit. Orange. So all the way

up Wells where it's not park. The block of Church across from Hawaiian Tel, where Uptown Chevron is would be orange. And then the blocks on Vineyard between Church and High Street. And then the, the block face that we're currently in the process of developing as orange. So I started looking at it and the more I've been talking with people about what's appropriate building height really is contact sensitive and that's already how our ordinance is written but knowing that we're going to be moving forward with a height increase it became even more important I think to define what are those block types specifically.

And then into the design requirements and stating for the block types that are green and orange there's not a lot of design context to pull from. The part where I think there's a lot nostalgia and affinity is the blue block types, the blue is the historic block type. The rest do not match our existing design guidelines and could not comply with the existing design guidelines if we wanted them to. And so coming up with the determination of is this even necessary anymore for those to continue to need this. I think it might be appropriate for us to keep it for the blue block face type. But for the rest potentially we create these new design requirements or something like this. So the first is parking is not permitted within any setback between a building and a public street, and that's the front yard no parking requirement. That no less than 60% of any building façade fronting a public street shall be transparent so that it does have to be glass at the ground floor level. Do I say ground floor? Oh, no, this would be on all floors.

The third is buildings must have at least one ground floor pedestrian entrance from an adjoining street. In all cases, ground floor transparent glass shall possess a 0.65 light transmission factor. This is to prevent the mirrored glass or the clouded glass that you can't see through. The intention is to have the transparency.

Four, buildings shall be located within five to 15 feet of the property line for at least 70% of the lot frontage along all streets and this is, as we said, to keep the active street front. Buildings may be setback up to 20 feet from the property line within the required built to area if the setback area is designated for outdoor seating. So it does create the ability, you know, again trying to promote an active street front, outdoor seating does that. You know, so you can pull the building back some additional space if it's going to be outdoor seating. But if it's just going to be office building, you know, and you're going to set it back 20 feet, it's, that's not an active use. It starts to make reduce dynamic the block faces.

Number five, residential housing and hotel rooms may not adjoin the ground floor at grade level in commercial type (A) or (B) block face areas. So this is essentially so that if you see the Marriott Courtyard at the airport they have ground level hotel rooms. Now we're saying you may not set the building back more than 15 feet, so you have a pedestrian then looking directly into a hotel room and it's not a high quality experience for either the pedestrian or the hotel guest. So typically what you would do is either elevate the level to a no less than four feet or you would have some buffer space. But ideally you would have it be a mixed use building where it's some type of a commercial use on the ground floor and I think that's what we want to encourage. And then commercial type (C) block face areas; living units may be located at the first floor, but must be elevated above the street level at a minimum of four feet.

So this is living units would include both residential dwelling units and hotel rooms. At existing grade, the first floor living units shall also be setback from sidewalk a minimum of 10 feet with a landscape buffer. Stairways, porches, windows, alcoves, awnings and sunshades may extend into the required setback. This really kind of gets to the older style of residential construction and this isn't and wasn't really done on Maui. This was done a little bit in Honolulu, kind of like the Rowe house, house design. But it does create an opportunity for more high density residential living. It does -- you can see in this image it has the landscape setback we described. The entry to the residence is up four feet. And then this is actually -- so you can see the building face would be here and all of these elements, like these windows, the porch overhangs, that kind of thing can extend into the required setback, the porch steps. But the other overall living space is setback from the street front. I think this is a possibility on Vineyard Street in a few locations and potentially on Church Street. So that's why we wanted to define this as an option for multi-family housing. This is certainly not going to be the most affordable construction type so it's unlikely, I think, that this -- that it's approached this way, but it's also important that as lots are in transition, I think, there's an opportunity sometimes to locate a manufactured home on it because it is a permitted use. You know we've had this come up a series of times where people want to do some temporary uses and just make it work for a period time to continue to generate revenue and we have to be specific about what's the expectation is, you know, even during the interim construction period.

So back to the ordinance...and then this is where there's incentives and bonuses for creating open spaces. It's interesting, several of the historic photos of Wailuku that have been circulating lately has been full of trees. It's funny how, you know, we have this sort of love hate relationship with trees and yet when you see the nostalgic and beautiful historic images there's lots, and lots of trees, so I did put some incentives in here for landscape.

So this discusses the goals here are to frame the views towards the ocean and towards the valley, and that's to promote a strong definition of the street space. All new structures shall reduce the mass of the building above the second story to an amount equal to 25% of the zone lot. The mass reduction must be adjacent to one or more rights of way. So this is potentially -- this segment (B) could potentially take the place of the step back requirements in these two categories. Okay. So right now my thinking is we're saying at least 25% so in most cases the reduction is going to be over that given the setbacks that we have indicated. So if we wanted to keep it but then say but it doesn't have to exceed 25%, we could do that. Or we could just get rid of the setbacks and altogether and allow the architect to determine what that step back should be.

