

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 21, 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 1:01 p.m., Friday, September 21, 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.: Let's call the meeting to order at...a minute after one. Public testimony, you can either testify now or you can testify as an item comes up. So, anybody would like to come up and have testimony? Please identify yourself.

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: Good afternoon friends, my name is Jonathan Starr and thank you for being here today. As some of you may know, my wife Helen and I are commercial property owners in the core of Wailuku, and we've, we've been trying to figure out for more than 10 years how, how -- what we could do with our properties that would help to activate and revitalize a town. We've looked at housing projects and unfortunately with the four tries we were never able to get that to work. And recently, you know, we started to feel that the town is getting in good enough shape that it could support a business hotel so we went out on a search of someone who knows what they're doing and a group that could help us do a, do a business hotel in Wailuku. And we were really fortunate to be connected up with an organization called New Crest Image and Mike, Mike Patel who founded that. And it's a family type organization that builds great select service hotels around the western half of the country. So, we're working together to put together a plan to build a business hotel in Wailuku with the hope that this will really help the town. It will provide services for the community. It will be a place where people's relatives can stay, sport teams can stay, but also help service the medical needs, the university, the courts, uses like that where there's a different concept for Maui. It will be branded Hilton Garden Inn, which is the premier business brand. It will attract, you know, people who are here to, to work and run away. I'm just ecstatically happy because I think what we're looking to do is something that's well designed and will really aid the community and yeah, anyway, that's about it. You'll be hearing a lot. We'll be having a lot of process. And if it's okay, we'll come back over and over again as we have --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Excuse me?

Mr. Starr: -- detail and design.

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

Mr. Starr: So anyway, thank you. And yeah, Mike Patel, I guess he's your next testifier.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, could you identify yourself and the organization that you're connected with?

Mr. Mike Patel: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Mike Patel, and I'm based in Lewisville, Texas. My company's name is New Crest Image. And it's been a great pleasure and honor to be in front of you sharing sort of my journey, how I got involved with Jonathan and Helen. It's been about last year, September, we were introduced by Hilton, and Jonathan's property was introduced to us. So we've been working with Jonathan for one year trying to understand the market, trying to understand the neighborhood, trying to understand what are the demands, how the community work, family. So over the one year we have done a lot of in-depth study about the market, and really understand how can we be a part of this community, Wailuku. And I had a pleasure of meeting with Erin in April try to understand the project that community's working on it, and Jonathan has two property, Main and Maloho Street on either side of it. So we positioned the hotel in such a way that it could be a part of the community. And the hotel, as Jonathan referenced, we would cater to business and family and local, with the mid-price point that people can afford it. It doesn't need to be high price point. It doesn't need to be low. Just right that where people can afford. We'll have a meeting room, about 1,500 square foot that we really use for business, but many times that meeting room will be used for community events where we do art nights where give local artists to come and show case their talent. We would show case that for health care event when there's a community hospital want to do something for the community that would be really great to do support and make somebody's livelihood change. Other item we looked at is education sector where we do high school kid -- have an event where they go to college, give them a career path, so we do a lot of that community activity. If you look at our company, New Crest Image, one of our core value is giving is fun, and we take very stride of it. And really, you know, we want to be a part of a community. Today we own about 40 hotels in the mainland, and we're a part of different community's involvement, and that is our goal to be a part of. You know, Jonathan and Helen had a dream, and we're just honored to be a part of their dream, and making something very unique for this community. I'm sure along the way we may think that everything that community wants it, but along the way I'm sure we would short fall on it, and we would ask the community to help us give a direction and guidance so we could fit in the community what should the product look like in the community. So we would be doing a lot of grass root level, talking to one neighbor at a time, one business at a time, and asking them what would they like to see if this hotel were to come in front of the Council or any of the County for approval. So we would be working with the community and neighbor, hand on hand, just to understand what would they like to see. And the one major concern we have is we do not want to impact somebody's livelihood, who's been living here for years and years. We don't want to make their life anything different because of this hotel. We want to try to make their life better by having this development. But those are the challenges we'll work with, the local county and community, here to make sure that we would avoid all that pitfalls or their hardship. Thank you for listening to me. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to share anything.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Commissioners, do you have any questions? Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Patel: Thank you.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Anybody else wanting to testify? Okay, at this point we'll close public testimony.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. Review of [draft request for proposals](#) for a circulator shuttle system throughout Wailuku Town.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Moving down the agenda, review of draft request for proposals for a circulator shuttle system throughout Wailuku Town. Erin?

Ms. Erin Wade: Okay, thank you Chair. This draft proposal, we ended up holding on, both to get your comments and because I knew we were going to be going to the Transportation and Parking Conference, and I'm glad we waited because there are a couple of things that we learned.

So the proposal was designed to do two things, if you read it. It was designed first to create a downtown employee parking shuttle essentially which would operate from War Memorial where -- which would be a parking reservoir, essentially, an off-site parking location, and do a downtown circulator loop for the peak morning and peak evening hours operating every 15 minutes at a time. So this was, this is intended to support employees, both State and County, and Maui Medical, and even business employees during the time of construction, as an alternative. So it's specifically for long term parking was the intention.

Then we also wanted to do, once you're in town, a mobile independent shuttle system that's more versatile, easier to hail, doesn't have to be stuck to a fix route system. So one of the providers, the largest provider of that in the nation is called Free Ride -- the FRED -- Free Ride Everywhere District. I'm just going to show you. This is the San Diego one just as an example. It would be, and the goal would be to have electric vehicles essentially that can circulate throughout the district. They operate kind of like an Uber or a Lyft where you can either call it on your phone, or you can hail as it's driving past and can take you within a one mile radius of the downtown core. So, within Main and Market we were identifying.

So this RFP included both services, or includes both of those services as it's drafted right now. One of the things I learned at the conference was...craft your RFP's so that your vendor can be successful, and understanding that there are probably people who do this model of independent circulation very well, but might then not do the employee's fixed route circulator shuttle well and vice versa. So what I was kind of hearing from the parking conference that we attended is you want to be specific in what you're bidding, and if the same bidder bids on both proposals and can do them both well, great. But if not, that then enables you to probably get the best vendor for the specific service that you're requesting. It ends

up being more work, of course, because it's two contracts instead of one, and it's two companies to stay on top of. But ultimately when it comes down to the customer service, the consensus from the conference was really to tailor it so that you're going to get the best customer service because otherwise people aren't going to ride it. And then us paying for this system isn't going to do us any good in the first place. So...so, you know, a little more front end work, but hopefully in the long term it could be better. So I did want to check in with you and find out if you felt that that would be appropriate would be basically to pull those two services apart and bid those two out separately.

And then, you know, relating to the scope of work itself, a good deal of the special provisions identified in here, you know, the first part I kind of went over with a scope would be. A good deal of the special provisions come directly out of the Maui County buses proposals and what the expectations are for both operation and liability. So we're presenting that right here at the front end. And then, identifying too, basically what the submittal process is and this is all --. What, what --. From section, section four, five, and seven are essentially standard for how these processes get bid out. The special provisions is really the section that we --. I worked with the Maui County Bus, specifically Mark Takamori to identify what they felt like we really needed to include in this, and what we didn't need to include. You should also know, talking extensively with them, the Maui Bus is not interested in offering this service. Initially I had talked to them about being the provider and the one that's bidding this out, and just using our capital improvement fund to do so, but their objective is different than our priority. Our priority, I see, really is being economic development, and it's to some extent, branding for the district. One of the benefits about this particular vehicle is you can wrap it with information about things that are happening in the district. It can be branded as Wailuku town. So it becomes something that gains interest. The Maui Bus isn't in that business. You know, their objective is essentially to move people from one place to another on their fixed route system so -- and -- so totally understandable. So this would be a contract under the redevelopment agency.

