

**LANA`I PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 5, 2007**

Approved 10-03-07

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Lana`i Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Reynold “Butch” Gima at approximately 7:03 p.m., Wednesday, September 5, 2007, in the Lana`i High & Elementary School Cafeteria, 555 Fraser Avenue, Lana`i City, Lana`i.

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 15, 2007

Mr. Reynold “Butch” Gima: At this time, I’ll entertain a motion to approve the minutes of August 15, 2007.

Ms. Beverly Zigmond: I move that we approve the minutes of August 15, 2007.

Ms. Alberta de Jetley: Second.

Mr. Gima: It’s been moved by Commissioner Zigmond, and seconded by Commissioner de Jetley that we approve the minutes of August 15, 2007. Any discussions? Any corrections? Okay, hearing none, all in favor say aye.

Commission Members: “Aye.”

Mr. Gima: Oppose? Okay, motion is carried.

**It was moved by Commissioner Beverly Zigmond, seconded by
Commissioner Alberta de Jetley, then unanimously**

VOTED: To approve the minutes of August 15, 2007.

Mr. Gima: Okay, let’s see, I will now turn this over to John for the public hearing portion of the meeting.

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

- 1. MR. JEFFREY S. HUNT, AICP, Planning Director, transmitting the 2030 Countywide Policy Plan (Plan) to the Lana`i Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 2.80B of the Maui County Code. The Lana`i Planning Commission may review and provide recommendations on Section IV (Goals, Objectives, & Policies) of the Plan, which was revised to reflect the recommendations of the Maui, Molokai and Lana`i General Plan Advisory Committees. Emphasis will be placed on the revised Education and Social Service and Health Care Sections. (Plan was mailed previously. Commissioners: Please bring your copy. To view Section IV, (Goals, Objectives, & Policies) see Maui County website at: http://www.co.maui.hi.us/departments/Planning/pdf/Full_Directors_Report.pdf)**

- a. **Public Hearing**
- b. **Action**

Mr. John Summers: Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the Committee and the public. Thank you very much for attending tonight. We are very happy to be bringing you a very important piece of work for the County. This is the first product that we are updating as part of General Plan 2030. So this is the Countywide Policy document, and we've worked the last four months very hard on that with the General Plan Advisory Committees (GPAC.) Simone Bosco, of my staff, has a little power point here that will kind of summerize for you the process that has gone on to this point and what to expect going forward. So, again, I want to thank you very much on behalf of the Planning Department for your time and your commitment to this project. With that, Simone.

Ms. Simone Bosco: Thank you. Thank you members of the Commission. We are very glad to be here finally, and to be able to bring forward the draft Countywide Policy Plan which John explained is the first of a series of documents which comprise the General Plan Update for 2030.

I'm just going to go very briefly over a power point which I understand you all have already seen, but this is actually more for the benefit of the public too, to just come up to speed and kind of understand what we're doing here. I'm going to start with talking a little about the plan organization, the structure and the relationship of the Countywide Policy Plan to all the other documents that will be coming after it.

The Countywide Policy Plan is the very first document. It's an over-arching policy plan which addresses growth and development for the next 25 years, and it also applies to all the Islands. So, its intent is to provide an overall vision for the County and for all the Islands, and it's intended to inspire the entire County to work towards a set of goals, objectives and policies which are designed to lead the County through the next 25 years. So that's the time frame.

After the Countywide Policy Plan is – actually it's – well, once – the first document I should say is the Countywide Policy Plan, and after that we'll begin with the Maui Island Plan, which actually the GPAC's – the Maui Island GPAC's has started to look at now. And then, we will be shortly, thereafter, bringing the Moloka`i Community Plan and the Lana`i Community Plan to the outer islands as well. And then after the Moloka`i and Lana`i Community Plans, we will begin to update all the other Community Plans including Kahoolawe. And that would be the Makawao, Paia-Haiku, Kihei, Wailuku, Hana, and West Maui Community Plans which are basically the smaller communities of Maui.

The role of the Countywide Policy Plan according to Maui County Code 2.80B, again, it's an over-arching policy plan for all Islands. It provides a vision. It provides core principals and themes that the entire County can look to. A list of broad goals, objectives and policies which will be the focus of this Commission's review. And it creates a structure to develop the Island and Community Plans following this Plan. It will be successful to the extent that it reflects the needs and desires of the citizens of the entire County. And realistically, integrates and reflects the conditions, trends, dynamics, economic, and social

pressures that are brought about by change. And so we're trying to look at the past history and try and bring all that information forward and look to, you know, the next 25 years to see what are our next goals. Inspires consensus and cooperation among the various agencies, developers, citizens toward achieving those common goals.

As far as the Planning Commissions go, I wanted to just kind of touch on where we're at. Once again, if we looked at the entire process for this document and also for the other documents, we started earlier this year, in February, by bringing a draft policy plan to the General Plan Advisory Committees – all three of them – Moloka`i, Lana`i and Maui. They had four months to review the draft plan, comment on it, and provide recommendations to the Planning Director. And during that period of time we worked very closely with the GPACs to try and really, you know, retrieve and record their recommendations, and we – in your binders that we sent to you – we provided a pretty transparent record of what their recommendations were through that process. They went through several reviews. The second review was a voting of all of their recommendations. So in your binders you actually have record of the first review, with all their original comments and recommendations. And then the second review, where they took votes on every single statement that they wanted to support, and in your binder there, that record is called the final recommendation matrix. You'll see, it's kind of the second tap in. And that basically shows what the General Plan Advisory Committees – all three of them – voted to recommend as the draft's goals, policies and objective statements. So when you look through your binder and when you actually review – the draft plan that we're going to be reviewing, we encourage you to keep in mind what the General Plan Advisory Committees actually voted on. And if there's a policy that you want to look back and say how did the General Plan Advisory Committees voted on this – what were the differences in how they worded the language – it's there in your binder to refer to. Okay? And we also will be referring to it through our review process.

Coming back to the structure here, the process – after the General Plan Advisory Committees completed their review, the Planning Department took all those comments, compiled them, synthesized them, and brought the final recommendations forward which we've provided to you as well in the binder. We had 30-days to that, and then forward those recommendations on to the Planning Commissions. So that's the phase we're in right now. We're in another 120-day, four-month phase, which is intended, and actually it has to be a period where the Commissions review the objectives, goals and policies, visions and core values and principals, provide recommendations and then, actually, vote as well on the recommendations that they support. So through this review process that we'll be taking you through, we're actually going go through each statement very shortly here and ask you to take a look at it – look at if you agree with the statements – and we're going to go through the whole record and ask for your consensus on what you agree with and you vote to be approved, et cetera. I'll get to that in a minute. Anyway, after that 120-day period, we're going to need to come back and compile all the Planning Commission's comments and forward that to the County Council, and they have one-year to act on the draft plan and actually adopt it and enact it as law. Okay? So that's where we're at right now, and –.

The Commission's role then is to comment, advise and provide recommendations to the

Planning Director regarding the proposed revisions prepared and recommended by the Planning Director. And that's according to Maui County Code 2.80B. Okay? So that's your purview. And the time frame, again, is four-months, and we expect to wrap this up by December. Okay?

We did set a tentative schedule for the order of the review. There are a total of 11 sections that the Commissions need to work through. We expect that in order to make that four-month deadline, as a Commission, we'll need to cover at least two sections per meeting. Okay? And in the memo that I provided to you dated August 22nd – if you have it – there's a table. Okay, I don't know if you had a chance to look at it. And that table illustrates how much working time we expect the Lana`i Planning Commission to actually have allocated towards reviewing these sections of the plans. And at this point and time, it shows that the Lana`i Planning Commission henceforth, after this meeting, may only have about an hour and 25-minutes to complete two sections per meeting. Okay, so it can be done, I think, if you work efficiently – it can be done. If we can go through this first meeting and see how it goes – see how efficient we can get through this, we'll have an idea of, well, you know, is this a realistic amount of time for you to be able to complete your review? Yes?

Ms. Zigmond: Simone, what I'm not understanding is if the Moloka`i and Maui Commissions have already had their August meeting and done two of their issues, which ever issues they are, and we're only doing it in our September meeting, then we're kind of a meeting behind.

Ms. Bosco: Say that again, the last question.

Ms. Zigmond: We're kind of a meeting behind then?

Ms. Bosco: No, no. We look at – from – actually no. We're looking at, for you, a full four months, 120-days. So the very last meeting in December for you would be the deadline. So each Commission, we're looking at it as –. You're not behind.

Ms. Zigmond: No, I didn't mean from the 120-days. What I mean is if the other Counties, or the other Islands have already started on their first two issues in August, and we haven't.

Ms. Bosco: That's right, you're last in order right now. That's right.

Ms. Zigmond: So are we going to have another meeting in December? Like, cause right now, we only have one meeting scheduled in December instead of two. And I'm thinking we're going to need another.

Ms. Bosco: I see what you're saying. Each of the Commission has only one meeting in December. However, I know that Lana`i normally meets only once a month, so my understanding is you've added a second meeting to each month in order to review the policy plan. So that allows you to be pretty much at the same pace as the other Commissions, except for this issue of how much time you have. Okay, so bare with me a little. Because you only have an hour and 25 minutes, we kind of want to see, you know,

can we get through two sections in an hour and 25-minutes each meeting? Or does the Lana`i Planning Commission need to start a little earlier in the day in order to get the amount of time they need to get that review done? Did I answer your question?

Ms. Zigmond: And it might just be because it's been a really long day already, but according to this table here, everybody has two meetings in September, October, November and one in December. But Moloka`i and Maui have already had an August meeting and we didn't.

Ms. Bosco: I see.

Ms. Zigmond: We didn't talk GPAC in the August meeting.

Ms. Bosco: I see what you're saying. Yeah, we'll make sure that if we – we'll make sure you have as much meeting time as the other Commissions. I recognize that. Yeah, you're right. You're starting in September and they are going to be starting as well and have two meetings in September where you missed August. I understand that now. So we have to keep track because our goal here to make sure you guys are able to, you know, really thoroughly review the documents. So the question right now before us is can we be efficient in our review? And if we cannot get it done within an hour and 25 minutes, or you know, if we can't expect to do that, the question I'm asking of the Commission to consider is would you like to start a little earlier, say 5 o'clock or something like that – 4:30 p.m. – so you have a little more time. The other Commissions are taking about three hours to complete two sections. But that was just the first meeting. So they may become more efficient. So I'm throwing that out there for you guys to consider. We'll be in touch with you. We'll communicate with you on it, and go forward – especially for the next meeting, there's a little concern because I know that there's a transient rental bill and one other item that should take, possibly, the full normal meeting time to cover. So at the end of this meeting we may want to talk about, with the Chair, what the wishes of the Commission is.

Mr. Gima: Excuse me, I think the key is the 120-days. So whether we have 15 meetings or eight meetings, it has to be done in 120-days. So, you know, if we fall behind, then we are required to have an extra meeting to complete it within a 120-days. Is that accurate?