The open space incentive zoning lots that are larger than 8,500 square feet, and this is definitely on a large side for Wailuku. May receive a height bonus for providing landscaped courtyards or open space that is open to the sky. For every 1,000 square feet of landscaped open space provide a 1,000 square feet of building area may be added on an additional story. In no case shall the building height exceed eight stories or 160 feet. And we had talked about this a while ago in this -- oops -- in this kind of scenario where instead of being wide and low you leave open space and go up. So it's a one for one replacement, but not to

exceed an eight story height limit. If you think about Wailuku and existing buildings that Wailuku Town Homes building is currently 8 ½ stories, and of course the County Building is nine so those would be points of reference in terms of height.

Back to the Code. Zoning lots that are 8,500 square feet or less may be exempt from upper story mass reduction when publically accessible open space is provided contiguous to a right-of-way. The open space must be no less than 15% of the buildable lot area, and be at least 15 feet wide by 15 feet deep. The upper story mass reduction exempted may be directly proportional to the amount of open space provided. So in other words if it's a small lot and instead of doing the step back you choose to set the building back or you choose to create - like I always want to call the Pono Center -- Lokahi Pacific's Pono Center where there's the alley space, a publically accessible alley space, that could then give you the ability to not have to do the step, and that's actually a good example of a smaller lot size. But, it has to be no less than 15 feet wide so it can't just be we're providing the fire access and that's our open space. It has to actually be utilized for public use. And then of course parking, porte cochere, required setback areas and loading zones shall not be considered open space. Open space must contain landscaping and trees. So just to be very clear that it can't be just a hard scape.

So those are staff's first crack at zone changes, and would you like me to turn on the lights for discussion or should I leave them?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: We can just leave it this way just in case somebody wants to refer.

Ms. Wade: Sure.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any questions? You want to talk into the mic so she can hear you?

Ms. Gwen Hiraga: Yes. So in terms of administrating or implementing the revisions, these code revisions, would it be you, Erin, as the executive director or the person?

Ms. Wade: You mean who does the review? So if a building permit comes in who's doing it?

Ms. Hiraga: Yes.

Ms. Wade: No, it would be the Planning Department.

Ms. Hiraga: Thank you. That was one of the questions that I had on page, well on this, page 4, Administrative Review Permit. So the administrative review permit would not be you?

Ms. Wade: Correct. Yeah, all permits will stay with Planning.

Ms. Hiraga: All permits will stay with Planning.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Hiraga: Okay. The other question I had was under the table. Yeah, right below the table, Item C, about building permits etcetera, it makes a reference to enactment of these rules. Is that appropriate rules? I don't consider this as rules.

Ms. Wade: I know. Technically at this moment in time they are rules. When the Planning Department updates their zoning code, the intent is to pull it in to Title 19 and then at that time it will be a Code.

Ms. Hiraga: That's all I have.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, thank you. Keone.

Mr. Keone Ball: I just have one question, I guess, and it's fairly basic. The conflict when you have a blue line and a green line, I guess they apply to those street frontages . . . (inaudible) . . . not the appropriate design applications for that?

Mr. Wade: Yeah, good question. So what we'll have to do and which is why I kind of made this rough from the get go is identify specific setback areas for each of these zones. So as an example, the corner of Vineyard and Market Street where two different zones abut one another -- and my crude box creating overlapped in this case -- we'll have to know what is the exact extent of the three-story height limit, and basically can that lot at some point have the taller height limit, you know. So I think that's what you're getting to, Keone. So I think we are going to have to say for the first 25 feet or something very specific in terms of the frontage so that it's clear where there is, where the two districts adjoin each other.

Mr. Ball: Chair?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Keone.

Mr. Ball: Some of these lots are fairly small so that could be --

Ms. Wade: The whole lot.

Mr. Ball: -- somewhat prohibitive, the design I guess.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Well and in most cases, you know, along Market, right now it is a three-story height limit today, right. So the depth of the lot essentially along the existing parcel lines -- and it might be I can show it if I showed enough. Here we go, so this is that Market Street block. So we may want to make the width of this, the depth of the lot all the way to the intersection with Main and vice versa, all the way to the intersection with Vineyard so that it's clear. It follows the parcel line which all of this zoning currently does, you know. Or I'm definitely open to suggestion. I just think that could be a clean way to do it, but it's, you know, I'm open to suggestion on that.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Vice-Chair Lindsey you got any questions?

Ms. Wade: Chair, did you want to take public testimony before we have more discussion?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Sure. Would anybody like to testify on this specific item? After what you've heard? No one. Okay, Commissioners have any other questions?

Ms. Hiraga: I have one last question.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yes?

Ms. Hiraga: When does the Department or when is the Department going to update Title 19?