So in summary, that's what the proposal is. But I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have about it. And if there was anyone from the audience that had questions or wanted to testify that would be okay too.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Anyone have any questions, Commissioners? Commissioner Hiraga?

Ms. Gwen Hiraga: So Erin you mentioned that this would be for when we're under construction. Is this only during the construction period?

Ms. Wade: That's a great question. My intention would be --. Well, first of all, we can only bid it for a one-year contract service. So, based on whatever the budget we have at the moment is because we'll only be funded on an annual basis. So it does say that in there, that it can be extended dependent on budget. But our -- my intention would be to start this any time before May of 2019. The earlier the better I would think because the goal for me would be to set up the system so that we're creating options for people before they need it, you know, so that they can try it out, you know, figure out what's working for them, if they

decide I'm comfortable having my car at War Memorial or I'm not. Or, before we actually take the municipal parking lot out of service I would like to start this because there could be additional places other than War Memorial that end up working out and working better for people that we can figure out before we take our municipal lot out of service. So that would be my goal, any time from January 1st until May 2019 would be the goal, to get the, at least the employee shuttle service operational.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So my question would be, you must have some other places in mind if you're saying there might be other options better than War Memorial. Do you have any, anything in mind at the moment or --?

Ms. Wade: Not specifically and -- I mean, there is the Safeway shopping center, all of which is parking is dedicated if they fill, if that shopping center fills, you know. But not being full, those parking stalls are undedicated, or could be considered undedicated. And it might be a very convenient thing for employees who might want to stop and pick up dinner anyway, you know, or pick up groceries before they head home. So if they're taking the shuttle, they're parking, there's folks parked at Safeway, they can go in and grab their food, get their car, and go home, you know. So this, this is something that we've only explored on the very surface level, and we probably need some more time to figure out. We can certainly bid it with the expectation that it would be at War Memorial, and then put provisions into the contract that would allow us to adjust that as we go.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Commissioner Hiraga?

Ms. Hiraga: With regard to Safeway, do you need an agreement with Safeway?

Ms. Wade: Yes we would, yeah.

Ms. Hiraga: Do you think we'll be charging?

Ms. Wade: I do think they would charge, yeah. Depending, I mean, if it was Safeway itself, and they saw it as a potential for more customers, you know --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: -- it might be something that they would be willing to, you know, it's a reciprocity thing. But if it ended up that our users were simply taking the parking, and then not being active customers they might not. So that's the other thing I would just say about this conference that I learned is build in space for trial and error. You know, build in the opportunity to test some things in the . . . (inaudible) . . . , in the contract, and in the execution of whatever the service is because whatever it is that you roll it out, it's not going to be perfect the same time. So I would like to build in maybe a little bit more flexibility and options because then too when someone starts bidding, they might see something that we don't see at this point and have suggestions, you know, that we hadn't anticipated, but, might work better.

Ms. Ashley Lindsey: Is there an approximate number of people it will shuttle? Because at 7:30 rush hour, it's only going to take eight -- if that vehicle -- it's only going to take eight people for half an hour.

Ms. Wade: I'm glad you asked that so I should clarify. So this wouldn't actually be the employee shuttle. This would be the mid-day circulator. So that the employee shuttle, we expect to be something from a sprinter van to the MEO's short, shorter bus for the employee shuttle service. So a much larger vehicle that can carry between 15 to 25 people at once. And then doing those 15 minute runs.

This little vehicle would be more of a mid-day circulator. So if I did park my car at War Memorial, but I need to go to the bank and it's raining, you know, I can jump in one of these circulators or, you know --. It's intended to give folks that have parked their car off campus the comfort and ease to know they can still run errands within the district, you know, as they might need to, or go to meetings, that kind of a thing.

And what --. Typically these are, these little vehicles have been used in more tourist communities. Like, ideally this would come and also operate out of Lahaina especially when the cruise ships are coming in, and it's the perfect little, very mobile, and flexible option to get folks moving around in a small, defined area. And then if they were operating in Lahaina, it probably offsets some of the cost for Wailuku too.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I'm calling myself now.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay. So these would be electric vehicles, the mid-day circulator? Is that what their wish is at this point on the wish list?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. You know, we described it as a sustainable energy, or energy friendly alternative, I think. How did that go?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So the offer would be -- I mean the person who's taking up this contract, they'd have to put in the infrastructure for the charging and all of that kind of stuff?

Ms. Wade: They would, yeah. And then, you know, long-term obviously our garage is going to have a lot more EV stations than we're required at this time, and could be something that subsidizes our service contract if this continues to operate after the development of the garage, you know. So we've -- we can build some longevity to the contract as, you know, the contracts either get renewed or rebid, we can be in more control in that way. There is a service operating out of Kihei right now. I think it's called Turtle Tracks that does this. It's the same similar kind of vehicle. It's painted green. So there is an on, on-island provider -

-

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I've seen it.

Ms. Wade: -- that we've talked to about, yeah, about doing -- you know, can they do this? That is the limiting factor right now, though, are the charging stations, and having access and availability to that specifically because they like to have their fleet to be in one place.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So have they given you an idea of how long it would take them to get the infrastructure built up, and where would this thing, this charging stations be and --? I mean, that, that would be the thing that I would --. Because it has to be somewhat proximate to wherever you're offering the service, right? So --

Ms. Wade: Probably.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So citing the chargers might be a challenging, depending on where they are cited so.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. And until we bid it out I wouldn't know that, you know.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: But that would probably be -- that would be some information that I could include in their request for the bid is to identify where the charging stations would be located, and then what proximity. You know, we could ask them will they own their fleet. That's one of the questions that's in -- from the Maui Bus is, you know, who owns, maintains the fleet. We can ask all of that stuff in response.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So let me clarify. You're looking on our guidance or is it your suggestion that you're going to split these, or the RFP's? Because I would support that, you know, to make it more specific and for you to find the right vendor. I don't know how the other Commissioners feel about that. I don't think there's really any action we need to take, but maybe this is just guidance at this point. Would the Commissioners agree with that?

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, yeah, I think that's a great idea, splitting it up and being more focused and specific about what each part of this needs, and then being able to control that. Much easier, I think, yeah.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, I mean, getting the two -- if it ends up being two independent vendors, it's making sure that they're communicating with each again, you know. But, but essentially the two services operate relatively independently. It's just they have the same customer base, and I want to make sure all the same good information.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So one more question about the, the employee shuttle. Is that going to work for a limited amount of time, like, at lunch or morning for an hour, and then right before

-- when work ends for an hour? Is that what the plan is at this point, is they'll work at specific times, sort of broken up during the middle of the day when employees are, you know, circulating if you want to put it that way?

Ms. Wade: Yes, so we had specifically --. What we were going to identify is the beginning work hours for County employees which is 6:45 a.m. and 9:00 a.m.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: And then the go home hours which is 3:45 p.m. to 5:45 p.m. or 6:00 p.m.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: So those would be the windows that it would operate. We were talking about not doing a lunch time.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Because of the circulator or the, the mid-day circulator so there are --. And part of it is a promotional thing for Wailuku town. You know, we want folks to eat in the district if they're, if they can, you know, so that will be the goal. We don't want to give it back . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: The captive audience. They're not going to be . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Lindsey: One more question about the mid-day circulator. Well, like this one, it has one mile radius, is that going to have that radius or is it just shuttling to and from the parking lot?

Ms. Wade: The employee shuttle?