Ms. Bosco: That is accurate. Yeah, thank you. Okay, so getting back to the order of the review. We had tentatively planned actually for your first meeting to be on Protect the Natural Environment and Preserve Local Culture. What happened since we established that scheduled is we took that proposed order to the Moloka`i Planning Commission and they felt actually those two topics were pretty important topics – maybe – they felt that they wanted to deal with the September meeting – the number one – the meeting number one topics first. Okay? So Moloka`i and actually Maui started with Education and Social and Health Care Services. So we're proposing because we want to keep all the Commissions reviewing the same sections, that tonight we start with those two sections if the Commission has no objections. And that way, you'll be able to also see the other Commission's comments – you have the benefits of seeing the votes that they made. And then the following meeting, the next meeting, we'll actually come back and start with the Natural Environment and Local Culture sections for the next meeting. But the advantage

– and it's very important to actually do this – the advantage of the Commissions being on the same sections, is you can actually see what their recommendations were on each section. We're going to be projecting that for you, and we have that available for you. So that, you know, maybe if there's a difference in opinion on the Island on something, you can see what the other island recommended. Okay?

So along with that, in your packet, we sent to you a letter from the Chair of the Moloka`i Planning Commission which provides a rationale that – the reason why he wanted to change the order. And he actually has requested that the order of the review for the entire policy plan be changed. And he's not here tonight to provide any testimony for this letter so I'm going to need to try and explain it for you. But essentially what this means is, you know, if the Commission would support this order – and you can kind of look at it, and either approve it or vote to wait on it, that would be one order of business. What we recommend is that we switch the first two meetings and then – and the Maui Planning Department actually requested this – I mean, the Maui Planning Commission actually requested that we come back – come back to the Commission at the next meeting – all Commissions and offer the proposed order that the Planning Department feels makes the most sense considering DeGray Vanderbilt's recommendations. And then at the next meeting, all three Commissions can finalize the order. Okay, but, for this meeting, we recommend starting with Education and Social and Health Care Services. And then for the next meeting, we'll start with Natural Environment and Local Culture. Okay? So, if there's any questions about this, though, please, you know, go ahead and ask.

Let me just complete my short presentation here, if you don't mind – I'm trying to get through this. We're going to be recording all of your comments and edits similarly to what was provided in your binders. It's going to be looking kind of like this – a table which shows the draft statement and then we're going to – on the right side have a column for the Planning Commission – for this Planning Commission to either make their suggestions and changes or actually vote to approve the statement as it is. After we complete our review, we'll go back and make a final – we'll synthesize all your comments and make a final – put the final recommendations in a draft form. So, again, we want to focus your efforts on do you basically agree with how the statements are worded? Are there any major omissions? Are there any redundancies? Is it a good statement? And we're going shortly go back into that, and I'll come back to this and explain how we're going to take votes in just a minutes. Okay, so we encourage you to stay focused.

Real fast – in my memo, I outlined some ground rules. Basically, there's six of them. We hope they provide you with kind of a foundation for how to discuss things. I'm just going ahead and read them. Number one, one person speak at a time. Two, listen with respect, don't interrupt. Three, keep to scheduled times and time limits. Four, items that are raised but not related to the topic of the meeting will be recorded to be addressed later. Five, focus on issues and content, not on the individual. And six, be open to other perspectives. Okay, and if you have any others that you want to add or if you disagree with any of them, please go ahead and speak up. Okay, and that's basically my presentation and if you have no other questions, I'll go right into describing how we're going to go through the review.

Mr. Gima: Commissioners, do you have any objections to the proposal by the Moloka`i Planning Commission for tonight? To do Education and the Health Services? Okay. And so the understanding is our next meeting we're going to vote to approve the Planning Department's revised schedule. Okay. The second thing is for procedurally, are we going to do like public hearing for Education first and then go through the goals and objections, and then do public hearing for Health and then go through goals and objectives?

Ms. Bosco: That's an excellent question.

Mr. Gima: Okay.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. We – I – my understanding of how public hearings work – and Corporation Counsel can actually advise a little better on this – is to take all the public testimony first. Okay, open the public hearing, listen to it, and then you can close it, and then after, I guess, after the public hearing is closed, we will work through the sections and the Commission is able to actually hear testimony after each section or after we do the complete review. It's your choice. But, the public hearing itself procedurally it's cleaner – the way I'm use to it, is to open it and then close it, but you're still able to take public testimony outside of the public hearing and consider that testimony as public input that is substance and can be considered.

Ms. Sally Kaye: I just have a question. In the beginning of the binder, the memo that laid out how this process is going to work said that the documents that we've gotten were sent to 15 agencies and their comments will be available at this meeting.

Ms. Bosco: Yes. That's right. We do – we do have the comments available, but the format is not my preferred format, so I've told –. My intention is to bring the agency's comments back in a format that is actually much better. I do have them with me just in case you're curious, but I prefer to reorganize them in a format that's much better for you guys to understand. Because they came in different forms. They came in e-mails. They came in – they were handwritten onto the draft, and things like that .

Ms. Kaye: Okay, well that raises the question then, for example, we do these two sections tonight and then we get comments from the agencies which raise another question on these two sections that we've finished. We can always raise it at another meeting, correct?

Ms. Bosco: Yes, and I just want to mention that all the comments from the agencies were addressed and incorporated into this draft. So when we compiled the very original draft, those agency comments applied to the very first draft. Okay? And, so just so you know, the comments are background information and they should've been addressed. So, yeah, I hope that helps.

We're going to bring up the worksheet now that the Commission will be working off of, and I believe that was sent to you too. It has a right-hand – okay. So, I'm going to go ahead and explain the process for working on this document. And then I think we should take – we should open to public hearing, with all due respect. But, first I want to explain how

you're going to navigate through this. One minute, we're just pulling up the screen. Okay, here we go. So up on the screen, you have on the left-hand side a column that's entitled "Director's Recommendations," and what that represents is a synthesis and what we'd say a merging of all the comments and recommendations of the GPACs. And in some cases we did change the final statement and where this statement differs is actually shown in your final recommendation matrix there. There's a very large 11 x 17 matrix under your very first tab – there you go – yeah, that's right. And so, on the left side, the Director's recommendation, in most cases, reflects the General Plan Advisory Committee's recommendations. If there was a reason to change it, we sometimes gave the reason. If there was redundancy, we tried to eliminate the statement if the statement was very close to another statement in the document. But essentially that Director's recommendation – that's the Director's language. If you want to see the General Plan Advisory Committee's exact language and what they voted on, please refer to that larger matrix. Okay? On the right side, we're going to be recording your votes. If you agree –

Mr. Gima: Excuse me. Excuse me, Simone.

Ms. Bosco: Go ahead.

Mr. Gima: You know on that huge matrix that we got – what's the significance of the bold versus the italics versus regular font?

Ms. Bosco: Thank you for asking. On the large matrix here? Okay, the bold is just intended to illustrate that that's the Director's recommendations. There were some formatting errors. Some of them weren't bolded – and that's just formatting – that's just like a typo. The italics show – that's a good question – show a statement which we believe could be removed from the plan, and re-scoped as part of an implementation program. So in our review here, we'd like the Commission to look at the italic statements and basically, both, do they agree with the statement and also do they agree with our intent to remove it and to put it as part of a larger implementation chapter. Okay, for example, on the screen here, C-1-d says "encourage local residents to become educators and teach in Maui County." Well, we re-scoped that as an implementing action because it's a very specific statement designed to be – well, it can easily become part of a much larger program to encourage local recruitment for education. And so the question is if the Commission would like to retain that statement as a policy then they would need to not vote for it to be an implementing action, but retain it as a policy and then that statement would lose its italics and become just regular font. But I'd like to just note that in every case where there's an italic, we looked at all the policies and we've seen that there's another policy statement that actually would support that statement already. Okay? So, but basically, take a look at it, see if you agree with the statement – if you feel it needs to be retained, please vote accordingly. If you feel that it's appropriate – it's too specific as a broad policy and it's appropriate to be removed, then vote for it to remain as italic implementing action. Okay? Did I answer all your other questions? Okay. Thank you.

What's the regular font? That's – you mean for the rest of the columns? Just for –

Mr. Gima: No, under the Director's recommendations there's bold, italic and regular fonts.

Ms. Bosco: That is just a typo. There's no difference.

Mr. Gima: Okay.

Ms. Bosco: Yeah, thank you for asking. Sometimes we missed a bold. Any other questions? Let me explain how we are going to be voting on this – how we're going to be going through this process. What we've been doing with the other Commissions is taking the goal – the goal statement – and the first objective statement, and then looking at – individually looking at all the supporting policies for that objective as a whole – we'll go through each section. And then the Commission can have discussion on if they agree with how each policy statement reads. If they have recommendations, they can make motions on how they would like that statement to be changed or amended. And then the Commission can either choose to hold their votes until discussion is completed on that one series of statements, and then they can vote that series, that section. Or the Commission can choose to wait to vote until the entire section. For example, in this case, Education, after it's been reviewed and discussed completely and they can vote on the whole section. Now the advantage of waiting is that you can go back and change a vote – I mean, you can go back and change an amendment. If you vote on a section – let's say you vote on – the goals statement C, all the way down to C-1-e – if you take a vote on that section, it's more difficult to go back and change that vote. So what we encourage you to do is we can look at the first series of statements, have discussion, have you make your recommendations, we'll be recording your recommendations and your votes – or you recommendations I should say, and when we're done, I'd like you to really look at it and think okay is this the intent? Is this the spirit of? Is this what we want to say? Because you just need to be prepared to vote on it. If we can get through these sections and get your votes then we can essentially make our deadline. But, we need to make sure you're comfortable with the way it reads, so I'm going to be asking for you guys to look at the statement and ask if you're ready to vote on it, basically. Here we go.

Mr. Gima: Any questions by the Commissioners on the format on how we're going to do this? Any concerns? Okay.

Ms. Bosco: Would you like to go into public hearing? Are you ready for that?

Mr. Gima: Okay, at this time, we'll go to public hearing. I have only one person signed up for testimony. Are there others that wish to testify? Okay, it will be short and sweet. Pierce.

Ms. Bosco: Okay. Here we go.

Mr. Pierce Myers: Members of the Commission, good evening and thanks for your service and specifically for your work on this project. My name is Pierce Myers. I'm the Principal of Lana`i High & Elementary School. I'm addressing my comments to the large sheet, Improve Education. I concur with most of the Director's recommendations. It sounds to me like the language there is concise and it leaves open, individual, community interpretation, with one exception, and that is on page #2 – reference C-2-d – the row in the middle of the page where the Director's recommendations reads "promote development

of neighborhood schools and educational centers.” Under the Lana`i GPAC recommendation, I would add there, “promote development of neighborhood schools and educational centers incorporating the P-20 concept.” And this is a piece that we have been working on here on Lana`i. And P-20 is encompassing the broad range of educational needs from “P” being prenatal moms all the way through 20, to bachelor’s degrees and beyond. We are setting up our campus to be able to offer those educational opportunities for everyone in our community here, through expanding our campus, and this is something that the County has been supporting. So specific to our situation here on Lana`i, I would like to see the P-20 reference included. Thanks.

Mr. Gima: Hold on Pierce. Any questions for Pierce?