Ms. Wade: They will be -- they still have to issue their RFP so they'll be funded for the, for the update of zoning code. Actually it's a rewrite. It's a rewrite of the zoning code. They'll be able to issue the RFP in July, and then I think Michele has a decent schedule for getting it started right away. They only have half the funding, though. They only have enough funding to get half way through. So in terms of when will this get incorporated into the zoning code, my guess is it's about a three to four year period or we'll have to continue to be the ones sort of massaging the code to make it work for us.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Which I have a question now. In terms of that, how does it fit in with all of the incentives for improvement while the construction is going on because now you've got this window of like three or four years before you implement or change the zoning, you know, and it would seem that a lot of those incentives would be tied in with sort of the extra height limits and those kind of things for people to be incentivized to redevelop their properties.

Ms. Wade: Yes, which is part of the reason I think we're not just waiting for the Planning Department to take over the update of the code that we felt like some of these changes should be made earlier. Knowing, though, I mean we need to be fully aware the minute that you start adjusting code text you're going to as it plays out there will be issues. Any time you adjust code language we're going to run issues and we're going to have to come back and refine as different scenarios come in. So, I think it's important to sort of be prepared that we'll come in and we'll start reviewing some projects and then we realize you know what we should have added a section on something, you know, and we can do some refinement. And luckily for you folks it's relatively easy. It's the public hearing process here with you and then the 30-day posting, and then it's adopted, so it doesn't take the long extended period that a zoning amendment takes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So what you're talking about is the unintended consequences of putting something in place prior to --?

Ms. Wade: I am. Yeah, I mean I think we know what we're going to get if we don't do this.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yes.

Ms. Wade: We've seen the type of the construction or the lack thereof, you know, living with this code since 2002. You know, there hasn't been a whole lot. And even in good times, in good economic times, there wasn't a lot of construction happening. So what we're trying to do is incentivize this is a good time for construction. Is there a way for us to make it more affordable so that -- and more buildable knowing that if you're going to go four-stories, you're going to be really limited by what you can put in that space especially knowing you have a parking requirement. The additional height is likely to create a lot more ability to build something new.

And then again I think one of the other prohibitive things is the design guidelines, and that's something I would really like to discuss is do we want to keep those design guidelines, or are you feeling comfortable with attaching them to a certain block face type? Do you like the block face idea and concept of kind of connecting form to a certain type of street frontage? And if so, can we have different design requirements for those street frontages? That's kind of some feedback, I'd appreciate from you folks if you're willing or able.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any feedback?

Mr. Ball: Chair, well, I think it should remain flexible for that. I mean, if we're changing it, we kind of don't know what's going to happen.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Ball: And kind of going back to what I was talking about the different color if you will, were you saying that if there was a conflict and they could come in just to us and say well this building works better if we did this?

Ms. Wade: And they can do that now. I mean, you folks also have the ability -- we haven't done our orientation yet, so we'll do a little of it right now -- so you folks also have the ability to provide variances to this section to this ordinance or code.

Mr. Ball: So they don't have to go to Variance and Appeals?

Ms. Wade: No. They can come here. So if they did come and said, you know, we really want to make this project work. We could do it, we just can't meet this standard. They can always -- they can come here as part of their application process. We just -- it's both a little bit longer and it's a total gray area then, right. You know you folks are really dependent on the type of information that they're able to provide to you for your decision making, so we do want to provide as much guidance and path, provide the path that we would like them to take as we can.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, I'm going to be a devil's advocate here. For those who are going to say well how do you maintain some integrity or character to the center of Wailuku? Because

that's an argument that we hear all the time. We even heard at it when we did the presentation at Vineyard Street for the Maui Native Hawaiian Chamber. What would be your response to that?

Ms. Wade: My response would actually be that particular block of Vineyard Street and Market Street, I think, we should be kind of hard nose about maintaining the existing design guidelines. That would be the way I would approach it. I don't think that there is a definable pattern of design or development throughout the rest of Wailuku. I think it's all been a little of this and a little of that throughout the decades. And that is kind of what's neat and authentic about Wailuku. And we've talked about this before where these isn't another small town where you can go and see, oh I can tell that was built in the 60's and this was built in the 80's, you know. Everything in Lahaina and in Makawao all maintained a really specific architectural vernacular. Whether it's true to the time period or not so -- and some leaning in the direction of a Disneyland effect where, you know, it's trying to replicate something that existed in the time before. And I think that's what's nice about Wailuku is it's just very honest about when the building was built, what it was built for, you know. And that's something that the Secretary of Interior promotes with historic preservations too is encouraging buildings to be true to form, and true to time period. So for the areas that don't have, you know, a really defined architecture vernacular, I would encourage us to pull away from the design guidelines and suggest it's an opportunity to allow some more architectural variety.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I'll just make one comment.

Ms. Wade: And you should tell me if I'm wrong by the way. If you think that's not the right way for Wailuku to go, don't let me, just because I'm coming at it from an implementation perspective, if you think it really does need to be something throughout the year, something specific, I would be happy to write that too. I'm just giving you my perspective.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So my question is would this be something worth having a public hearing on?