Ms. Lindsey: No, the mid-day.

Ms. Wade: The mid-day. The mid-day is the one with one mile, one mile radius, yes.

Ms. Lindsey: That's pretty far, right?

Ms. Wade: It is far. It goes all the way to Maui Lani. I mean, it goes all the way to Foodland essentially. So if that was your intent was to go to Foodland and get lunch, you could do that with one of these.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: And just talking with a couple of these providers about how they operate, they like to have that flexibility, I guess, to, to go that distance. They would rather have more rides and be operating consistently than to have less rides and be confined to a smaller area in a

district like this.

Ms. Lindsey: I'm just wondering about the residential impact. You know, there's lots of residents here so if you're stopping at every, all these residences, it kind of limits the businesses.

Ms. Wade: Are you --? Just to clarify, do you mean -- you're worried that the little vehicles are going to be going in and out of the neighborhoods?

Ms. Lindsey: No, I'm not worried about that. I'm just worried about the use not being used. Like maybe aunty over here wants to go to Foodland, and they don't want to drive, so they just use the free shuttle to go to Foodland.

Ms. Wade: Which to tell you the truth, I mean, for me, I hope they do that, you know, and start to get used to and comfortable with maybe not needing their own car all the time, you know.

Ms. Lindsey: I'm, I'm support of that after the parking lot is built, but while it's happening, you know, the functioning of that. I don't know.

Ms. Wade: Oh I see, so you're worried they're going to be going to get their own groceries to and from their house and meanwhile people are waiting on the curb at Wailuku Coffee for --. I see, yeah, okay. That's actually a good scenario to think about. And you know, maybe there's an opportunity to prioritize rides for these folks. If they're, if the origination is within the downtown core itself, or the origination or destination is within the downtown core itself is when it takes priority. But if they're slow they can go to, you know, Kehalani to Foodland if that's, you know, if they want to. Okay.

Ms. Ridao: So for the -- I'm sorry.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: No, go ahead.

Ms. Ridao: For the radius, how far down towards Kahului would that be?

Ms. Wade: It goes to, actually it goes to UH. It goes to --

Ms. Ridao: Okay, UHMC.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Wow.

Ms. Ridao: Okay, good.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So you're within shooting distance, even of walking over at Kaahumanu, yeah. I was just thinking that.

Ms. Ridao: No, I was just thinking about what people do during their lunch break.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, yeah. A lot of people do errands during their lunch break.

Ms. Wade: For me too, it's a -- it's kind of nice exposure to get a vehicle wrapped in Wailuku branding heading to the college and to Kaahumanu, and heading back up into the district, where, you know, maybe they weren't, people weren't thinking that there was good shopping, or great coffee place or anything in Wailuku. But it gives us some additional exposure the broader the reach. So they did give us scenarios too of a one mile and a three mile when I -- because these were the folks that I reached out to, FRED -- we're just trying to determine if it was even feasible, you know, and them having operated in multiple locations, they were more than happy to take a look and see if it was feasible to operate it here. So the three mile is certainly more expensive route for us to operate, but the, the one mile, the one I thought went all the way to UH, I thought, we don't need, we don't need it to go farther than that...at this point.

Ms. Hiraga: I have one last question.

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

Ms. Hiraga: Yes, I have one last question, Erin. So, you withheld in issuing the RFP. So what is your new plan for this?

Ms. Wade: So now that I'm going to pull it apart into two programs, yeah, I probably -- we're looking at bidding probably mid-October at this point. Oh, no. So bidding deadline for this fiscal year is October 15th, so maybe early, early October.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So the goal of this is to get people used to a shuttle, and how it operates and --. Because it would actually --. You know, we just had testifiers talk about putting a, a hotel in the middle of Wailuku. Actually, that would also work into this whole idea of being able to shuttle visitors, as well as local people who are staying for business in town, around.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: It would, it would be a service that would be nice to have.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I think even essential if want to reduce traffic in the center of town which, I think, would be a benefit for something like this. So, you know, the more people get used to this, I think the better off the whole central area of Wailuku town will be so.

Ms. Wade: I'm glad you brought that up because one of the things too at this Parking and Transportation Conference -- and this came up when we were at Urban Land Institute as well -- is the curbside. The curbside area turning to a drop off area and pick up zone, and how we will likely want to have specific identified areas within the downtown neighborhood. So

there aren't cars just pulling in and stopping all over the place.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: Whether it's our circulator, or Uber, or Lyft, if that starts being a lot more common because we've taken away the parking, you know, we want to have some zones. So, that's probably, once the vendor comes in, that will be something we'll be coming back to you with. They'll identify and we'll maybe collectively identify where those locations make the most sense. And then potentially taking away an on-street parking stall so that can be accommodated, the pickup and drop off safely, in multiple locations.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Anymore questions? Well, thank you very much on that one.

Ms. Wade: Okay. So I will pull these apart. And what I'll do, Commissioners, is I'll send it out to you folks for your information. If you have any questions or concerns, and want to e-mail me back directly, you're welcome to do that. And I'll leave it, I'll leave it out for you for maybe a week, and then I'll send it to Purchasing Division. Okay.

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

Ms. Wade: All right.

2. Request to change regular meeting of the December 28, 2018 to December 21, 2018.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, next is the request to change the regular meeting of the December 28th, 2018 to December 21st, 2018. Has everybody looked at their schedules already?

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah, I'm not going to be here both days.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Lindsey: 21st is better for me. I'll be gone on the 28th.

Ms. Ridao: I'm fine.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I'm fine. I usually take vacation in December and I'm home anyways so it's usually fine for me.

Ms. Lindsey: Thursday, I'd prefer, but I can do Friday.

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah, Thursday I can. Thursday I can do.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Can you do Thursday the 20th? That depends on whether this meeting room is available, correct.

Ms. Wade: Leilani, can you tell? She's pulling it up.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: She's doing her --. She's searching. She's doing it already. As long as we all agree.

Ms. Lindsey: I can do in the morning too; I don't have a baby sister.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: We like our other Commissioner here. She hasn't voted yet. She usually votes at some point. So, the December 20th look all okay for you or --? Yeah, it's looks okay for me. Gwen, would that work for you?

Ms. Hiraga: December 20th, it should be okay.

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

Ms. Hiraga: In the morning. Oh, okay, what time?

Ms. Wade: 9:00 a.m.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: 9:00 a.m.

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah, can. Good.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay. Can you get us two hour at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday? Okay, good. So without objection we have moved the meeting, regular meeting of December 28th to Thursday, December 20th at 9:00 a.m. here at the Planning Commission Conference Room. Good.

The regular meeting of December 28, 2018 is rescheduled to Thursday, December 20, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in the Planning Department's Conference Room.

D. OLD 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. [PROPOSED AMENDMENTS AND CORRESPONDING MAP](#)**

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, let's move on to Old Business, or Unfinished Business. We got to change that from that to unfinished business. Presentation of the proposed amendments to the

Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning and Development Code, Article II Zoning Districts. And I think you have that sheet with you. So Erin, can you take us through this?

Ms. Wade: I would love to. Okay, so just a refresher, we are talking about adjusting the commercial mixed use district specifically. In the beginning, the uses, the only changes would be eliminating adult establishment and changing the terminology to bars and taverns. The numbering got off on that, so I'll be adjusting that numbering for the final draft. And then taking the...telecommunications and broadcasting antenna, the most popular application in the redevelopment area in the last four years, which currently requires a public hearing process even when folks are just replacing antenna panels and ended up being a lot more cumbersome process than I think we all felt it needed to be so we've moved that from being an MRA use permit, to now being under administrative review permit.