Ms. Kaye: Could you recommend a specific wording? If you were writing this section, how would you want it to read?

Mr. Gima: Pierce, are you recommending this for the whole County or just Lana`i?

Mr. Myers: Just Lana`i.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Because this is a Countywide policy, so I think your suggestion maybe more appropriate when we get to the Community Plan update.

Mr. Myers: Okay. Understand. Addressing the specific language, I would say, “promote development of neighborhood schools and educational centers incorporating the P-20 concept.” And when it gets to the specific community pieces, I can return. Thanks.

Mr. Gima: I have a question Pierce. What are your opinions about some of the policies and objectives being made? Is it – the way I read it that a lot of the policies are State of Hawaii, DOE responsibilities and how appropriate is it to put it in the County’s “kuilana?”

Mr. Myers: I agree that on the face of it many of them are State responsibilities. However, my look at it was that if the County can lend support to those needs, I think it’s appropriate for them to be here. I think jurisdictionally, a lot of them are State issues, but I would sure like to see the County supporting those.

Mr. Gima: Thank you. Any other questions for Pierce? Okay. Thanks. Any other public testimony – for both Education and Health? Thank you very much. The public hearing is now closed, and we’ll go back to you Simone.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Okay, we’re ready. I have a request from Julia – she needs to be able to see your names, so can you move your names kind of facing her and she’s going to be recording your initials and stuffs. Is that it? Okay. All right. Great. Thank you.

What I’m going to do – I’m going to start off reading the first series of statements, but as we kind of get into this and you get the kind of the hang of it, I’m going to ask you guys if you even want me to continue reading. Because if you don’t need me to read, you want

to just look at the statements, we can do it that way too so it goes faster. But to start out, I'm going to go ahead and start reading. Well, that's what we've been doing, but I don't need to.

So, just to start out with Education – that's the first section. I'm going to go ahead and read the goal statement and the objective and the supporting policies here. Goal C, "Maui County residents will have access to life long formal and informal educational options enabling them to realize their ambitions." Objective C-1, "attract and retain school administrators and educators in the highest quality." Policy C-1-a, "provide teachers with nationally competitive pay and benefit packages." C-1-b, "encourage local residents to become educators and teach in Maui County" – that's an implementing action. C-1-d, "ensure teachers will have the teaching tools and support staff needed to provided students with an excellent education." C-1-c, "allow for more Maui County district and school based decision making in public education." C-1-e, "study the feasibility of a local Maui school board whose sole jurisdiction over Maui County schools" – and that's suggested to keep as an implementing action. Okay, and go ahead and think about these statements. You may go ahead and discuss them, make recommendations, and as a body, after you're completed, you can make a motion. After you've completed your discussions on all of those statements, you can make a motion to approve as is, approve with amendments, or you can even discuss until you agree or can actually go through the whole document and vote at the end. It's your choice.

Ms. Alberta de Jetley: I have a comment. On C-1-d, "develop incentives for local residents" – I'd like to see that word "local" deleted because what do you mean by "local?" Do you mean like haole versus local? Do you mean alien residence? I think that the term "local" should be deleted.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. And Julia is recording everyone of your comments at this point and we can go back and re-look at them after you've discussed everything.

Mr. Gima: Any other comments on Section C-1?

Ms. Kaye: You know what, this is just a general question, I should've asked it before –

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Ms. Kaye: One thing, I've read through all of this and I've read through the whole book, and there's very little said about the implementation part of it.

Ms. Bosco: Yeah, thank you.

Ms. Kaye: And so I'm unclear whether the implementing steps – this is a pretty broad agenda – are going to be fleshed out via the Community Plan or is there going to be a separate section Countywide that's then going to focus on what steps should be taken to implement all of these policies?

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. We will have a chapter in the Policy Plan dedicated to

implementation where we will sort of set out how these policies will be implemented and the methodology we'll use for implementing them. And we will, in the Community Plans, also be setting up mechanism to implement the Countywide Policy Plan. But the answer is really, in both cases, in both situations, for in the Community Plans and in this document, we're going to have an implementation – an implementation mechanisms really.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, then that leads to the question of “who” is going to decide what steps are – aside from the ones that you've recommended to be moved to that section here, it's going to take a lot more than that. So, you guys do it as staff? And does it comes to us again, or just goes to County Council or –?

Ms. Bosco: If we're very efficient, okay, we would like to bring that chapter back to the Commissions for their input in the review. We want to be able to show you what that – that's Chapter Five in the Policy Plan – what that looks like. That particular piece is very dense. It takes a lot of coordination and input from the agencies. There's a lot of thought that needs to go into that, but basically, it should be – the Chapter should very board and it should provide a framework for how we're going to implement a lot of these statements that you see here and many more. So, I don't know if that helps, but that's what we'd like to do. We would like to bring it back to you for your comment and review.

Ms. Kaye: I'm sorry. One more question then. Will this implementation – Chapter Five – also include time line and periodic re-checking to make sure bench marks have been met? I've noticed in the 1990 plan there's some things that show again 17 years later.

Ms. Bosco: Yes.

Ms. Kaye: And there's no real information or reason why it was, you know, not dealt with 17 years ago.

Mr. John Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. We do intend to have an implementing chapter in this document. We have one currently but we'd like to expand it and include some of these more specific items that are currently drafted as policy that maybe more appropriate as implementing actions. We would like to attach that to a schedule. The Community Plans require a far more specific and detailed implementation program. So that's really the best tool for that more specific cost of program. We also have a number of functional plans for infrastructure systems, and other facilities where implementation gets a lot more specific. So we will touch on it, but it's going to be broad, as compared to, say, the Community Plan or a technical plan for an infrastructure system.

Mr. Gima: For section C-1, conceptually I agree with the objective and policies, however, I don't think this is the County's responsibility, nor should it be. I think it should remain with the State of Hawaii and the DOE. I didn't see anything in the folder as to why the GPAC's wanted the County to take on this responsibility.

Ms. Bosco: Yeah, thank you for asking that. You'll find that throughout the document, we have addressed areas which normally fall under the jurisdiction of Federal, State and County. Sometimes we even go into establishing policies that address private –

corporation from private. So although we're not taking the State's jurisdiction away – that's not the intent of this. We're not taking responsibility for State mandates and State's – the things and programs that they run. The County needs to take a position at least on, you know, what their vision is for certain – for certain – I don't know how you'd say it – on certain subject. Education is so important that the County needs to really kind of just develop a vision for itself. And if you look – when you look through these statements, what we want to notice is if there's a statement here, okay, that talks about, that should be like a DOE responsibility, a State responsibility, the way it's worded, it should be broad enough that we're not taking away – we're not necessarily taking over that function but we're sort of establishing what we want to support. So if we, for example, if we want to support allow for more Maui County District and school base decision making in public education – okay – if want to support more local control, then the Commission can vote to approve that statement. That would entail just the more local control over schools – or educational aspects. Okay?

Mr. Gima: I wasn't implying that it's not the County's responsibility in terms of taking over. I don't think it's realistic that they can attract and retain school administrators. I don't think they can provide teachers. So the wording has a lot to do with it.

Ms. Bosco: Yeah, that's right.

Mr. Gima: And if we're just going to say, we support you doing this, I think it's kind of – it doesn't need to be in here, it can be in some other . . . (Inaudible... changing of tapes). .

Ms. Bosco: Well, specifically when looking at – can you point to a certain policy and explain what you mean by that?

Mr. Gima: Well, I mean, objective C-1, "attract and retain school administrators and educators of the highest quality," I mean, I don't see any community or any part of the County government being able to that. Let alone, if they wanted to do that, how would the DOE and State of Hawaii incorporate that into their recruitment and retention program they already have in existence? So it's like – it's not like the DOE is saying County we need your help in this area. Like again, conceptually, we agree that we want to attract and retain, but it's not our "kuliana."

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Maybe I can shed a little light on it. This is a very important question that you bring and something that was debated extensively at the Advisory Committee level. Essentially what it boiled down to was a strong desires by the Committees and by the Department as well to take a position on some of these important issues, whether it's State Highways which interface with County's responsibilities, or whether it's Harbor or Education in this instance. It allows us, for instance, as a community because this is really not "County" plans, this is the people of Maui County's plan to articulate positions on these important issues, to provide direction to Council Members or administrative agencies like the Planning Department. We often times have to testify before the State Legislature and take positions on State issues, and these are the kind of statements that we fall back on it. It gives us a lot of support to have policies like this that

we can fall back on when we take a strong position on a State issue. So, in the end, even though it's not directly our "kuliana," it does provide the County and the County government a stronger base to make positions that reflects the desires of the community.

Ms. Bosco: Is there anymore discussion? Would you like to –? Okay, so if there are no objections or anymore discussion on this section, the Commission can make a motion to approve with the one amendment that I heard to remove the word "local" from the statement C-1-d – approve statements as they are drafted with that one amendment. Or if you wish to wait until we finish the entire the section to make the final votes, we can do it that way too, so it's your decision.

Mr. Gima: Any objections from the Commissioners to wait till the end and take a vote? Or do you want to go objective by objective?

Ms. de Jetley: Why don't we, Chair, why don't we just do it by sections so we can move on quickly?

Ms. Kaye: Yeah, I agree.

Mr. Gima: Okay, you want to make a motion?

Ms. de Jetley: I move to approve the Director's recommendations with two exceptions. First on C-1-d, remove the word "local," so it would be "encourage residents to become educators." And the second addition would be on C-1-c, to allow for more Maui district and school base decision making in public schools," with Pierce's recommendation which "incorporating P-20 concept in Lana`i School."

Ms. Bosco: Incorporating – okay, the comment – can I – Alberta, may I just mention that the policy that our testifier referenced was actually C-2-d on the next page. Did you want to wait?

Ms. de Jetley: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yes, leave that out, and I'll it on when we get to the next page.

Ms. Bosco: Okay. Thank you. So the motion –

Mr. Gima: Alberta, is your motion to approve objective C-1, C-1-a, C-1-b, C-1-d, C-1-c, and C-1-e with your amendment regarding the word "local?"

Ms. de Jetley: Yes.

Mr. Gima: Okay.

Ms. Bosco: And C - and the goal C statement.

Ms. Kaye: And I think we have to also agree that C-1-e is moved. It's corrected – consider

that as an implementing action, right?

Ms. Bosco: Yes, we have two proposed to be removed – C-1-d and C-1-e. And take a look at the screen as we're going through this to make sure Julia has the language correct. And the language for C-1-d is "encourage residents to become educators and teach in Maui County." Is there a second?

Ms. Kaye: I second.

Mr. Gima: Okay, it's been moved by Commissioner de Jetley and seconded by Commissioner Kaye that we approve goals C, objective C-1, C-1-a, 1-d, 1-b, 1-c, and 1-e with moving C-1-d and C-1-e to the implementing action. Okay, any discussion?

Ms. Zigmond: I just have a question. Is it not more appropriate as someone has indicated before that the P-20 concept is a Lana`i – for the Lana`i Plan? And what we're doing here is for the County. So –

Mr. Gima: She withdrew it.