Ms. Wade: We will have to have a public hearing.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Public hearing on changing the guidelines, but also at some point since we're discussing this and the question always comes up there should be some sort of written rationale behind the design guidelines in terms of why things would be set up the way they are, or some frequently asked question section where it explains the rationale behind the, the redevelopment agency sort of making a decision for a particular kind of design guidelines.

Ms. Wade: I agree, yeah. You know, now that I'm sort of testing with you folks what your level of comfort is and I'm trying to figure out where you feel like it's appropriate to make the changes and where you feel like maybe I've gone too far or we should keep the height less or whatever. At that point I'll understand your rationale better too, you know, and have a better sense of the direction that you would like to take it, so I'd be happy to write up a full staff report as well that expresses, you know, here's what we looked at and why. And then

here's what it's connected to, you know, and there's, there's the series of patterns both who've investment and disinvestments throughout Wailuku that should be referenced when we make these changes to illustrate, you know, there are only x-number of building permits pulled in this district despite the expedited review process and permitting process, and, and we think, you know, here's the reasons why that's happened. And so we're trying to incentivize.

The other pieces that we talked about that in the past that I didn't include in here is the transfer of development rights ability for historic structures. So the structures that do have existing historic integrity, being able to transfer their development rights and receive additional height or development. That's going to -- that's something I probably want to hire out to look at and definitely have the Corporation Counsel heavily involved because it's the whole program that needs a lot of look, look at.

But the architectural tax credit too is another piece of incentive that we've talked about doing with this, so all of this package will come like in pieces to you for review but that's another thing that I can provide in a staff report is what is the big picture, how does all of this fit together, and then here's what we're going to do in what order. I think that would be helpful.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any comments on that? Okay. Good. Thank you very much.

Ms. Wade: I would be curious how you feel about the height and the height bonus that I put in there. I mean we discussed the six stories in the past. Did the put the six story building potential in the right places based on the map? So those would be the green. Let's talk about that first.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I guess in an initial impression, if I can share, you're trying to prevent sort of the cavern feeling?

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: You've got all of the taller height limits on Main Street.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, that's true. That's true.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So if they're giving you your setback, then there's a possibility of eight stories, right, instead of six...that, that would definitely be a cavern.

Ms. Wade: The eight story they won't be able to get without the open space bonus like we talked about with . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, I understand that.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, so that would help, you know, to some extent. And there aren't very big lots actually on Lower Main. The places that I actually see potentially the eight stories happening would be at Good Shepherd where they're looking to build housing, at Maui

Medical where they have lots of space, and then -- what was the other one? Oh, up Vineyard -- no, I made that yellow. I mean, orange. I think those are the only two places that a potential height bonus of eight is possible.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Question, yes?

Mr. Ball: Could we do something where if it is for housing we allow, you know, an eight story?

Ms. Wade: Add a housing bonus, you mean?

Mr. Ball: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Would you want it to have an income threshold or just housing in general?

Mr. Ball: Probably just housing in general. That's what I think.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Ashley Lindsey: I agree with that, just housing in general.

Ms. Wade: Okay, great.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Which brings up a question for me, okay. Now to throw a wrench in the works, but is part of this, part of our duties or our mandate to also kind of...inspire affordable housing within the, within the district? I mean, I'm all for market, you know, based housing, but I think we should also allow, my opinion is that they should be allowed opportunities for affordable housing, and that's such a need. And if we're thinking about mixed communities and mixed incomes and people who have opportunities to rub shoulders and, you know, not gentrifying which is going to be the, the accusations of what we've been doing with Wailuku, I think that that opportunity has to be there in my opinion.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, and certainly there's nothing to prevent housing. In fact, I think this additional height of that, I think, really encourages. One of the, one of the major things preventing multi-family housing in Wailuku now is the parking requirement.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: And if you dedicate one or two floors of your building to parking right now at a four story height limit you're already not . . . (inaudible) . . . There's no possible way of making it work. And so even the six, you're right, even the six is getting at borderline and maybe not making it work, but the eight stories could really do that. So a height bonus --. Up to, again, up to eight stories for --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I think that's a great idea.

Mr. Ball: And maybe eliminating the...the open space requirement for that too.

Ms. Wade: Without the requirement for open space.

Mr. Ball: Depending on how it looks.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any other comments on that?

Ms. Wade: Can I have one more question if there isn't? You mentioned, and I want to follow up with your question about how the height is on Main Street. So to preserve views then did you want to retain a required step back on Main or did you want to allow, you know, more of the sort of flexibility in terms of surface?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: That's a good question.

Ms. Wade: I know. It's not an easy question. I go back and forth myself with this.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Because that's the view to the mountain, right, and you're going down towards --

Ms. Wade: Yes, so I'll come back up to this first slide. Yeah, this is the view. I wish I had a ground level.