Then, we've also added a short-term rental as a use within the use district, and rather than duplicating the rest of the County's procedure for short-term rentals, we've referred uses for short-term rental to the Title 19, Zoning Code, of the short-term rentals. So it would basically be kicked out of the redevelopment agency and just operate through Planning Department, any short-term rentals is the way that it would function. Essentially that's a whole lot of work, in and of itself, the short-term rental management, so it seemed like that's not really our priority at this time that we'll move it back to Planning.

And then the section that's most significantly altered is the Development Standards, so as you'll see there's a whole lot that's been retracted in the Development Standards. In, in lieu of what was there prior, we've identified several block face types. So in talking about how do we want the area to redevelop, we identified three zones that makes sense for different development standards. So the first, and if you're looking at page-7 which has the new table proposing heights and setbacks. We've identified Commercial Type A Block Face as what's shown on the map in green. So this is the area that would be the most intense, the most intensely potentially redeveloped, allowing for six-stories and 82-feet in height. We did, in this table, replicate front, side, and rear setbacks, as it was in the previous version of the Zoning and Development Code, with the exception of front for the first and second floor which we added five-feet to that. The primary reason of requesting a five-foot additional setback where in most cases you do want the building set right up to the sidewalk on the sidewalk edge. But the issue throughout these areas is almost everywhere you see that's shown in green it joins a State highway and there isn't adequate sidewalk width now. So the goal is to provide that additional sidewalk width by having the building setback an additional five-feet, on the frontage, on the, on the prime frontage.

Then we have, and this is the case in the existing zoning, is a 10-foot setback at the third floor, and another 20 at the fourth. That is -- I'm sorry, not another 20, and 20. So it's not 20 on top of that, it's 20 total. The building that reflects this stacking as I call it, like, wedding caking, would be the Main Street Promenade Building. If you're familiar with that, how it comes up and then it pulls away at different heights. I did just simply repeat this that expectation in this segment. And I'll show you in a minute, I asked a couple of folks who are actively working to design projects to try to meet this development code...and it doesn't necessarily work. It doesn't work well I should say as, as, having the 10-foot and 20-foot stepped backs. So I'll show you another alternative in a second to the Type A Block Face.

Type B is the area in blue. What we did was we reduced the minimum lot width to be more consistent with what's actually on Market Street. So you think of Market Street as the typical for the Type B Block Face. A lot of those building frontages are very small, and it doesn't make sense to intentionally prohibit them from investing in their properties. So we made the minimum lot width smaller. We kept the zero-lot line frontage just like Market Street has today. It adjoins the sidewalk directly.

And then for the third and fourth floor, we again kept the 10-foot and 20-foot stepped backs which may or may not be necessary. I mean, again, I'll show you the alternative. And then for C --. And that's three-stories or 46-feet. That is what Market Street currently is and all of the area shown in blue, so that, that's the development standard for those.

For Commercial Type Face, Block Face C, 25-foot minimum lot width and this is -- now we're looking at the orange areas, so upper Vineyard in particular, and then several areas on Wells Street, the Church Street on the Waikapu side as well. So again looking for some expansion of the sidewalk width by adding the five-foot minimum setback in those areas. 10-foot, and 20-foot stepped backs which again I'm going to propose an alternative. And then maximum height of four-stories or 58-feet. So this is, this is what's currently allowed actually everywhere but what's shown in blue. So this isn't actually a new proposal. The only place that we're suggesting to go to a height increase is the area shown in green. Okay.

Just to skip ahead because I've teased you now with maybe not needing to do the stepped backs. So I did ask three folks who are making --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Excuse me? Can I ask a question?

Ms. Wade: Oh sure.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: We had a presentation on this earlier in a sense, did we not?

Ms. Wade: We did.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: That kind showed that part of the reason for these setbacks often times is that you just don't get cookie cutter buildings that are sort of block shape. There's some architecture to them, and then also concerns about view planes as well.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So what we're going to see now is sort of an alternative so people can actually still keep some space that was useable because some of these setbacks are unreasonable considering how we're configured in Wailuku. Is this my understanding?

Ms. Wade: Yes, you're taking me exactly where we need to go.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: So you had asked for a more specific example or images that would illustrate what

we're trying to accomplish. So instead of having --. So I'm going to show you the one that the folks that had done a massing study recently, okay. So this shows -- and this reflects, what I'm showing here in B, and this is on the back page. So you have the Development Standards on -- in the table on one page. The very next page, on the back, it says B, Exposure to Sky, Upper Story Mass Reduction. Okay. Which was intended to be potentially an alternative to the development standards. The way that it's written now, it's, you have to do both. But this project does meet the exposure to sky, the way that this massing study is showing, okay. So this isn't exactly any -- this isn't exactly how any project is going to come to you, but this is an illustration of how it could be massed.

So this is an example at the corner of Main and Market. If you have the 20% clear sky. So these lots are 20,552 square feet, okay, in terms of lot size. So, 25% of the lot area would be 5,632. This has 5,715 square feet of clear sky area, so it exceeds the 25% clear space as it's being shown. Okay.

If you look, this is, this would be like a view from Market Street so you see it's, it's setback a bit from the buildings looking at Market Street, and this, this --. Actually I should go back to this side because the 25% applies to frontage along the street. It doesn't apply to the interior property lines. It applies to the frontage of the street. So if --. Actually...this is the one that I wanted you to look at. So you can see on the ground floor this would be looking up Main Street on the left, and you see the ground floor essentially acts like a podium that the upper level sit on top of so the upper levels could be setback away. Now when you try to bump in an additional 10-foot which was what was being asked, so this sort of divides the -- it divides the pie a little bit where instead of it being the 10-foot setback at the second and third, and then 20-foot at the upper levels, the whole thing is setback 15. So the first floor is at five, everything above that is at 15 which does meet the 25% open sky requirement. So if you're -- except, with the exception of the balconies. So the balconies are projecting into the required setback area.

So what I wanted you to see with this because this isn't something --. I was messing around and trying to do things in Photoshop and it just wasn't illustrating what I felt like you needed in terms of information to make a clear decision about what works for the text here. What I feel like this illustrates is having -- pulling the building back from the building edge, you can envision if the edge of that building was right up to the frontage and how that does pinch the view a little bit, and how giving that upper floor some space at the upper level opens up the view a little bit as we're trying to do with the -- that's the intention of having the upper story floor stepped backs. One of the things that I noticed with this conceptual massing study was that the balconies go a long way to breaking up the building mass. And as I was reading through our requirements and there wasn't an allowance for something like a balcony, after I saw this, I thought that balconies or eyebrows or frontage a way to undulate the building planes basically on the front would go a long way to helping. Because when there are floors that have just -- and again, it's just purely conceptual -- but when there are long expanses of just flat space, I think it starts to look like it doesn't fit as well. Whereas when we give the opportunity for more flexibility with the architecture it makes it, it makes it fit better.

So for me what I'd like to do, you know, I'd like to hear from you folks whether you would like to stick specifically to the development standards table, or go exclusively to exposure to sky, or give people the option. I mean, that's the other thing that we could do is utilize this table as the

foundation, and then have an exception where if this table doesn't work for the development project, alternatively they could utilize this exposure to sky and accomplish the same thing essentially, not having us prescribe the setbacks for them, but meeting the exceptions of what we're trying to do with that. So maybe I could take feedback on that section, and then we can move on to the other -- the rest of it.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Commissioner Ridao?