Ms. Zigmond: Oh.

Mr. Gima: Okay, any further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor say aye.

Commission Members: "Aye."

Ms. Bosco: Can we have a show of hands?

Mr. Gima: Oppose? Raise your right hand. Okay. Motion carried.

Ms. Bosco: Unanimous, and the Chair actually – Chair you can vote – you don't need to vote unless there's a tie breaker.

Mr. Gima: Okay.

It was moved by Commissioner Alberta de Jetley, seconded by Commissioner Sally Kaye, then unanimously

VOTED: To approve the Goal C, Objective C-1 and its supporting policies with amendments.

Ms. Bosco: And when you're going through the votes, just for ease when you make your motion to approve a section or whenever you're going to do, you don't need to reference the policy number, you can just say "move to approve the goal and the objective statement with supporting policies," and I'll know that you mean all of those that are underneath that one objective. Okay, it might be easier to do it that way. Thank you.

Mr. Gima: Okay, Pat. Use the mic Pat.

Mr. Pat Reilly: My name is Pat Reilly. I am a resident of Lana`i and I'm also a member of the GPAC. I'm asking for the record for a ruling by Corporation Counsel. You may have noticed we're fairly silent. So I would like it placed on the record the ruling of Corporation Counsel regarding our participation in a public hearing. Thank you.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you.

Mr. Michael Hopper: I basically told the GPAC members, because of the Sunshine Law, if there's been rulings by the Office of Information Practices where if – the General Sunshine Law Rule is if two or more members cannot discuss board business. Two or more members of a Board or Commission which would include the GPAC, cannot discuss board business or else that's considered a meeting of the GPAC. It needs to be agenda and properly noticed seven days in advance as with any other agenda. And it has been interpreted in the past by OIP that if two or more members – more than two members of a GPAC or any other Board or Commission testify at public testimony as members of the GPAC, then that's considered a meeting of the GPAC, and it's a Sunshine Law violation. Now this wouldn't necessarily prohibit people from testifying as members of the public on things like, for example, if someone is an educator and they are a resource for education, they can answer questions and testify to education. However, I caution to the GPAC members as they came in and I can tell you now that I cautioned them about the issue of having more than two members give public testimony as members of the GPAC because that would be considered a meeting under the Sunshine Law. This is all the things that I went over with you, I think, it was about a couple of weeks ago. So if people want to testify as members of the public, they could do that. But as GPAC members, or as with regards to business that they conducted as members of the GPAC, I've recommended that they don't testify because that could be potentially be a Sunshine Law violation, and considered a meeting of the GPAC. So, just to let you know what I talked to them about. I also advise the Moloka`i and Lana`i GPACs so I attended those meetings in general.

I did talk to OIP about this particular issue. The GPAC is actually still in operation right now and they may at a future date potentially have to give comments further on these particular issues. It specifically says in 2.80B, that the GPAC shall be kept – shall not be dis-banned during this whole process, so that's another issue. And OIP has told us that if it's substantially likely that those members – that the GPAC may have a meeting in the future that there would – it could potentially be considered a meeting of the GPAC and a violation of the Sunshine Law if there were multiple members – more than two –testifying at a meeting on GPAC business. So that's what I discussed with them and a concern that I raised with them.

Mr. Gima: Thank you.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. Are we ready to move on – did we get our vote? We got a unanimous vote. Objective C-2, provide nurturing learning environments that build skills for the 21st century. Do you want me to read these by the way? Okay. Go ahead and I'll wait for you to go ahead and discuss.

Mr. Gima: Any comments/questions from the Commissioners? Sally?

Ms. Kaye: Yeah, I have a couple. C-2-a, “expand professional development opportunities in disciplines that support our community’s economic development goals.” I think that’s not clear. It might be better said, “to support the economic development goals of Maui County,” because there’s a “gazillion” communities and to say our community is very ambiguous.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, so, “expand professional development opportunities in disciplines that support – “

Ms. Kaye: “- the economic development goals of Maui County.”

Ms. Bosco: “The economic development goals of Maui County.” Julia is typing that out.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, I have – I don’t know how you want to – you want to do this section by section? But, I have a bunch of comments on this just one.

Ms. Bosco: Go ahead.

Ms. Kaye: C-2-j, it seems to me, it’s exactly the same as C-3-c, which is in a different objective, I understand that, but –

Ms. Bosco: C - which is the other one? I know where you’re going – I saw it – I know which one you’re talking about.

Ms. Kaye: Yeah, okay, it’s the technology.

Ms. Bosco: The technology - C-3-c.

Ms. Kaye: Yeah, you have it moved to implementing actions.

Ms. Bosco: That’s right.

Ms. Kaye: But would it be moved then down to the next objective because that’s – you see what I’m saying?

Ms. Bosco: So you’re saying it might fit better as an implementing action under the policy –

Ms. Kaye: Well, you left “broaden the use of technology and telecommunication” as a policy under objective three. I’m asking if you’re going to move that implementing action in the preceding policy list, is that where you’d put it?

Ms. Bosco: Yeah, basically, we would – well – yeah. Basically, we could or we could leave –. Essentially it’s moved is the point, and there is a supporting policy there that supports the implementation of it.

Ms. Kaye: Okay.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, that's –

Ms. Kaye: C-2-i, “integrates schools, communities parks, playgrounds and expand each community's use of these facilities.”

Ms. Bosco: And expand – repeat that again.

Ms. Kaye: “Integrate schools, community parks, playgrounds and expand each community's use of these facilities.”

Ms. Bosco: Okay, I got it. Change the word “the” to “each.”

Ms. Kaye: Right. Next one, C-2-e, “improve coordination between government land use” what? Actions? Laws? I wasn't sure what that was going for.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, let me look at that. There should be a –. There should be a comma after government? Improve coordination between government land use – okay, hold on. Let me look at that a minute here. In the original statement – if you look at the large matrix, you look at policy statement 7018 and that's where it came from. And what we did is – looks like we kind of collapsed State and County's land use.

Ms. Kaye: Yeah, I saw that. Land Use what? Laws? Rules?

Mr. Summers: I think the State and County both have agencies that deal with Land Use Planning. For the County, it's the County Planning Department. Primarily for the State, it's the State Office of Planning.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, fine, then why don't we just put in “Land Use Planning.” That's what you're saying right? They both have planning so they should coordinate?

Mr. Summers: Yeah, that would work.

Ms. Kaye: Well, let's do that. Let's recommend that.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, we'll strike “government.”

Ms. Kaye: Okay, the last one then is C-2-m, “seek to improve student teacher ratios.” The 1990 plan had lower student ratios and I don't know how you'll improve them if you don't lower them. So I kind of like to know why that's improved instead of lower?

Ms. Bosco: It can be lower. It's a more accurate statement – to lower. Improve is a broader term, I think, so –. You know, I generally know that lower student teacher ratios are better. I don't know if that's true in all cases, but in general it is. Okay, so, any other questions?

Mr. Gima: Simone, just out of curiosity how come the reference and the numbers are not in order?

Ms. Bosco: Not sequential? Thank you for asking that.

Mr. Gima: Because when Sally was going through that, I was looking. And well I know this is sequential in one way, but then my notes are on the big matrix.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. Let me explain that. In the clean worksheet, the worksheet that we're working off of, these numbers are actually referencing the draft document. Hold on. This draft. You see that? This is section four, so that where the numbers come from. Whereas, they don't closely –. Do they coordinate? – the large matrix that's not the same numbers right? These numbers aren't. In this document.

Ms. Julia Staley: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Bosco: All right, in the larger matrix, the reference numbers should coincide on the left side, but there's – the 7,000 series refers to the earlier matrix – the earlier – the first review of the first matrix. Does that make sense?

Ms. de Jetley: Could I add on that C-2-d, to incorporating the P-20 concept.

Mr. Bosco: Okay.

Mr. Gima: Well, Alberta, remember Pierce was saying that his recommendation was specific to our school versus this is a Countywide Policy. So it wouldn't be appropriate to do a P-20 for the entire County.

Ms. Kaye: Why not? I thought he said that was a County focus as well.

Mr. Gima: No, it's our school's focus.

Ms. Kaye: But, couldn't it be a County?

Ms. de Jetley: Could we generalize it then – the P-20 or other concepts.

Mr. Gima: Well, the P-20 concept is a very specific concept in terms of, I think, education of the children and the actual footprint of the school. And so, although it maybe something that we may want to pursue, I don't –

Mr. de Jetley: So are you saying that we are going to be the school in the County with this concept?

Mr. Gima: We maybe the only school in the nation.

Ms. Bosco: What we can do is we can develop broader language that suggests the P-20 concept without using that particular term.

Ms. de Jetley: Well I thought it was important to him. Otherwise, why would he have bothered to show up to give public testimony? And he specifically mentioned that, and I

wanted to make sure it was included since he took the time to come here to testify for it.

Ms. Kaye: Would it be appropriate to compromise and say that the language here is Countywide. And when it comes to the Lana`i Community, we're implementing steps for this specific to Lana`i, that's the P-20 concept.

Ms. Bosco: Absolutely. It would be very appropriate to place that language in the Lana`i Community Plan.

Ms. de Jetley: So all of this will come back and it would be specific to Lana`i then? Okay, I'll go with that.

Mr. Gima: Okay, any other comments on objective C-2? Just for the record, I just want to state pretty much the same thing that several of these policy statements are, I believe, are in DOE State of Hawaii. I won't belabor that point anymore.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you.

Mr. Gima: Thank you.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, we have several amendments, and if you could please review what's on the screen. C-2-a is amended to read "expand professional development opportunities in disciplines that support the economic development goals of Maui County." And then, down to the next page, C-2-i, "integrate schools, community parks, playgrounds and expand each community's use of these facilities. C-2-e, "improve coordination between Land Use Planning and school facility planning agencies." Is there a comma after Land Use? I wanted to make sure. And then, down below, C-2-m, "seek to lower student teacher ratios."

Mr. Gima: Okay, any further discussions or additions to this objective?

Ms. de Jetley: I move to accept the C-2 with the corrections/additions – what would you say?

Ms. Bosco: Amendments.

Ms. de Jetley: Amendments.

Mr. Lawrence Endrina: Second.

Ms. Kaye: Second.

Mr. Gima: Okay, it's been moved by Commissioner de Jetley, and seconded by Commissioner Endrina that we approve Objective C-2 and the accompanying policies with amendments. Any discussion?

Ms. Bosco: Who seconded that?

Mr. Gima: Commissioner Endrina.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you.

Mr. Gima: Okay, hearing none. All in favor, please raise your right hand.

Commission Members: (*Hands raised.*)

Ms. Bosco: It's unanimous.

**It was moved by Commissioner Alberta de Jetley, seconded by
Commissioner Lawrence Endrina, then unanimously**

**VOTED: To approve the Objective C-2 and its supporting policies
with amendments.**

Mr. Gima: Okay, motion carried.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, the next section – would you like me to read the objective statement or would you just like to read it? Okay, go ahead.

Ms. Kaye: Can we ask questions though?

Ms. Bosco: Yeah. Sure.

Ms. Kaye: I don't know what a senior college is.