Mr. Ball: Chair, it would be nice, I guess, to see a ground level of that. See where in the current buildings where the view kind of disappears, you know, while you're driving on that, it is in that current state that we're not going to fix it by making it --

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Ball: Go back, I guess.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: So I'll mock up, I'll use Photoshop, and mock up a scenario of what it looks like looking up from a couple of different points. If basically --. Because then this, you know, the building doesn't go straight up but like if you're looking and of course you're not looking right down the façade either but this segment that's the furthest out is the pinch point for the view if there was a view down that direction. So it is the outer most point that does define that edge so I'll show you essentially what it would look like if the building façade went up in each of these scenarios where the existing frontage is, if when it went up the six stories there and then if it went up the six stories bumping back a couple of stories. Okay?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Great.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Good.

Ms. Wade: That's great feedback. Thank you.

2. Review of draft grant language to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration for a Public Works grant for the Wailuku Civic Complex. EDA BUDGET

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, if there's no objection we can move on to the review of the draft grant language to the US Department of Commerce, EDA, for Public Works grant for the complex.

Ms. Wade: The narrative for a grant -- and now this is the second Federal grant we've put together on behalf of the redevelopment agency -- they don't give you a lot of flexibility on what to share with them. They know exactly what they want to hear from you so we've put together as best we could in the short number of characters that they allowed for us to have what, what the project is all about. The thing I wanted to review with you folks most importantly because the narrative is what it is, but there's two things that we're doing here that are important for you to understand.

The first is the phasing and this is on page 3. The way that we described how the project will unfold, and that's accompanied by the phasing map that I gave you. So essentially we're showing in phase one all of the streets and public rights of way improvements that we discussed. This is 1A. And in 1B, the parking structure. So this, our intent at this time is to bid out both the streets and the parking structure in fiscal year 19. So we have the \$44 million right now that starting July 1st, so we'd like to proceed as soon as the Environmental Assessment document is complete and the construction bids docs are ready we would bid out both of those with the intent of starting with the Vineyard and Church Street renovations. Very first is going to be the light at the intersection of Church and Main, and the segment of Vineyard Street adjoining the parcel, and then the rest of the street frontage. And then overlapping with that would be the parking structure development. Okay.

Phase two is the vertical construction at the civic building. And phase three which technically isn't a separate phase. Phase two and three will be bid out together. It is broken apart in the request to the EDA so that we are able to apply over three fiscal years. Okay. Because the project will cover three fiscal years. We're right at the end of their current fiscal year which ends at September 31st or 30th. So that's the reason it's showing in three phases. It's not that we're -- that there's going to be three different bids. Okay.

The other piece I just wanted to highlight was you've seen these job numbers, but I don't think you've seen them broken out this way as shown on page 5 at the top table. So it does talk

about construction dollars and total jobs. This is something that we will need to report on. I need to be very open with you about the federal funding so when we tell folks these are the jobs and this is the type of wage that's being received, this will now become a reporting requirement for us when we start to claim these types of things. So we're prepared and the Office of Economic Development is working with me on this and is prepared to continue to work on this.

And then next table I wanted you to look at was the cost breakdown which is in page 8, at the top of page 8. So this shows the sources of funding. So as I've explained before we do intend to ask the State for funding and three years from the Economic Development Administration. So this brings actually our share of the funding to only 68% which is, I think, you know, we're only be needing to go back to the County Council for another 11 million if we're able to secure these funds in this way. So that is the, that is the ideal scenario I think. You know, there's a chance that this won't work out this way, but I think that this should be what we try to work for if you folks are okay with us representing it this way to the EDA. Okay.

And I think that is -- yes, that's the extent of the critical things that I wanted you to understand that we're committing to as a result of this application.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any questions? I have tons of questions.

Ms. Wade: I'll say, I knew it.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay. Do the commissioners mind if I start and then I usually want you guys to chime in first so, okay we're in the midst of a political transition so the current Office of Economic Development is helping you with this.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And it's a big question mark about the following Office of Economic Development. And am I saying anything that's not true at this point?

Ms. Wade: Nope.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay. What are the contingencies for working with the new administration, and also kind of signaling to the present Council of what's required of them in order to make this thing work as a transition? That's a question.

Ms. Wade: Yes. So I have been basically been awarded the assistance of Tokie Ogawa which has been amazing from Office of Economic Development so she's been helping me meeting with all of the businesses, getting the letters and things from those businesses. I expressed to this Mayor and to the Budget Chair how valuable her assistance is and they both authorized me to meet with all three potential mayoral candidates to discuss keeping staff from OED that they're willing to retain and the importance of that staff to follow this