Ms. Ridao: Thank you Chair. Yeah, I think I like giving the developer an alternative because I'm thinking in my mind sometimes you have a really small lot and they're going to need flexibility in order to create that building.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Ridao: And Wailuku is full of small lots, so yeah I like the alternative.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Ms. Ridao: Suggestion.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Commissioner Hiraga, it looked like you were ready to say something.

Ms. Hiraga: No, I'm fine.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Is that pretty much the consensus then that . . . (inaudible. Multiple speakers) . . . ?

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

Ms. Wade: Okay. So I would like then to suggest that we move that Exposure to Sky up to right below where this Development Standards table is, and maybe in this minimum setback section I put this asterisk and I refer to that below and say alternative to set and stepped backs.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: And then still keep the heading, Exposure to Sky -- Upper Story Mass Reduction, because that explains why. Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Can I, can I ask a question that is totally off out of left field, okay? I told you I got pulled into a meeting on community plans and, yeah, all those designations, and they keep mentioning the zoning study, okay, that's going on right now with the consultant. And we've talked about before about trying to piggyback our changes on to that whole effort so we're not trying to compare, but it's actually an integral part of what's being changed. Where is that right now because I'm looking at this and we're making changes, and I'm saying, okay, so how does it fit in with that process?

Ms. Wade: A really good question. So the Department did not get fully funded for the zoning rewrite first of all. So they're trying to figure out whether they're going to go out to bid with partial rewrite or to wait and try it to the next fiscal year and try to get fully funded. And then secondly even if they start the rewrite process, it's a good three to four to five years before a brand new zoning code gets adopted. And given that we've -- we're going to light a fire under the neighborhood with the project that we're moving forward. A lot of projects are going to come in right now, so if we're still using our zoning code that doesn't work for them, I think it's probably worth our time to at least tweak it and make it the best we can for -- and just by amending it. But simultaneously, we can participate in all of the -- as the zoning rewrite project moves forward, I think we will be participating in that. It's just, we probably shouldn't wait for them.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, good, good, I agree. Thank you for answering that question. At least it's on the record.

Ms. Wade: Yes. Moving then to --. Were there any other questions about Development Standards?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Are there any other questions?

Ms. Wade: Were there any other concerns about height? You're seeing, you're seeing in this what the six-story looks like. Okay, Design Requirements is the next section. So what we go into here is parking not being permitted in the setbacks that adjoin -- that are between a building and public street. This is already in the guidelines, but to give it additional teeth we've moved it up and put it in the Zoning and Development Code. So if you weren't going to do this, it would clearly be a variance process.

No less than 60% of any building façade fronting a public street shall be transparent. That's the goal of as you're walking down the street, being able to see in and out of the buildings.

No. 3, buildings must have at least one ground floor pedestrian entrance from an adjoining street. In all cases, ground floor transparent glass shall possess a minimum of 0.65 light transmission factor. And this is so you don't get people covering the windows and not, you know, being able to look in. So it's just blacked out essentially. So that's the goal is to maintain transparency. And the one question about that, and this, you know, these properties and there's a lot of corners actually that we're going to be dealing with in this redevelopment process, a lot of round corners. So as an example, this isn't showing an entrance directly on Main. It is showing an entrance at the corner of Main and Market, so I wonder maybe we're penciling, or brushing ourselves into a corner by requiring it on all street frontages. This one happens to be on three corners. You know, have three street frontages. Do they really need one on Market, Main, and Maluhia? Maybe not. So that might be something. Even for us with the Wailuku Civic Center, you know, thinking about it's on, it's on Vineyard and Church. There will be entrances on Vineyard and Church, but then we also have entrances on the plaza side making for a very complicated back of house experience. You know, as we're designing the building, the trash pickup, the propane gas, all of those things that you have to have a space for have, we've had to make some -- really put our architects to the tests finding space for that. So and there's going to be, because of the small block, there's going to be a lot of that, so maybe we dial back on the required -- just a suggestion -- ground floor entrance per each adjoining street...or, or at corners. Maybe, maybe

we could say if there's an entrance at an intersection or corner that it could be considered to serve both street frontages or something like that. Okay. I don't know.

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

Ms. Lindsey: I don't like it that it fronts every street, but I think at the corner would balance it out.

Ms. Wade: So it could be every street or at a corner?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Okay. Next on Design Requirements, buildings located within 5 to 15 feet of the property line for at least 70% of the lot frontage along all streets. So requiring that buildings aren't set way back from the street frontage. Buildings may be setback up to 20-feet from the property line within the required built-to area if the stepped back -- setback area is designated for outdoor seating. So it does allow for café opportunity outdoor seating if they wanted to set their building back to do so.

Residential housing and hotels may not adjoin the ground floor at grade level in Commercial Type A or B Block Face areas. And we talked about this the last how for privacy reasons you don't want a hotel room looking directly in. You don't want to look directly into a hotel room from your sidewalk and have it be at grade height. You want to elevate it a bit.

And then in Commercial Type C Block Face areas, living units may be located on the first floor, but must be elevated above street level a minimum of four-feet above existing grade. And this is really typical if you've seen a brownstone unit or, you know, anywhere that you go in the country that has older housing and you're going up a series of steps, a few steps, to get to the, the main level. It's a very typical residential experience in an urban neighborhood.

First floor living units shall also be setback from sidewalk at a minimum of 10-feet with a landscaped buffer. Stairways, porches, window alcoves, awnings, and sunshade may extend into the required setback. So that kind of gets to what I was talking about for, not the residential units, but for a project like, like this one that's in -- it's not in Type C, it's in Type A -- but we might have some things that we also want to allow to exist within the setback area. So we've created a path to do that in Block Type C. I don't know if you folks also had interest in doing something similar in Block Type A because I actually think this covering is not going to meet the five-foot setback and we don't necessarily want it to. We would like --. I don't know that actually, but I'm making an assumption. If this doesn't meet the five foot setback. But the goal is that you can pull in and you're out of the rain, you know. So to serve its purpose it probably can't meet that. So I'm curious if you would be interested and willing to allow some alternatives like we do in commercial Type C for things that would project into, and if there were specific requirements that we should attach to that.

Ms. Hiraga: I'm okay with alternatives if I'm offering alternatives.

Ms. Wade: Okay. Something --. Go ahead.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I think a lot of this sometimes is by a case by case bases wouldn't it be, you know, when we're looking at the project?

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So, so, we can give them the alternatives, they can design it in, and then we can make a decision. Is that what we're trying to do here?

Ms. Wade: Yes. Okay, I like where you're going with this because the way that we phrased it -- and I might need to expand this too in the Block Face C, where we say, may extend into the required setback.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: And we could say, dependent on MRA design review.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: Which gives you folks flexibility to decide if it's appropriate or not.

Ms. Ridaio: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Okay. So maybe we'll say something similar. I'll include another design standard in here for Type A and B, and say that there could be architectural features such as, and I'll list, you know, like balconies, or eyebrows, or awnings, that kind of a thing that may extend into the required setback, subject to MRA design review.