Ms. Bosco: Good question. That's as oppose to a Junior College.

Ms. Kaye: Why don't they just say a four-year college?

Ms. Bosco: Well–.

Ms. Kaye: It sounds like a college for older folks.

Ms. Bosco: It's higher education. It can include – the Maui Planning Commission said the same thing.

Ms. Kaye: Well, if I'm confused, there's going to be other people who will be confused. I would say four-year. What did you say?

Ms. Bosco: I said, "higher education or upper" – what's another word of saying it? – four-year university.

Ms. Kaye: Well, there's a difference between college and university though.

Ms. Bosco: Just delete the term is a suggestion.

Ms. Kaye: Yeah, just say –

Ms. Bosco: Or a college to enable local residents.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, and then “enhance Maui Community College” – “enhance” – what does that mean? Does that mean, you want to be promoted? You want to make people know it’s already wonderful? Or you want to make it better?

Ms. Bosco: Make it better is essentially it – both in facility planning and also programs.

Ms. Kaye: Well then wouldn’t improve or expand or enhance –?

Ms. Bosco: Would you like a different language?

Ms. Kaye: Well, enhance speaks to me of image rather than substance.

Ms. Bosco: I hear you.

Ms. Kaye: I don’t know what anyone else thinks.

Ms. Bosco: You can also – you can say develop, although that’s difficult too. You could say improve. You could say – what’s a better word?

Ms. Kaye: Well, I can’t think, but there’s two more questions that you probably can answer – very short ones.

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Ms. Kaye: “Integrate cultural and environmental values” – which cultural values? Is that specific? Is it all cultural values? Is it –

Ms. Bosco: It’s all inclusive.

Ms. Kaye: Okay. And the next one, “support opportunities for life long language emersion” – which language?

Ms. Bosco: That would be Hawaiian.

Ms. Kaye: Only?

Ms. Bosco: Yeah. This is pertaining specifically to Hawaiian and language immersion.

Ms. Kaye: Then I think you should say that.

Ms. Bosco: Okay. “Life long Hawaiian language.” Okay?

Mr. Endrina: I have one. On C-3-e, “promote teaching of the traditional practices.” The

examples given seem limiting. Could you take them out and kind of – since it’s a general one.

Ms. Bosco: You can take them out. We’ve actually reworked this statement on the other – at the other Commissions too. So, you can change it to be more – to be broader if you’d like. I mean, seriously you can even drop the entire last part of the phrase and stop it at “practices.”

Mr. Endrina: I think that would be better – just drop the last part of it – instead of taking out –.

Ms. Bosco: That keeps it very broad, okay?

Mr. Gima: Or you can say, “including but not limited to,” and then listing these.

Mr. Endrina: Yeah, that’s an idea. We can do that.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, so, “including but not limited to.” Thank you.

Mr. Gima: Ditto my earlier objections.

Ms. Bosco: For the policy C-3-b, “enhance Maui Community College” – how about “expand and improve?” I’m coming back to that because there was some discussion on it. Is that better?

Ms. de Jetley: Sally, could we just go with improve? Just improve?

Mr. Gima: I’m interested what the GPAC’s discussed when they were talking about the four-year university – were they thinking that it was going to be separate from Maui Community College or was Maui Community College was going to be enhanced into a four-year university?

Ms. Bosco: Yeah, thank you, excellent question. We kept – we kept two policies in here to address both the Maui Community College separately from the four-year university – future university. Boy, my language just sucks tonight. I’m not speaking how I normally do. Anyway, basically, we were looking at it as two separate entities – two separate institutions/agencies. We wanted to make sure there’s a policy statement that supports just the Maui Community College in a policy statement that supports just the four-year university. Does that help? Thank you. Thank you. Sorry.

Mr. Gima: Okay, any other questions, comments, recommendations for objective C-3? If not, I’ll entertain a motion to approve C-3 and the accompanying policies with amendments.

Mr. Endrina: I move to –

Mr. James Elliott: I thought you said, “expand and improve.”

Ms. Bosco: We had a suggestion to just say “improve” – I thought.

Mr. Elliott: Okay, sorry.

Ms. Bosco: Would you prefer keeping it as “improved” or “expand and improve?”

Mr. Gima: Larry?

Mr. Endrina: Okay. I move to accept objective C-3 and its supporting policies.

Ms. Zigmond: Second.

Mr. Endrina: With amendments. I have to say the amendments, right?

Ms. Zigmond: I second.

Mr. Gima: Okay, it’s been moved by Commissioner Endrina, seconded by Commissioner Zigmond that we approve objective C-3 and its supporting policies with amendments. Any discussions?

Ms. Bosco: And remember to take a look at what’s written, and why don’t I just go ahead and read each statement, okay? C-3-a, “establish a four-year university to enable local residents to get bachelor’s and post-graduate degrees in Maui County. The next amendment is “improve Maui Community College as a comprehensive community college.” Down to the next page, C-3-e, “promote the teaching of traditional practices including, but not limited to aquaculture, subsistence agriculture, Pacific Island and Asian forms of alternative medicine and indigenous Hawaiian Agriculture.” And C-3-i, “support opportunities for life-long Hawaiian language immersion.”

Mr. Gima: Sally?

Ms. Kaye: I’m ready to vote.

Mr. Gima: Okay, if you don’t have any further questions, all in favor, raise your right hands.

Ms. Bosco: Unanimous. Thank you.

**It was moved by Commissioner Lawrence Endrina, seconded by
Commissioner Beverly Zigmond, then unanimously**

**VOTED: To approve Objective C-3 and its supporting polices with
amendments.**

Ms. Bosco: Next section, C-4, “maximize community-based educational programs.” Go ahead and read through the next – the remaining policy statements.

Ms. Kaye: And while they’re doing that, I’ll ask my questions. First I would think C-4-c

should read “participation in and support for.”

Ms. Bosco: “Participation in and support for.” Thank you.

Ms. Kaye: And C-4-e, “expand education of important life skills” is what exactly?

Ms. Bosco: An example – coping skills – that’s now a good example. Or skills on, for example, how to find a job or what the youth can expect in the job –.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, I get it. I guess my question is who gets to decide what those are?

Ms. Bosco: Well the person offering that particular program. It’s just a very general policy statement that is intended to encourage educators to teach important life skills. We’re not deciding who. It’s just a statement to encourage it for anybody to do that. Whether it’s the State or a County program or an informal educational program.

Mr. Gima: Sally, may I suggest that you capitalize “Life Skills” because in the social service sector, when you say “life skills,” social service agencies know what life skills are thought in different programs.

Ms. Kaye: Right, it’s actually – it’s a whole thing, which was where I was going with this. Why is this here and not in social services matrix?

Ms. Bosco: Because – okay – because I believe –. Well it could be under social services.

Ms. Kaye: Just a question.

Ms. Bosco: Yeah. I think it seems as an important part of educating the public.

Ms. Kaye: Okay.

Ms. Bosco: I mean, social services doesn’t always specifically address, you know – we’re educating – I mean, social services address is the whole range of social problems and challenges. Although, it does include – addressing life’s skills in certain cases, but really, I think we’re saying here it belongs under an education section because that’s where you’d learn –

Ms. Kaye: Okay. Final question then I have is C-4-g, “support community facility such as museum, libraries,” blah, blah, blah, “that provide interactive learning.” This bothers me. I read it and read it, and it seems to me you’re either saying we’re only going to support those institutions which already have inactive training to the exclusion of encouraging all institutions to provide that interaction. So it’s just unclear.

Ms. Bosco: How would you like to re-word that?

Ms. Kaye: “Encourage,” blah, blah, blah, “to provide . . . “ Those would be the only changes cause then you’re – it’s all encompassing then – you’re going to encourage

people to do it and support.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, so we have “encourage community facilities such as,” the following.

Ms. Kaye: That –

Ms. Bosco: “Such as museums, libraries, zoos, nature centers and the like to provide interactive learning opportunities for all ages.” Okay, on C-4-b, can you take a look at that, and right now what we have on the screen is that. We need your language here. “Improve partnerships which utilize –“ what was the language that you suggested for that particular statement? Did you want to make any changes to it? No.

Mr. Summers: Mr. Chair if I may? Going to back to that policy on supporting community facilities. I know that the original intent with that particular policy statement was to encourage private or governmental support for the expansion of, or providing more museums, libraries, zoos. When we do change that to two, doesn’t that narrow the statement to really just encouraging these institutions to provide interactive learning opportunities? Rather than the original intent which was we want more nature centers, more museums provided throughout the County. So I think it’s an important change in the policy and –. Right, so the original intent was to encourage more of these kinds of facilities in the County, whether they be museums, or nature centers and the like.

Mr. Gima: So the intent was more facilities versus more interactive learning?

Mr. Summers: Right. Right.

Mr. Gima: Okay, maybe we should leave out the interactive learning and let the facilities determine what educational services they’re going to provide.

Mr. Summers: That would definitely be a way of doing it. Absolutely. Just drop a period in after “centers.”

Mr. Gima: How’s that Sally?

Ms. Bosco: I’m just wonder – visit this a little here. We are specifically trying to support facilities that provide interactive learning opportunities.. The statement doesn’t say we’re not going to support facilities that don’t have interactive learning opportunities. Okay? We’re also not trying to dictate that we want community facilities to provide interactive learning opportunities. So, just to revisit this – “encourage community facilities that provide interactive learning opportunities.” The idea is to encourage – I don’t know if I’m making my point, but it’s –. Go ahead.

Mr. Gima: You may just want to flip the sentence around, and start out with the intent of encouraging interactive learning opportunities in community facilities – I mean, re-word it.

Mr. Summers: Absolutely. And then we can use our “including, but not limited to,” instead of “such as.”

Ms. Bosco: So let's look at the language and please help us out here. Mr. Chairperson, we're flipping it – can you take a look at what's being written – see if that's what it should say.

Ms. de Jetley: You actually want more, so “encourage more community facilities.”

Ms. Bosco: “Encourage community facilities” – “encourage more community facilities which provide interactive learning opportunities for all ages including but not limited to museums, libraries, zoos, nature centers and the like.” How does that read?

Mr. Gima: No, I was suggesting that you start off the sentence with saying “support to encourage interactive learning opportunities for all ages, in community facilities, including but not limited to” . . . blah, blah, blah . . .

Ms. Bosco: Okay, got it. So, start it out with saying support interactive learning facilities or opportunities?

Mr. Gima: The intent is education so that's why I'm suggesting putting the interactive learning opportunities for all ages at the front of the sentence.

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Mr. Gima: Which is the main point.

Ms. Bosco: “Support interactive learning opportunities for all ages in community facilities such as, but not limited to . . .” Okay, Julia, “support interactive learning opportunities for all ages in community facilities including, but not limited to,” and then, “museums, libraries, nature centers and the like.” Okay is that right?

Mr. Gima: Okay, if no other additions, why don't we review the amendments before I entertain a motion.

Ms. Bosco: Do you want me to read them? Okay.

Mr. Elliott: You're missing the word – I think you're missing the word “for” in C-4-c.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you.