project through. It's not just --. You know, they've secured me and Alan, but Tokie has become a really vital piece of that too. So whether she stays with Office of Economic Development or there becomes another position within the County where she can do that I'm hoping that she can continue to do that. Other than that, you know, there isn't a whole lot of security. The potential is we hire out a service if OED is no longer able to assist us we would have to hire assistance to help with the documentation and the continued interface with the businesses. I mean, the big thing is for businesses to open up and share with you what their books look like, how well they're doing each month, where they're struggling, it takes relationship building and trust, you know. And so the continuity of that person is really critical. So, I mean, they might be willing to tell you it's bad, business is bad, but to really get in and understand how you can help them takes a high level of trust and so Tokie has really built that with the shop small campaign already. And so even if she's not there and we're able to retain her on a contract basis that could be a possibility for the future.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Anybody have any questions? Okay, I've got a couple more.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Interfacing with the State, okay, what, what -- how did this come about, who are we interfacing with right now, what are the chances of this actually occurring considering the climate from last year where I don't think Maui got any State funded projects simply because of the, the problems on the Big Island and what happened with the flooding on Kauai. So what, what, what's, what would be the status for getting 10 million over phase one and phase two from the State?

Ms. Wade: Good question. So this is going to require some work almost immediately, probably starting early August. Developing a package that expresses the benefits of the project to the State in real clean and clear language. We've already talked with Senator English and Senator Agaron who are willing to support our request. And I talked with the Mayor, with Judge Cardoza, and Chief Justice about letting them know not only that we're going to be running the shuttle service, but we're building this parking and how it benefits both their employees and the jurors, how the shuttle service benefits the jurors, expressing to them, you know, the State's really responsibility in helping us with the project. They both agreed so they were trying to figure out where it belongs in the budget, you know, in terms of a request or line item, and if there's a department that it goes to or if it comes straight to us. That's, that's one of the big questions right now.

And then once we get that kind of figured out --. At this moment it appears there's lots of excitement to help and lots of people who want to be connected with the project, you know. So the more that we can create that positive relationship where everybody wins and gets a pat on the back for being a part of it, I think that's sort of what we're looking at right now is how do we get those, the team together and then follow the path that they present to us to how to make it happen. But we definitely need specific numbers in to them that they understand it. And the Governor's race, I mean the Governor's race is also going to be a big question. It's not certain, you know, should we even start meeting with the Governor at this

point. I know our Mayor is developing a draft budget to give to the next Mayor. I don't know if that's happening with the Governor, and it's a very difficult timeline to turn around the whole State budget if you're coming in cold so -- if it is a new Governor. But -- so that's one of the things. I mean, we'll certainly meet with Governor Ige's office but whether he's in budget planning mode during the fall, I don't know, you know, so we'll just have to see our level of receptiveness to that. But part of the advantage of us being up in Management is they have the legislative arm that's always looking at changes in legislation and heading over to the, to the State regularly to share our interest. So those relationships are in place that will now be able to just sort of build off of and have consistent communication.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And last but not least, the Council, in terms of when do we go back for, and explain the phasing, and understanding what their responsibility is going to be currently in terms of either a budget amendment or further funding to get us into phase two at the very least.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. We had talked about going in for a budget amendment this fall the last time we talked. We're pretty certain now that the politics is going to carry people's attention and it's not going to be something that they're going to have the capacity to address this . . . (inaudible) . . . for a budget amendment. So the strategy now instead is to encumber every penny of the 44 that we are able to encumber with construction contracts, and apply during the next budget which I said Mayor is already drafting his FY20 budget. So the remainder of the funds will be in there. In fact, I think his, his strategy is putting the full remainder assuming we get nothing from the State or the Federal government in the draft budget. And then whether the next Mayor takes that on or not I don't know. But I think that has to be the budget strategy.

The communication strategy about phasing and follow up, as you know Budget Chair Hokama has really been driving the way that we communicate with the Council, and I think it would be helpful if we can approach it from a different angle moving forward. So we need to work on that a little bit, is getting permission to approach it from a different angle, maybe even possibly a different committee to be able to really go over how all of the mechanic. There's so many more mechanics to this than just the money, you know.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: And it's important that they start to be able understand the programs that are supporting it, you know, all of the permitting process and the funding. So, we'll be working on that.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Thank you for indulging me members and my curiosity.

Ms. Hiraga: Good questions.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yes. It just seems to me we have to get our basis covered because there's so many contingencies involved in this right now, depending on who comes through and who

doesn't.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And that there's so many moving parts to this and we don't want to be left with something halfway done, and then somebody kind of pulls out the rug from under us. That's my fear that this particular point that, you know, we're already \$7 million down this rabbit hole, almost. You know, we're going to be another \$40 million down this. It just doesn't seem right to, to all of sudden get the, the rug pulled from under you. So all the Mayor candidates have to understand how far down this road we are already, and what the benefit would be for the State, for the County as well, and for the, the Wailuku residents, and Wailuku themselves. Thank you very much.

Ms. Wade: You're welcome.

3. Review of draft request for proposals for a public relations consultant to assist with information and communication regarding the Wailuku Civic Complex.