Okay, now we've covered the Exposure to Sky, we moved it to Design Standards. (C) is the Open Space Incentive. So this is zoning lots larger than 8,500 square feet 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 provided, a 1,000 square feet of building area may be added on an additional story. In no case shall the building exceed eight-stories in height, or 106-feet. As you do know we do have eight-story buildings in the district now. The Wailuku Townhomes is eight-stories. The...the Maui Realty Suites is effectively, I mean, it's practically only six-stories, but it is, if you include the grade change there, about 100 feet in height from, from the lower end to the upper end. So height wise, massing wise, it's about the same as those, those two buildings in consideration. Obviously the County Building is nine-stories, 10 if you count the additional space in the Council Chambers so. We had talked about this in order to allow for more ground level open space because as you start to build out any little pockets of green space and gathering space, it starts to become very heavily utilized. And so the more that we can incentivize people to develop that or utilize that on their property the better we felt. And so -- but to do that, we kind of got to give them an incentive. As we've been finding out with the development, if you're, if you're building more than four-stories in height or -- yes -- if you're not going to use wood construction -- you're moving away from the wood construction, you're going to add additional height, the cost per unit gets a lot higher. So what we want to do is to be able

to offset that by giving people additional height and making the units buildable and creating opportunities for affordable housing and other types of housing units. But if we don't --. But then if we create too much height and there's no ground floor open space, you've created an unlivable district so trying to give the people option to either go low and long, or high and would create open space. I have a better graphic than I'm describing it actually. Where's that thing? Here; so it's essentially a floor area ratio on just moving what would be floor area ratio from ground level to upper level is the bonus that we're offering not to exceed eight, eight-stories.

Zoning lots that are 8,500 square feet or less may be exempted from upper story mass reduction when publically accessible open space is provided continuous to a right of way. So that means blocks like -- Market Street doesn't work because it's got a much lower height limit. Or would it work? Sorry, I'm just processing. The open space must be no less than 15% of the buildable lot area and may be at least 15-feet wide by 15-feet deep. The upper story mass reduction exemption may be directly proportional to the amount of open space provided. So again, you know, the, the upper story mass reduction exemption -- so that's what this is doing is it's, it's basically a get out of jail free card for the upper story mass requirement if they're providing the open space at the ground level.

Okay, and then finally parking, porte cochere, required setback areas and loading zones shall not be considered open space. So we want it to be functional and useable for people. Open space must contain landscaping and trees. Okay.

Are there any questions on the Open Space Incentive?

Ms. Lindsey: I'm wondering about courtyards. So because it could look like a block from the outside with a whole open space in the middle.

Ms. Wade: Gwen, could slide her mic closer please? I can't quite hear you. I don't want you to wake up baby, but --. Thank you.

Ms. Lindsey: I'm wondering about courtyards.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Lindsey: Like having a whole open space in the middle versus -- and so from the outside you'd see a box.

Ms. Wade: You'd just see the building, right. You wouldn't see the courtyard.

Ms. Lindsey: The inside, you would see the courtyard. But that wouldn't -- I feel that wouldn't really benefit the public.

Ms. Wade: Yes. Okay. Which is why I didn't include it in the first place. I mean I can if you think that it's of enough public benefit that we want to give them an incentive.

Ms. Lindsey: No, I'm just wondering about this because it's like 50% lot coverage on the two-stories, if the roadside were on the street -- if the street were on the top side, then you'd just see

the building. You wouldn't see -- you know what I mean -- which would be allowed here, right? They would have the incentive. They would get the incentive so they could go higher, but the public wouldn't get the benefit.

Ms. Wade: That's actually a really good point because there's a lot of those situations in Wailuku today where, you know, like the, the big ficus tree that's in back of North Shore Hostel, right? So it has that little alley and you go back there and there's this beautiful open courtyard.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Courtyard, but nobody knows it's there.

Ms. Wade: Right. Unless you know, then, it's great, right.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Unless you know, exactly. You don't want anybody else to know because it will get crowded.

Ms. Wade: But potentially it's, it's --. Well, I would say it's probably not as valuable as, as open space adjoining a public right of way. But it might be -- it's of some value, you know. So is that kind of the direction you're going that maybe we acknowledge?

Ms. Lindsey: Yeah, is that okay, or not okay, or whatever, to their own --?

Ms. Wade: So allowing for an interior courtyard.

Ms. Lindsey: Or not allowing a courtyard.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Then you get into the definition of public space, right? If they -- if there was, let's say, a courtyard in the middle of something, but it was open to the public versus now it's becoming a private enclave just for the people who live in the building. Is that what you're getting at?

Ms. Lindsey: Yeah. Well, because like the public, for example, up Main Street, they would see the frontage, and you know, they would see up to lao which is . . . (inaudible. Multiple speakers)
. . .

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Lindsey: But if, if the open space is on the backside, they're not going to be able to see up to lao, but they can have the eight-foot building.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Well, and not today because right now it says it has to adjoin a public right of way, right? Does it?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: I thought it did.

Mr. Hiraga: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, contiguous through a public right of way.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Not that we want to discourage --

Ms. Lindsey: The pockets are pretty cool, to me.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, but hopefully, I mean, hopefully whomever is developing will see that as a benefit. Because they can monetize it and do whatever -- I mean, it becomes an amenity, a private amenity then essentially that would have to --

Ms. Lindsey: But the public wouldn't benefit by seeing the view, you know, the open space.

Ms. Wade: Right. Okay, so no change then. Is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Leave it as is. Okay. Is there anything else that we should consider addressing in here...that I have overlooked? And then you might have members of the public that would want to testify, Chair. Potentially you might have a member of the public that wants to comment on the --?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So should we have a public hearing on this or --?

Ms. Wade: Yes, we will. But I have to publically notice that. So this will go back to Corp Counsel for review and edits, and any formatting changes that need to be made, and then we can publish the public hearing notice and it will be on your agenda again prior to approving it. So this isn't an approval; this is still just a discussion document.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Lindsey: Are you saying there's a testifier?

Ms. Wade: I don't know. Is there?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, there we go. Oh, yeah, go ahead. Identify yourself and then --

Mr. Morgan Gerdel: My name is Morgan Gerdel. I'm an architect. I work and live in Wailuku. I was kind of reading through the draft, and I just noticed some things I just wanted to comment on.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Gerdel: It has the description for the 70% frontage for adjacent roadways, and that might be

difficult if it's a smaller building. You may not be able to actually cover 70% of the frontage of the roadway like with a corner lot or something so.

Ms. Wade: Could you --? Chair, could I ask the testifier to identify the location in the ordinance section that he's referring to?

Mr. Gerdel: That is Design Requirements, A.4., I think. So buildings located within five to 15 feet of the property line for at least 70% of the lot frontage. I guess the 70% might be difficult if it's a small building.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Gerdel: And then also related to the setback requirements. I guess traditionally a lot of urban buildings have kind of a zero side setback because they're built next to each other, so you may want to allow that to cover more of the street frontage, to become more of a traditional look. And then maybe just have the setbacks on the front and rear potentially.

And then for the map, I was kind of looking at the different colors, and it might be useful to do a map where it's by parcel and you look at the heights by parcels because some areas like they have two different heights on the same parcels and that would be tricky to design around.

And then, I guess, the other way kind of looking at the design of projects is maybe looking at the design guidelines because a lot of the questions kind of really to the massing could be described in the design guidelines and addressed there versus having a set setback. And maybe some projects work really well stepping back 10-feet, but maybe other projects make sense just to have a straight wall and have more detailing architecturally so that, I think, will give more flexibility to the lot owners and designers that way.

And then for the Design Requirements A.6. I like the concept of the elevated living units, but I think the challenge will be keeping accessibility for those units with a four-foot grade change because like if you have an accessible unit it would be difficult to get there. You'd need an elevator or a separate entrance or something to try to get to that unit so. Yeah, those are all the comments I have.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Gerdel: Oh, and I guess this is kind of a general comment. I've been working with a lot owner, looking at doing apartments on a lot in this area and I know it's the challenge of providing parking on the site because all the lots are very small, so maybe one way to think about the parking is it's -- I don't know, it could be something that it's kind of an exception providing onsite parking because the lots are so small versus a standard. But, if there's a way to look at using the future parking structure, other ways to achieve the parking requirements, that would be helpful.