Mr. Elliott: And while I'm at it, I'm heading for the mainland for a crash course on the English language – if anybody wants to come with me tomorrow.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, those first two are okay, and then Julia is going to scroll down. And you wanted the word “Life Skills” capitalize in C-4-e? Okay.

Ms. Zigmond: I move that we accept objective C-4 with the supporting policies and amendments as noted.

Mr. Endrina: Second.

Mr. Gima: Okay, it's been moved by Commissioner Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Endrina that we approve objective C-4 and the supporting policies and with amendments. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor raise your right hand.

Commission Members: *(Hands raised.)*

Ms. Bosco: It's unanimous.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Thank you.

It was moved by Commissioner Beverly Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Lawrence Endrina, then unanimously

VOTED: To approve Objective C-4 and its supporting policies with amendments.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. We're done with one section. You guys are faster than I am.

Mr. Gima: Okay, let's take a 10 minute recess.

(The Lana`i Planning Commission recessed at 8:40 p.m., and reconvened at 8:53 p.m.)

Mr. Gima: Okay, we're back in order.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, we're waiting for the laptop to project the next section. Here it comes. Okay, we're going to start from the top – hold on – let me just switch the section – hold on. Okay, we're ready.

We're going to be doing Strengthen Social and Health Care Services next. And I'm not going to read anything, but we're tackling the goal statement, the objective D-1 and the supporting policies.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, my only recommendation and I don't know how anybody else feels about this is to delete "spiritual."

Ms. Bosco: This came up on the other islands as well.

Ms. Kaye: I'm sorry, D-1-f, "ensure equal access in an increasingly digital society." Now I went back and I saw what the intent of that was, but it doesn't – that statement doesn't answer access to what? Are we talking about access to the technology or access to the services for those of us with computers can learn about?

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. That was also another reworded statement. It's intended to provide equal access to social and health care services in an increasingly digital society.

The other Commissions re-worked this statement a lot. The intent here is to basically widen access for everyone to services. Julia is projecting the other Commissions revised language here – take a look at the screen – let’s see here. So Maui on the left revised it to read, “ensure equal access to social and health care services through both technological and traditional means.” And then Moloka`i re-worked it to read, “support equal access and participation to social and health care services for those who are not part of an increasingly digital society.” Okay, that may help you get some idea what we’re striving for.

Ms. Kaye: My personal opinion is Maui is better.

Ms. Bosco: Maui is better?

Ms. Kaye: Yeah.

Ms. Bosco: And you can actually chose – use that language – it’s up to you.

Ms. de Jetley: I like Maui’s language.

Ms. Bosco: There it is on the screen.

Mr. Endrina: Ditto.

Ms. Bosco: Okay. And Sally, so we’ve deleted the word “spiritual” in the goal statement. I’m going to recommend that the order of the goal statement reads – the order of the first words read “physical, mental, and social health care services” because I think putting the word mental next to physical kind of illustrates that we’re talking about the body, you know, the physical body and the mental body. And then social and mental health care services kind of make more sense to be together – I mean, social and health care services because –. It should be “and social and health care services” Julia –. “Physical, mental, social and health care services will be expanded,” because we’re talking about a social and health care services section. Thank you. If the Commission agrees with me.

Mr. Gima: Is health care suppose to be together or is it suppose physical care, mental care, social care, health care?

Ms. Bosco: Physical, mental, and social and health services – you don’t need to word care in there. It wasn’t in there before. Thank you.

Mr. Gima: I work for adult mental health, so I would prefer it’s physical, mental health.

Ms. Bosco: Okay. Let’s see how that reads – physical, mental health, social – okay it’s a little awkward.

Mr. Matthew Mano: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Bosco: Physical, social, mental health.

Ms. Kaye: . . .(Inaudible). . .

Ms. Bosco: That's good. We can do that – “Physical health, mental health and social services.” Thank you. “Physical health, mental health and social services will be expanded. . .”

Mr. Gima: Can you explain the intent of D-1-d, “improve opportunities for disadvantage youth and encourage the tradition of hanai and foster care?”

Ms. Bosco: The first part of that is focusing on youth services – trying to help disadvantage youths and that's a very broad term. The second half of it is just really talking about – how do you describe this – supporting, mentoring big-brother/big-sister type programs – programs which reach out to children that may not have the kind of adult, guidance or parental support that they need at home. Or just, you know, taking youth into homes, foster homes or whatever – any kind of programs designed to accept youth in need into, you know, homes that can provide – or any kind of program that can provide some kind of adult care. Does that help?

Mr. Gima: No.

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Mr. Gima: I mean, is the intent more for – I mean, if we're looking at foster care type of services, again, that's State of Hawaii, Child welfare services. If we're looking at promoting or encouraging more use of hanai practices, I think you need to separate that from foster care. And if you're looking at opportunities for youth versus disadvantage youth, I think we need to be clear about that. So I think there's like several things you want to accomplish in one sentence.

Ms. Bosco: Would you like to break that policy up and create two separate policies? And we could – I mean – it's possible to just create one policy statement that says “improve opportunities for disadvantage youth,” and then a second policy statement which says, “encourage the tradition of hanai –.”

Mr. Gima: I would suggest you take out the first part of the sentence and go with the initial draft language which doesn't seem like it was altered by any of the GPACs.

Ms. Bosco: 2003 – “encourage the tradition of hanai and expand opportunities for foster care.” And then drop the first part?

Mr. Gima: Yeah.

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Mr. Gima: Because I was wondering where that came from.

Ms. Bosco: Let's see where it came from – because it was probably dropped from another

statement in the matrix. "Improve opportunities for disadvantaged youth." We're going to make a reference to make sure we're not removing something that came from another policy statement, okay? So, Julia, when you – put a parenthesis and say check the first part of the statement and see if it came from anywhere else in the document – check – I don't know how you'd say it. I'm talking about "improve opportunities for disadvantage youth" – that might have come from some where else. We may have merged that idea from a separate policy statement. Check initial portion of sentence for original input – yeah – thank you.

Mr. Gima: Okay, under D-1-d, regarding local hospitals, I would suggest language to say that we, you know, encourage expansion but we want to facilitate the establishment of new health care facilities and facilitate that prompt and high quality emergency and urgent care services for all is provided as oppose to the County having the responsibility of insuring and the County having the responsibility of establishing.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, so the language – to improve in the language – how would you –?

Mr. Gima: "Encourage expansion and improvement of local hospitals, facilitate the establishment of new health care facilities."

Ms. Bosco: Okay, hold on – "facilitate the establishment of" – hold on – "of new health care facilities and ensure –"

Mr. Gima: No, "and facilitate the prompt and high quality emergency and urgent care services for all."

Ms. Bosco: "And facilitate the prompt" – hold on – "and high quality." Okay, there you go. Okay, Butch can you take a look at the language up there?. Does that reflect what you mean? "Encourage the expansion and improvement of local hospitals. Facilitate the establishment of new hospitals facilities and facilitate the prompt and high quality emergency" – "and facilitate the prompt" – wait – "and facilitate prompt and high quality emergency and urgent care services for all." Thank you.

Mr. Gima: Okay, any more discussions or edits to objective – I mean, goal D and objective D-1 and accompanying policies? Okay, you want to review the amendments before I entertain a motion?

Ms. Bosco: Okay, I think what we're going to do, just for the record, we're going to remove the staff's note. We're going to keep it in our notes. We're going to do some internal looking around to see if there's any other statements. And if we find there's important statement that's been lost, then we'll add it as the Director's recommendation, but not part of your record. Okay? So –.

Ms. de Jetley: I move to accept D-1 with amendments.

Mr. Dwight Gamulo: I second the motion.

Ms. Bosco: And as well as the goal statements?

Mr. Gima: You want to go with goal D and objective D-1 and accompanying policies with amendments? Was that the motion?

Ms. de Jetley: Yes.

Mr. Gima: Okay, it's been moved by Commissioner Alberta de Jetley, and seconded by Commissioner Dwight Gamulo that approve goal D, objective D-1 and accompanying policies with amendments. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor raise your right hand.

Commission Members: *(Hands raised.)*

Ms. Bosco: Okay, it's unanimous. Thank you.

Mr. Gima: Motion is carried.

**It was moved by Commissioner Alberta de Jetley, seconded by
Commissioner Dwight Gamulo, then unanimously**

**VOTED: To approve Goal D, Objective D-1 and its supporting
policies with the amendments.**

Ms. Bosco: Okay, next section, D-2.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, while we're reading, I just have two – three things to ask about D-2-b. When I looked to see what this might mean, it appears as if two separate policies were collapsed into one, and it makes no sense. Well, to me, I'm probably missing something. "Encourage investments to improve recruitment" – does that mean putting more money into the recruitment process? And if so, it doesn't belong, I don't think, with the –. Because the original way it read back in different versions was "encouraging investments to improve the quality of medical facilities and equipment," and somehow "investment to improve the recruitment of professionals" got stuck in there too.

Ms. Bosco: Right. Let me take a look here.

Ms. Kaye: Sure. And then, for D-2-g, the "allowing the elderly" – and I would add "and the chronically ill."

Ms. Bosco: And the chronically ill.

Ms. Kaye: You actually make it sounds like they're the only ones that need that kind of care.

Ms. Bosco: I just want to make a note that Maui wanted the term "and the terminally ill."

Ms. Kaye: You know I thought about that, but a chronically ill person, I thought was more inclusive – terminally ill is limited.

Ms. Bosco: Yeah. Okay.

Ms. Kaye: So we can put both of them in, I suppose.

Ms. Bosco: Butch, did you have an important comment you want on the record?

Mr. Gima: We may not need to list the type of patients. I think it's assume when you list the facility that they will know what types of patients they will take in.

Ms. Kaye: Well, how about just "an individuals?" – "allowing individuals to be cared for –"

Ms. Bosco: That is a much simpler way of doing it.

Ms. Kaye: "And in a manner incongruent with his or her needs or desires."

Ms. Bosco: Okay, so let's look at it – "allowing the individual to be cared for in a manner congruent with –"

Ms. Kaye: "–with his or her needs."

Ms. Bosco: "– with his or her needs."

Ms. Kaye: "And desires." Period.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, let's help Julia here. "To be cared for in a manner congruent with his or her needs and desires." And after desires, period, and then take off "of the individual." Is that right Sally?

Ms. Kaye: Yeah.

Ms. Bosco: And did you want to add –? Never mind. Scratch that.

Ms. Kaye: Okay, and while you're looking for D-2-b – whatever that might mean – D-2-j, what's an index?

Ms. Bosco: An index – let me read that – that policy statement. The reason I'm hesitating in answering is because I didn't draft that policy, and the planner that did would better be able to explain this.

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This would be a set of indicators that would measure the health of the overall community. There could be one for instance on –

Ms. Kaye: Why don't we just put the word "indicators" in then? That makes sense – index just didn't.

Mr. Summers: Yeah, that would work.

Ms. Bosco: So instead of the word “index,” put “indicators?” Is that right? Or – “a set of indicators?” – is that the term? Okay, so Julia, “support the development and maintenance of a set” – take the word “comprehensive” – do you want the word “comprehensive” in there? No. Don’t forget to speak into the mic. That’s okay.