PHASING PLAN WAILUKU CIVIC COMPLEX

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, can we go on to the review draft request for proposals for a public relations consultant? I think that's in your packet as well. It's an RFP, yeah? Erin?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. I'm going to come back up there real quick.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Okay, thank you. So speaking of all the programs that we have going on and messaging and how we communicate with people, I'm realizing now and even if you go to the reWailuku website it's all geared towards the planning process and how to plan for a project of this type. And now the planning piece, once we've completed the environmental assessment we'll be done, and we'll be moving into execution and we'll have a number of programs we'll want to tell people about. And while I feel like we're strong in talking about planning, we could use some help with PR messaging.

So the goal here is essentially to hire someone to help us both pull together a brand and logo and a name for the project. This is something we're going to have to talk with Chair Hokama about because I know he's talked about the name specifically, but no matter whom I tell this to in the sales world, tells me I can't sell anything with name, you know. You're not going to get anybody who want to go to a market called the Wailuku Civic Complex, you know. So if it truly is intended to be an economic development project, I think we're going to need to request some flexibility with that and let him know we're going to hire pros to help us to do that kind of a thing.

So that, that would be included and then really have this person be a tremendous resource for the businesses. So if they are looking to do promotions, you know, or a Wailuku art walk night, or you know whatever it is that they want to do that they have this team at their disposal to be helping to generate interest. Also to promote the shuttle service. Once that starts, it's only going to work if people thinks it's fun, and cool, and new, and something they want to try, you know. And if we don't have a good marketing team to do that I think we're going to be wasting our money, so, even on the service itself, so I want to make sure that we have that in place heading in.

So that's what's the purpose of the RFP is and it -- I expect this contract to probably be close to \$100,000 so, or more, so it will have to go through the formally bidding process and selection. And so you'll see in there it does have the list of selection criteria. I will have to create a . . . (inaudible) . . . committee. So if any of you are interested in sitting on that committee, I'm happy and I'd appreciate your help. But I'd like to hire this -- this is one of the first things I'd like to hire for this year because I think from now and moving forward and probably from six months ago, this would have been really helpful, so anyway, that's the RFP.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any questions?

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah, I have a question.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yes, Commissioner Hiraga?

Ms. Hiraga: So when is this going to be issued or has it been issued?

Ms. Wade: No. So I wanted you to review it before I issued if in case you wanted to make any changes. But starting July 1st we will have the money at our, at our disposal so we can issue it right away.

Ms. Hiraga: I'm actually looking at the intent deadline of July 16th.

Ms. Wade: Oh, yeah, we're going to have to change that. So probably August 1st. If we issued on --. Probably the soonest we could issue would be Friday the 5th? Is that a Friday?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I think the 6th.

Ms. Wade: Friday, the 6th. And then 30 days from then, so August 3rd would be the due date then.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: One of the things talking with Tokie today she said I might want to really beef up is the whole social media piece and the expectation for ongoing social media content. And that it's not just there's a promotion or something, but like, you know, little individual things, postings about you can find this at this store or just street scenes in Wailuku, things like that

that keep people's interest.

Mr. Ball: Construction?

Ms. Wade: Construction, yeah, exactly, all of those things. So the blog, right now, for the reWailuku page serves does that to some extent now. But if you're not signed up for the blog you're not seeing any of it. And on communication's person who works under Rod Antone, Kehau has been telling me your blog should be feeding your Facebook page. I'm just kind of oblivious to that sort of thing, so I think the PR person will be really helpful.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I think Instagram would help too because the pictorial kind of element in Instagram, you know, from the beginning of construction going through to, you know, as the thing starts going up. That would be kind of an interesting sort of a historical record actually.

Ms. Wade: Dave Yamashita said that. He said, you know, you should really . . . (inaudible) . . . a time lapse camera or, or a video for when construction starts so that you can see the thing coming up out of the ground. I think that's a good idea.

Mr. Ball: And also just the things like where people park and . . . (Inaudible. Multiple speakers) . . .

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Exactly.

Ms. Wade: Yes, exactly.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Lower the heat level of the people getting frustrated in the area.

Ms. Wade: Exactly. Yeah. One of the things someone brought up recently -- it might have been one of the businesses -- is the valet service that's come up several times. A district wide valet service. So we've talked about the shuttle, and the circulator, but being able to basically to pull up in front of the Lao Theater and have a valet take your car for -- especially something like if we wanted to keep First Friday. Well, the street is closed, so we'd have to meet at an alternative location. But let's say it's a show at the Lao, you know, when you're going to bring 250 people in, it's going to be difficult to park. But we will have the Wells Park overflow parking. But at night you might not want to do that, so that might be something we sponsor for evenings would be a valet service especially for the shows when you know there's a lot of people coming in. So I'll look into costs for that too. But that would be a great thing to promote. You know, you might tell yourself, oh, I'm not going downtown in Wailuku.

Mr. Ball: Right, because they don't know where to park, right?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, exactly. But if you knew, I don't need to know where to park, all I've got to do is drop off my car, right?

Mr. Ball: Within the criteria, I don't see that component that we might want to put some --

Ms. Wade: About social media?