Ms. Wade: So true.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, good. Thank you Morgan.

Mr. Gerdel: Thanks.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I would have to think that one through.

Ms. Wade: Chair, the parking section as you know we amended in 2015. But now that the construction of the parking structure is eminent, I think, the testifier is absolutely right. It's going to be important for us to be ready with changes potentially as developers are coming in with projects. So, we are incentivizing and asking folks to be coming in, to be building during the construction window where we're planning and immediately following. So even though we don't have a parking structure today, it probably does make sense for us to amend the section of the parking code to anticipate that future condition. Even if it -- it might cause some short term additional parking challenges, but we're creating a shuttle, so maybe we can offset that in the, in the meantime. And if you're interested, that could be the next section that I could take a look at.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Any comments? Yeah, I think we should take a look at it, but if we have to look at it very cautiously and very, you know --. This parking lot is not going to be an answer to everybody's parking problems in the middle of Wailuku, and we don't want to give it that impression that if you're going to develop something, oh, we can just rely on the parking lot over in Wailuku. I don't think that's the message we want to send out personally. So...that's my opinion on it.

Ms. Wade: There is now too the option for utilizing offsite parking. For anyone today can utilize offsite parking within a certain radius, so -- and that was intended because of the small lot sizes. But for, as the testifier brings up, for residences, it's one of those things that you want certainty. If you're going to own or rent a unit, you're going to want to know you have a place to park so it might be something that we look to, you know, identify in more specificity in the future.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, and I would agree with that, that's something we have to look at carefully in terms of use and availability.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. Okay. If the --. The, you know, testifier did bring up on no. 4, the 70% of the lot frontage and thinking about, you know, a good example might be that corner of Vineyard and Market. It's the lower building. Joe Blackburn's building as an example. If I'm thinking about what is 70% of the lot frontage along all streets, and that the building has to be located five to 15 feet along the property line, we did just approve a parking lot expansion for him on that side, and I'm wondering now, given this specific requirement we've stated here, would I have been able to do that if this requirement was in place. So maybe, maybe this is, maybe potentially -- I mean, and you're welcome to reflect on this too -- maybe this is redundant with the design guidelines. Maybe it's unnecessary for us to be this specific in this place. I can pull up Joe's building if you're interested just for a frame of reference.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Reference.

Ms. Wade: Sometimes I've been finding as we've been working through these scenarios that it's always helpful to think of a real world example to test it on. I'm so glad he was able to fix the internet. Okay. Oh, we're in his shop. That's what I get for --. Here we go. Okay, so with

this really small building frontage requiring --. And for this --. Oh wait. So this is all the building there is at this point. This does not encompass 70% of the frontage along the street, right, so this is not even half of the frontage on the street. So essentially this section makes this scenario nonconforming, you know. So the testifier's point is well taken that I don't know that we want to create conditions where we're making what is today allowed a nonconforming.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Nonconforming. Okay, yeah, makes sense.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, so maybe we just eliminate that...section.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Good add Morgan. Okay. And then the comment about the accessibility is absolutely correct. It does, for no. 6, it does limit accessibility or would require you to have a ground floor entrance if we're requiring the residences to be up four feet -- residential units to be up four feet. It would require you to have a second entrance with an elevator, you know, if it was going to be elevated above. Or, alternatively, it could be setback a minimum of 10-feet, you know, so if it's setback and there's a landscape buffer. So maybe just ensuring that that is worded correctly so that it's not confusing. So that they know you can either be elevated and on the, on the edge of the sidewalk or you can be setback no less than 10-feet. Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: Okay. Are there any other changes that I should be making at this stage?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay. Yes?

Ms. Lindsey: I like the zero-lot line. I like the zero-lot line that you brought up.

Ms. Wade: Having the zero-lot line, you like that?

Ms. Lindsey: And the sides, yeah. Do we have that?

Ms. Wade: We have that --. Actually that's a good point. So we could -- what might be worthwhile is segmenting again here. So we have front, side and rear all lumped into one single category.

Ms. Hiraga: It should be separated.

Ms. Wade: Okay, we'll break that out. So supportive of zero-lot line on side, and rear also or not rear?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: You have a thought?

Ms. Lindsey: I need to see -- I need to think of an example. I know the side, for sure. Yeah, I can't think of anything for the rear.

Ms. Hiraga: Chair?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Go.

Ms. Hiraga: . . . (inaudible) . . . front, side, rear, then we see the zeros, and we see the numbers. It makes more sense.

Ms. Wade: Okay. Sure. I'm going to keep rear at five-feet for now, and then you can, you can -- yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: It's always easier if we can see something that --

Ms. Wade: I know.

Ms. Hiraga: Visual.

Ms. Wade: It's a complicated table. I'm trying to think of how I'm going to break this out, but we'll figure that part out. Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Because the table can't...account for every contingency. You get what I'm saying?

Ms. Wade: That's right. Could I return to the map, please, Chair? The testifier made a really good point about the fact that there could be split heights on some of it and...I'm not exactly sure how to get around that given there's multiple frontages, you know, so like as the example at I'll use right here at Church and Vineyard. This upper corner of Church and Vineyard which poses a complicated situation where we have the taller height limits along Church and then the lower height limits along Vineyard.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: And it's a single TMK. This whole thing right here is a single TMK. What should I - -? I'm going to go up the block here, just drive us up there real quick. So looking at this, so this property goes from here all the way to the end of this building. And then it goes from here all the way to this building edge. Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: That's a single TMK?

Ms. Wade: That's a single TMK.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Wow.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. So -- and right now we have this frontage and this frontage looking differently. So going back to the map, again, that's here, we have the lower height limit going all the way to the corner.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: And the taller height limit setback a little ways from the corner and coming down this way. But that would mean then back to, back to this that essentially this segment stays lower, and this segment on the interior goes up. Oh actually, I did that intentionally now that I remember because of this view.

Ms. Lindsey: I think we talked about it when you --

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: About that, yeah.

Ms. Wade: We did. Yeah. We talked about that. But functionally though, and this is going to be complicated, is defining where that line actually is. Is it right at the end of this building? And legally, now I'm worried about the map, you know. Because right now we have a very just crude map that indicates the edges. And I've been meaning to adjust this, but if it's not following property line specifically. I think I'll have to talk to Corp Counsel about this, how to cite this.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Commissioner Hiraga.

Ms. Hiraga: And I think that the testifier mentioned about showing it by lots.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yes, that's what he said, yeah.

Ms. Wade: Okay. All right.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So there was a method to your madness in terms of view planes, right?

Ms. Wade: There was when I was making this map, and that was like three and a half months ago, so, and it doesn't do anybody any good if it's just a map as they're looking at it and understanding why, you know. So, okay, I'll set up an appointment to talk with Corp Counsel about the best way to set up the map, I think, and then we can figure out so that --. Would you folks be comfortable with us posting for public hearing prior to you seeing a final version of this map? Could I post prior to that and then we can --? Because you can always extend if you're not ready to approve at the public hearing. You can always have additional meetings if you're not ready. Because otherwise the next time you see this it's going to be at the public hearing.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Commissioner Hiraga.

Ms. Hiraga: I don't want to delay the progress, but what -- when are you looking to having this public hearing?

Ms. Wade: We can still make it for the October meeting, but not by a lot.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: What's the notice period?

Ms. Wade: We might not. Actually not if, not if I have to . . . (inaudible. Multiple speakers.)

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: 30-days I thought, right?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. So not if I amend the map we can't, so that will be the November meeting, the public hearing.

Ms. Hiraga: I mean, I, I would be okay, you know, it's to get input and it might give us some insight, you know, to what the community wants, so I'm fine.