Mr. Elliott: Why couldn’t you just say “and maintenance of indicators that will measure health and wellness needs?”

Ms. Bosco: Can do that – “maintenance of indicators that will measure the health and wellness needs of Maui County’s families.” Thank you. Sally, coming back to D-3 – it’s better to keep those two ideas separate. Do you have some preferred language, though, for that? The original language read, “encourage investment to improve the quality medical facilities throughout Maui County,” and we’re referring right now to D-2-b. In the second policy statement was “expand programs and incentives to recruit qualified doctors and medical professionals to Maui County.” Two separate policy statements. Thank you. So Julia, could you –? Yeah, we’re referring to 2012, the original language; and 2014, the original language – bring those into your – two separate policy statements. Thank you. 2014, the original language.

Mr. Gima: Under D-2-k, could we reword it to say either “assist or facilitate the State of Hawaii/Department of Public Safety in strengthening programs and facilities which will . . .” blah, blah, blah.

Ms. Bosco: Okay: “Assist or facilitate” – help me out here a little – “assist and facilitate” – what the strengthening?

Mr. Gima: No, “facilitate the State –“

Ms. Bosco: The State of Hawaii.

Mr. Gima: Slash the Department of Public Safety in strengthening “yadda, yadda, yadda.”

Ms. Bosco: Got it. So, “assist and facilitate the State/Department of Health and Safety –.”

Mr. Gima: No, Department of Public Safety.

Ms. Bosco: Department of Public Safety?

Ms. Kaye: Aren’t they County facilities? Like the County jails? No County jails? They’re all State run?

Mr. Gima: Well, like MCCC –

Ms. Kaye: Yeah?

Mr. Gima: – is run by the State Department of Public Safety.

Ms. Bosco: Well there is – Police Department does incarcerate people. So, would you be excluding that?

Mr. Gima: But the jails don't provide social and mental services, the prisons and – they're suppose to.

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Mr. Gima: And the prisons are the ones that transition incarcerated individuals back into the community, not the jails.

Ms. Bosco: What about non-governmental institutions and organizations such as what MEO Best House?

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The only thing here is whether we want to facilitate other organizations whether it's non-governmental. For instance, MEO Best House – there's a number of them that help to – help the transition of inmates back into society. We don't want to make the statement too narrow in terms of foreclosing that as well.

Mr. Gima: I'm opening to modifying what you just said. I just wanted to put in language to show that we are going to support who's responsible to carry out this mandate, like many others, that's not the County's responsibility.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you Mr. Chair. How about if we kept the original language – “assist and facilitate the State, Department of Public Safety and other organizations and other efforts to strengthen programs and facilities which improve –“ Is that okay?

Mr. Endrina: On D-2-h, who's going to figure out who's native Hawaiian?

Ms. Bosco: That's going to be the State.

Mr. Endrina: Is there a set –

Ms. Bosco: There's a set definition that the State has for that.

Mr. Endrina: Okay.

Ms. Bosco: Yeah. We won't get into that.

Mr. Gima: Can you talk about D-2-f? “Carry the spirit of cooperation among the police, courts and the public.” Where is the foundation for that and the intent? And why the County would be the one that would be spearheading this?

Ms. Bosco: Let's look at it. I think I'll refer to the original matrix and see where that – how

that revolved – D-2-f – 2022.

Mr. Gima: I mean, is it one of these let's all work together type of things or is it conflicting statutes, laws, ordinances that make it difficult to work together?

Ms. Bosco: I think the original intent – and I didn't draft the original policy – I have to say that and I would have to ask the planner who did – but how I read this is the original statement didn't have the judiciary in it. And so, it was intended that the public – that it would be a mutually supportive relationship – that the public and the Police Department would work together to create an improved public safety. So, for example, I guess there's programs that are senior citizen driven or programs which, you know, citizens participate in with the public – or I mean, with the Police Department – that help improve public safety. I'm trying to think of the one on Oahu that they do. I can't think of it right now off the top of my head, but the businesses kind of get together and they work together. Now, the addition of the Courts, that probably has something to do with it. I mean, I guess, just to broaden it to include the Courts, so that the Courts – I don't know – I mean, naturally the Courts judicate things. So I'm guessing that – that came from Maui. So, I wasn't there at that meeting when they discussed so I'm at a disadvantage.

Mr. Gima: I would suggest sticking with the original intent because if you throw in the Court, you throw in the State agency. And then the Judiciary with the judges, I mean they've got their own idiosyncracies on how they want to do things. And I think it just makes it a lot more difficult to accomplish if you throw the Courts in there.

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Ms. Kaye: I would, from experience, disagree that. The Courts definitely need to be in there. It is, at least, a four-way street – public, it's the defendant, it's the Courts, it's the police. I don't see any reason to take it out.

Ms. Bosco: There are programs that the Judiciary offers that help the public a lot too. And then you have mediation and we have other social programs that go through the Court systems that do help increase public safety. So, I'm not sure if you would want it excluded.

Mr. Gima: I think the Judiciary is important, but then you have probation, and parole, and PD's, and the Prosecutors, and the Judges all part of the so-called Court. So, I mean, if there's something specific that we want to ensure cooperation between the Police, the public – and the difference –

Ms. Bosco: Judiciary, I would say, probably, the broader term. Not the Courts – the Courts refers to only the Courts. Judiciary includes the entire structure. The entire –

Ms. Kaye: Actually, I would disagree with that statement as well. The Judiciary is who sits on the bench. The Courts is probation, parole, plus the Judge.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, so you would say that the word Courts is a better term?

Ms. Kaye: If we're going to get to that level, I'd say Courts is better than Judiciary.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. Okay, so, is the language up on the screen – “encourage the spirit of cooperation among the Police” – and do you want to add the term “the courts?” Keep it as it is – “and the public?” So, do we want to change it or do we want to keep it the way it was? This is up for discussion?

Mr. Gima: This one is hard one for me because I don't know the intent and the foundation from which this was originally drafted. And we are making some assumptions what Judiciary and the Courts mean. And only the Maui GPAC added the Court.

Ms. Bosco: You want to refer to the original – in your binder, we can go back to the original comments. Let me just find that really fast. So, let's look. Okay, so, under the first review, policy 2022, under Maui, it say strike expand, replace with broaden the. So it looks like that was not done. And then under Moloka`i, the comment was bridging the gap, get police more involved with youth. So, Moloka`i wanted – it looks like Moloka`i basically supported the statement but wanted the emphasis to be on youth – engaging the youth somehow. Does everybody see where I am? No. Okay.

Mr. Elliott: I just wanted to say I don't see that you gain anything by taking it out or losing anything by leaving it in. It seems to me, it's fine like it is.

Ms. Bosco: Fine the way it is. Okay. Would you like to take a vote just on this statement so we can kind gage where we are at on it?

Mr. Gima: Any comments from the Commissioners on D-2-f?

Ms. de Jetley: I have one. The Lana`i recommendation was between the Police and the public.

Mr. Gima: Well, I'm not going to lose any sleep if the Courts are left in there. It's on record that there was some confusion so maybe you guys can use that and when the next draft comes up, come up with something better.

Ms. Bosco: Okay. That's a fair comment.

Mr. Gima: Okay, so no objections to not voting specifically on this one? Okay.

Ms. Bosco: Okay.

Mr. Gima: So, let's review the amendments before I entertain a motion.

Mr. Elliott: I'll make a motion that we accept D-2 with the amendments.

Ms. Kaye: Second.

Mr. Gima: Okay, it's been moved by Commissioner Elliott, and seconded by

Commissioner Kaye that we approve objective D-2 and accompanying polices with amendments. Any discussions? Hearing none, all in favor raise your right hands.

Commission Members: *(Hands raised.)*

Ms. Bosco: It's unanimous.

It was moved by Commissioner James Elliott, seconded by Commissioner Sally Kaye, then unanimously

VOTED: To approve Objective D-2 and its supporting polices with amendments.

Ms. Bosco: Okay, next section D-3 – last section and then we've completed our work.

Ms. Zigmond: I have a question please. Could you enlighten me on D-3-b?

Ms. Bosco: Yes. The intent of this is to encourage – I guess, encourage community involvement, participation, engagement, in any real way. I mean, there are many formal and informal ways that the community comes together to mutually support itself and it's parts. That could be community events or community programs. For example, Habitat for Humanity is a non-profit organization. They get together and volunteers come out and, you know, help build homes, as an example. So there's things like that. There's lots of volunteer programs that are non-profits that really strive to keep the community in tack, sort of speak. Does that help? Yeah, it's a very broad statement. If want to make it more specific, we can. But we just tried to keep it broad so it can apply to many things.

Mr. Gima: Was the wording too global for you Bev?

Ms. Zigmond: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Gima: I guess this is where some Pigeon-English would convey the message out to come out better, yeah? – each more community will more tight.

Ms. Bosco: There you go.

Ms. Kaye: I just think if it's going to come out, it's going to get fleshed out. I like it that it's broad because the way a community would become more cohesive here is going to be way different than it would be in Kahului.

Ms. Bosco: That's what I'm thinking. I think Maui could – it means that everybody helps each other or something.

Mr. Gima: Okay.

Ms. Bosco: If you look back you can see how that statement evolved. It was originally "develop programs to foster community cohesiveness," and we wanted to drop that word

programs because it starts to get into implementation. So I thought I'd mention that.

Mr. Gima: Well, if there are no amendments to be made, I'll entertain a motion.

Ms. Zigmond: I move that we approve objective D-3 and its implementing actions and motions and amendments – there aren't any – there are none – as it is. Okay.

Mr. Bosco: There are none.

Mr. Gamulo: I second.

Mr. Gima: Okay, it's been moved by Commissioner Zigmond, and seconded by Commissioner Gamulo that we approve objective D-3 and accompanying polices. Any discussions? Hearing none, all in favor raise your right hand.

Commission Members: *(Hands raised.)*

Ms. Bosco: It's unanimous.

Mr. Gima: Motion is carried.

It was moved by Commissioner Beverly Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Dwight Gamulo, then unanimously

VOTED: To approved objective D-3 and its supporting policies as presented.

Ms. Bosco: Thank you. You've completed two sections. Good work!

D. COMMUNICATIONS

- 1. Discussion on when it would be appropriate for the Lanai Planning Commission to discuss the 1990 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Lanaians for Sensible Growth and Castle & Cooke Resorts concerning development at Manele.**

The Commission may decide on whether the matter can be discussed at a future date and select a date for the discussion.

Mr. Gima: John, do you want me take number one?

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman, that would be wonderful.

Mr. Gima: Okay, I discussed with Corporation Counsel about the appropriateness of scheduling the – not scheduling, but making the MOA document available to all the Commissioners. And what was decided is that we need to find out it is a public or private document so I'll take the responsibility of contacting Counsel for Lana`ian's for Sensible

Growth and Castle & Cooke to see if they would have any objections if copies be distributed the Commissioners. And so, if there are no objections, then we'll get the copies to all of you. Okay? Any questions on that?