Mr. Ball: Yeah, and all that it encompasses, I guess.

Ms. Wade: Yes, yes. But, yeah. So the extent of what the contract needs to cover. Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, it seems like it needs a little bit more detail.

Ms. Wade: Meat on the bone. Yeah. Tokie's going to take another look at it today and kind of flush out some pieces I think. Because they regularly do the PR contracting for the four Friday's or the five town parties. So I think they have some substance they can add.

Mr. Ball: Is this time frame going to happen, September 1st? How long is the bid process?

Ms. Wade: It's only a 30 day bid process. But then we have to write up a contract so it will take a month to get the contract in place.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any other comments?

Ms. Wade: If we add some more content, did you folks need to see it again before I publish or you're okay?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: No.

Ms. Wade: All right, great.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: As far as I'm concern the sooner this gets out the better.

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah, we need to get moving on this.

Ms. Wade: All right.

4. Review of draft request for proposals for to provide assistance and consultation regarding the implementation of the Parking Action Plan.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, last but not least review of draft request of proposals for to provide assistance and consultation regarding the parking action plan.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, thanks Chair. We're going to have to postpone that because it hasn't been scheduled yet by PEA Committee.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: We are looking at August 20th right now with Councilwoman Sugimura. So I think the parking action plan will go to the PEA Committee on August 20th.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Just a comment on that and sort of other, it would be nice if we knew ahead of time, if we could put out a schedule once you know of anything that's happening in Council about this project, no matter which committee it is, if we could know as soon as possible and, you know, if one of us could be there or, you know, just to kind of monitor the situation. If our schedules allow I think that would, personally, I think that would be helpful.

Ms. Wade: Definitely, yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So they see us, one of us in there, you know.

Ms. Wade: Right. Right.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: If it's, if it's possible for us to do our schedules, but I know that's not always possible, but at least we make the attempt.

Ms. Wade: Sure, yeah, I will.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any comments on that?

Ms. Wade: So this the only thing right now, but I will certainly keep you posted.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, good. Thank you. Department update; International Downtown Association Conference.

D. DEPARTMENT UPDATE

1. International Downtown Association Conference

Ms. Wade: Yeah, so we submitted the travel forms for you, Ashley and Gwen. Keone and Jo-Ann weren't available to go to International Downtown. So it's not been signed by the Mayor as of the 11th. So when I go back we have to make sure it's signed and then it goes. And so we won't be able to make the plane reservations but we can get the registration encumbered. And then also myself, David Yamashita, and Alan Murata are believed to attend for International Downtown. So that's San Antonio, October 24th to the 26th. We'll fly in the day before and leave the day after, but that's -- so we'll have a bunch of updates between now and then.

Ms. Hiraga: Sure. There's still time.

2. Archeological Inventory Survey status

3. Status of Draft Environmental Assessment

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Thank you. Archaeological Survey?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, so we did get authorized last week to conclude our archaeological work, so based on the finding of the contaminant at the old King Theater lot, we consulted with State Department of Health who said cap and leave it until such time as you're under construction. And so we told the Historic Preservation Division that prevents us from doing any further archaeology and by the way there was nothing but trash in that lot anyway, you know, nothing significant. Their motivation is for us to chase out the building foundation because the King Theater's building foundation we did find the corner by Vineyard and Church Street. However, we have the 1963 survey before everything was demoed at the Wailuku Municipal Parking Lot that shows the location of the building foundation. So we told him, we told the State once we're prepared to do the required mitigation we will document it in the AIS, but we want to publish the EA as is with the information that we have, and we got the okay this week to do that. So AIS is being wrapped up right now, and as of now we are on scheduled to publish the EA on the August 8th.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, so when does the --. So the Environmental Council has already given its okay for this?

Ms. Wade: Environmental Council?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: The one that the -- State board where all these EIS goes to?

Ms. Wade: The OEQC?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: OQUS, I'm sorry.

Ms. Wade: Oh, yes. They know, it's on their radar that it's coming, but they receive it two weeks prior or little more than two weeks prior to the publishing deadline. But we're on schedule to meet their deadline requirements for August 8th.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Oh good. And it's under the old rules, not the new ones.

Ms. Wade: It is so far under the old rules.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Good. I'm just checking.

Ms. Wade: The existing rules, not old rules.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Existing rules. Yeah, not yet. The Governor hasn't signed them yet. Right, exactly, and they haven't finished the process. So last but not least, Status of Draft -
- oh, you just went through that.

Ms. Wade: I did. So that's it.

E. NEXT REGULAR MEETING: July 27, 2018

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So, next regular meeting July 27th. Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Ball: So move.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Without objections.

There being no further discussion brought before the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Keone Ball
Frank De Rego, Jr., Chair
Gwen Hiraga
Ashley Lindsey, Vice-Chair

OTHERS:

Erin Wade, Small Town Planner
Michael Hopper, Deputy Corporation Counsel