Ms. Wade: Well I could --. We could then actually if we're not going to do the public hearing until November, we could post the map for the next agenda. I can work with Corp Counsel. The map could be agenda next time.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, I think, I think I feel more comfortable with that, yeah.

Ms. Wade: And that gives us better certainty of getting through the public hearing with an approval or, you know, decision at the end of that discussion.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, I'd rather do something that's close to what we want at the public hearing so it doesn't become just sort of a, you know, let's see what people have to say about something that we haven't really kind of thought through so.

Ms. Hiraga: Yeah. Because then Morgan will come and testify on the same thing he did today.

Ms. Wade: Really good point.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: This is why we have public testimony; so we get input.

Ms. Wade: And it's much appreciated when it's somebody who's got the level of expertise he does. It's great. Okay. All right, that's all I have on this item, Chair.

E. DEPARTMENT UPDATE

1. Southwest Parking & Transportation Association (SWPTA) 2018 Annual Fall Conference

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, so let's move on to Department Updates. Parking conference?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, I've given you a whole lot of information. I will say we formed sort of an allegiance now with Park City, Utah; Monterey, California; San Bernardino. There's about a dozen of municipalities that also attended the conference that are in the process of going through either developing paid parking, or developing garages and things like that so it's been excellent in terms of finding our peers, you know, who are going through this process right now.

One of the things I learned though none of the peers, my peers that were at the conference were, still retained their economic development or redevelopment hat. They were all now parking managers. So most communities when you're developing a parking system have a not -- maybe just one position, maybe a whole division dedicated to parking management because it includes your enforcement, it includes finance, it includes...what was the third one? Personnel, when our case, we'll be dealing with employee parking. So often housed under Department of Management, or under the city manager's office in most of them, but typically there's a parking division. So moving into next budget season, that might be something that we identify also as we're looking at the enforcement position that's being added that we also look at a primary person who's going to manage all of these contracts because there's going to be a series of contracts to manage as well.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So has there been talks with the Police Department about the enforcement side?

Ms. Wade: Yes, yeah. Extensive. Police is all for it. Plus police is very supportive of this. So that was kind of my big takeaway. I do have about seven pages of notes from this which I'll give you copies of. And at the next meeting, if there's anything in particular to highlight, I'll, I'll show you that at the next meeting.

2. Final EA Status

Ms. Wade: The Final EA draft; so the comment period is currently closed. We're in the process of responding to all of the comments that came in and we'll be publishing the Final EA at the second posting in October, so that's October 23rd.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, just for interest sake, would you characterize the number of comments in the dozens or --

Ms. Wade: Oh yeah. I mean, well, every agency we sent to replied.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: You know, and that's typical. And a bunch of them just replied with, we have no comment at this time.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: The substantive comments aren't anything that really affect the design. They're all comments that affects the way we go about the construction specs. You know, what the, what the storm water management is going to be, and things like that. So the specs for the construction is primarily what they addressed, and so we're going through and detailing how those are all going to be addressed as the project moves forward. There's nothing substantive that changes any direction at this point for the project.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Good.

3. Wailuku Civic Complex Phasing

Ms. Wade: And then the Civic Complex Phasing. So we'll be going out to bid for Phase 1A. Pre-bid will be the first week of October. And Phase 1A is the roads with a closing date the second week of November. We do not need to encumber the money before the end of the fiscal year, so we do have some time. We're not going to be forcing a contract.

And then Phase 1B which is the parking structure we'll be ready to bid in December if anybody's around. We're debating right now whether we do go out to bid in December or we wait until the New Year. It will depend on...it will depend on whether our documents are ready. Our documents are pretty darn close so we could actually move up the bid timing, but we're thinking it's going to be a very busy time of year, so I don't know if it's a good idea. But I'll keep you posted on that.

Everything in the bidding is accessible online on the County's website so we --. And now I can send you the link so that if you start to get asked you know where they're seeing these bids coming out and what's been posted.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And we'll be closer to what the actual costs will be, in other words, correct?

Ms. Wade: In this bid?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: When it's bid.

Ms. Wade: Well, so our most recent cost estimate that came back has Phase 1A at \$9.7 million.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Right.

Ms. Wade: It has Phase 1B at \$27.8 million. So that's the parking structure. Yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And the most expensive part is going to be the --

Ms. Wade: The civic building, plaza, and landscaping. Yeah.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Civic and plaza, okay.

Ms. Wade: And we're going to work on that. We're doing a little bit of value engineering right now so I don't even want you to see that cost estimate.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Wade: We're going to do some refinements. Still keeping high quality, but being smart about where the money's getting spent.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: And per our last discussion, we'll also be in discussion after the election with our elected representatives in terms of a State contribution for this?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. So that's the other pitch that we need to make very soon, and you'll be seeing the MRA's annual report. We have to make an annual report to Council every year so I'll have that for you for the October meeting. And that essentially we're going to condense that down, which will become the pitch to the State for funding.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, good.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

F. NEXT REGULAR MEETING: October 26, 2018

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Thank you. Okay, so our -- I think that's it.

Ms. Wade: That's it for me.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: So our next regular meeting is going to be --

Ms. Lindsey: While we're on, while we're at the conference.

Ms. Hiraga: Do you want to change the date?

Ms. Wade: Don't we come back on the -- we're back on the Friday, right?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: No, we're back on Saturday aren't we?

Ms. Hiraga: You're not going to be here.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: We're not going to be here.

Ms. Wade: We're not going to be here.

Ms. Hiraga: It's the reason why I couldn't go too.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: That's right.

Ms. Wade: How did I miss that? We come -- you're right, the 27th.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, we leave the 22nd, so we get there the 23rd. We leave the 27th.

Ms. Wade: Do we want to bump up that meeting?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: The 19th?

Ms. Wade: Gosh none of our meeting times are working out this year.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I know. Can, can people make the 19th?

Ms. Wade: Is the room available first? The room's available. The 19th is fine with me.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: I can't on the 19th, I just remembered. I have the -- a conference that week.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah, that week is terrible actually. I'm like triple booked.

Ms. Hiraga: What is the following week after you get back?

Ms. Wade: In November, the 2nd?

Ms. Hiraga: Or, or another day.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah. Could we do like the 18th, on Thursday?

Ms. Wade: What looks good in terms of the use of the room?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Oh, no, I can't do that whole week. That's right. That will be shot for me the week before.

Ms. Ridaio: The week of the 28th.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Yeah. So could people do October 31st on Wednesday if the room is available?

Ms. Ridaio: Halloween day?

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Bring candy.

Ms. Ridaio: Come in costume.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: You're going to come in costume. Okay, I want to see that. I want to see that. That's actually worth it.

Ms. Wade: It's available you said Leilani on the 31st?

Ms. Hiraga: On the 31st?

Ms. Wade: That works for me.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Do one o'clock? One o'clock? Okay, sounds good to me.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Can you send out a reminder? I'm trying to put it on my calendar right now.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. We'll do an update, and we'll update the website too.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, good. So 1:00 p.m.

Ms. Wade: Okay, great.

Mr. De Rego, Jr.: Okay, so in that case, if there's no further discussion, we'll adjourn the meeting.

G. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion brought before the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Frank De Rego, Jr., Chair
Gwen Hiraga
Ashley Lindsey, Vice-Chair
Jo-Ann Ridao

EXCUSED:

Maui Redevelopment Agency
Minutes -- September 21, 2018
Page 34

Keone Ball

OTHERS:

Erin Wade, Small Town Planner

Mimi Desjardins, Deputy Corporation Counsel