Ms. de Jetley: I have. Will this – once we get the MOA back, will we be taking public testimony? Because if we are going to be taking public testimony, you should allow a lot of time because this is really hot issue on this Island.

Mr. Gima: I think what the Commission had requested that a workshop be provided by Lana`ian's for Sensible Growth on the MOA. And the Corporation Counsel had ruled that it would inappropriate at this time because the County of Maui was a party to the Land Use Commission hearings that occurred a couple of weeks ago. So, we haven't heard anything back since. But in the mean time, maybe, if we can get the copies of the MOA, at least we can familiarize ourselves with the contents of the MOA so that when the workshop does happen, we'll be ready.

Ms. Zigmond: So what you're saying then is that we cannot do what it says here which is deciding that future date because we don't have approval to do that yet?

Mr. Gima: Yeah, I think we have to get approval from Corporation Counsel and we have to find out if we can have access to the actual document.

Ms. Zigmond: If we can't have access, can we still have the workshop?

Mr. Gima: Pending Corporation Counsel's opinion and approval.

Ms. Zigmond: So this is misleading here then? Under Communications, it makes it sound like it is happening. It's just when it would be appropriate, not if.

Mr. Gima: Well, I mean, the bottom line is we have to wait for Corporation Counsel to give us the okay. Okay, any other further – any other questions on the MOA? Okay, John, can I turn over number two to you or to Corporation Counsel?

2. Discussion on the processing of SMA exemptions.

The Commission may look to direct staff to produce draft legislation regarding amending the current process.

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Clayton Yoshida discussed this briefly with me and would like to comment on it at the next meeting, if you may. And I don't know if Corporation Counsel has anything to add to this item.

Mr. Hopper: Thank you Mr. Chair. I really don't have anything to add. This would be something that should be introduced by the Planning Department's staff since they will be drafting the amendment. You do have included in your packet an amendment made by the Moloka`i Planning Commission to their SMA Rules to do with, I believe, you had discussed doing at the meeting where this came up. So you can take a look at that, in the packets,

and see what was done. But, this should really be introduced by the Planning Department. As though we would review this as to form and legality, it would be the Planning Department that would draft your Rules based on you instructions.

Ms. Kaye: Mr. Chair, as I read this – “may look to direct staff to produce draft legislation” – as Counsel points out, we did get it, we did read it, I’ve compared it to the Rules as they exists. I don’t understand why we couldn’t just simply, as you suggested last time we don’t need a formal motion, ask staff to, in fact, draft that legislation for our review.

Mr. Summers: If that’s the will of the Committee, we’ll bring that message to Mr. Yoshida, and he’ll move forward.

Mr. Hopper: What did you want them to draft though? I don’t understand any directions that the Planning Department has been given. Yeah, in order for them to draft something, you would need to have a discussion at least on sort of what they want – want you want to draft.

Ms. Zigmond: I think we did that last time. We said we wanted approval of exemptions.

Mr. Hopper: Okay, well, I suppose the Planning Department is okay and has enough on the record to draft something, that’s fine. But, I’m not sure if they do, and I can’t really speak for them.

Ms. de Jetley: I thought at last month’s meeting when I asked that it be placed on the agenda, I thought that we were told then that Moloka`i already had that, and it would just be the matter of copying their language.

Mr. Hopper: If that’s what you want. If you want to use their exact same language and do what they’re doing. But Moloka`i did go through a pretty extensive review process of what they wanted. If you’re okay with that same language – you know, I can’t speak for the Planning Department, let me just say. So, I really got to really kind of step out of this because I could review what was done and say if it was legal, but it’s really up to the Planning Department. If they have enough information to draft this rule change – that’s the only reason why I don’t feel comfortable, you know, speaking for them.

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a pretty weighty issue and it’s something that Mr. Yoshida has been intimately involved in and has direct experience with how it’s played out and worked on Moloka`i. You know, given that, I would strongly encourage that you have that conversation when he’s available. He has participated, previously, at the last meeting with this Body, and he’s got a lot to share in terms of the experience on Moloka`i. I would be the wrong person, to be honest, to get into the details of this since I haven’t reviewed it and haven’t worked with it.

Ms. Zigmond: Well, when is he going to be available because this is something that we don’t want to be put on the back burner for months and months? And if he’s not going to be available at the next meeting, then perhaps we should seek some other way of doing this.

Mr. Summers: Well if this is an item that's important with to the Committee, then he can, or appropriate staff, could be here for the Committee so that a reasonable, logical, rationale decision can be made on this item. Well, he'll be available or he can have staff – we have shoreline specialist that can be available in his place if he can't make it.

Ms. Zigmond: Can we make that happen?

Mr. Summers: I can certainly bring it up with Mr. Yoshida. And in all probability, I can't speak for Mr. Yoshida, but I'm sure the Department can probably swing that for you.

Ms. de Jetley: I'm a little bit concerned here because on this, we have open projects by TMK reports. I don't know where the Brown residents and whether or not this TMK is in that shoreline management area that we're concerned about. So if we're being put on the back burner here, it will just go to the Planning Director and be approved, and we'll have no input at all.

Ms. Zigmond: Thank you Commissioner de Jetley.

Mr. Gima: Is there something that we want Clayton to specifically do or prepare for our next meeting, whether he is here or not?

Ms. Kaye: I think from my recollection of the last meeting, there was a little bit of discussion about this is a difficult thing on other islands when Moloka`i decided to take in their own exemptions. And so, we asked, how many exemptions have ever been applied for on Lana`i? And no one knew. So that's one thing – a history of what kind of exemptions have been applied for. And a list of pro's and con's – short to sync – and draft legislation that would reflect the change here, and then we can decide from there.

Mr. Gima: And the change would be similar to or exactly what the Moloka`i Planning Commission did?

Ms. Kaye: Yeah, at first read, I couldn't think of anything else that would have to be included, but I'm sure Clayton would have an opinion on that.

Mr. Gima: Okay, so history, pro's and con's and change in the language. Okay, any other discussion on number two under communications?

E. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Commission Chair's request to discuss the following:

The feasibility of changing the zoning of the remaining 65 acres of land donated to the County of Maui by Castle & Cooke for affordable housing. The change would go from its current zoning to the appropriate type of zoning that would make the land ready to be improved.

2. **Open Lanai Applications Report**
3. **Public Hearing on Proposed Amendments to the Rural District Ordinance, and on 5-year time extension on the Manele Residential SM1 and PH2 Approvals scheduled for September 19, 2007, 7:00 p.m., Lanai Senior Center.**

Mr. Gima: Okay, on to Director's Report. Director is not here. I usually talk about number one. So I don't have anything further to report on item number one. Any questions or comments on number two, open Lana`i applications report? Jim.

Mr. Elliott: I guess my question is just are we anticipating these are going to come before us at any point? What is the strategy for that?

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chair. Normally they do. Right.

Ms. de Jetley: Can staff advise us whether or not the open projects for the Brown Residence is in fact in the Manele Project District or is it at the Keamoku area? Does anybody know where that actually is? On the TMK.

Mr. Summers: We can appraise you of that at the next meeting.

Mr. Gima: Alberta, if you don't want to wait that long, you can just call the Planning Department, tomorrow, and ask him specifically.

Ms. de Jetley: Yes, but it's not going to do me any good because as it is now, the Planning Director can go ahead and approve a private residence in the SMA district.

Mr. Gima: I see your point.

Ms. de Jetley: Then the other question I have is on Castle & Cooke – is that install their weather data stations – is that going to have to go to public hearing?

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm not familiar with that project. I can pass the information on to Clayton and have him contact you, but I don't know.

Mr. Gima: Yeah, those are the met-towers for the wind farm. So I think it's in either open space – open space – yeah, I'm not sure. So we'll get the information in two weeks then since you guys will be here. Well it looks like Sally's efforts have helped – open Lana`i reports is down to just three lines now. Okay, onto number three. Who's going to talk about this? Ralph already left.

Ms. Zigmond: So Mr. Chair – I'm not going to talk about it, but I have a question. Does this mean that all of the surrounding neighbors et cetera have been noticed? Because that was part of the recommendation or part of what we had – when we did this six months ago – that there would be a public hearing and all of their neighbors would have to be noticed.

Ms. Kaye: . . . (Inaudible) . . . Can I just ask is number three just going to be on our agenda in two weeks? We're not going to do anything about it tonight – it's next week.

Mr. Summers: That's correct. This is really just an information piece.

Mr. Gima: Yeah, we should receive the packet by next Wednesday correct? So in there it will show whether they complied with all of the conditions and whether the neighbors have been noticed.

Mr. Elliott: Well, I just wanted to say that I know of people who have received that – and I don't know if it's everybody – I know of people that have. That's all.

Mr. Gima: Okay, so for September 19th meeting, we have this public hearing under proposed amendments for the rural district ordinance and the five-year time extension at the Manele Residential. In addition to going over the – what are the next two?

Ms. Zigmond: Local culture and preserve natural resources. But also, in addition, we have the SMA issue.

Mr. Gima: Okay. And we're going to be at the Senior Center, not at the Cafeteria.

Ms. Bosco: Commission, before we adjourn, I want to ask if we can somehow get your opinion on meeting earlier for the next meeting because your agenda will be full. And we do need to cover the policy plan. Whether you want to do that through the Chair or now, it's up to you. But, before the next meeting, we need to decide if we're going to start early.

Ms. Kaye: Is that adequate public notice that the meeting time has been changed to do it in two weeks?

Ms. Bosco: No, we would – as long as the agenda states the starting as early within the sunshine law requirements – eight days in advance or whatever. It will be posted as an earlier time, but I want to make sure you guys are on board with that before we do that. So, do you have any opinions about it?

Mr. Gima: Six? Can people do six?

Ms. Bosco: Six.

Mr. Gima: I think I can.

Ms. de Jetley: Well I have a question. On the public hearing part for the native Hawaiian thing, is that going to be after our regular business?

Ms. Bosco: I do not know the order. I don't set the order for the agenda. I am just concerned, right now, that we have enough time for the policy plan since I'm trying to process it. But the question can be asked and I can communicate with Clayton because he creates the agenda.

Mr. Gima: What would you prefer Alberta?

Ms. de Jetley: We take care of our business first on this other stuffs before we work on the plans.

Mr. Gima: Which is the "other stuff" and which is the "plans?"

Ms. Bosco: The regular business would be business first.

Ms. de Jetley: The regular business taking care of first, so that we can get some kind of information on the exemptions that we want for the SMA.

Mr. Gima: Well –

Ms. de Jetley: Well, we want them to come back with the draft within two weeks, right? And I'd rather take care of getting that done, and after we're through with all of our regular business, then we can do the stuff we were doing tonight.

Mr. Gima: Okay, what we're going to have to do at the beginning of the meeting is make a motion to amend the agenda to take on communication first before we go to public hearing.

Ms. Bosco: Probably –

Ms. de Jetley: So you already have the September 19th agenda set?

Ms. Bosco: No we do not.

Ms. de Jetley: We don't have to make a motion. She can set it that way.

Mr. Gima: No, but it wouldn't come under public hearing. The SMA stuff would come under Communications and if we want to take Communications first, we have to amend the order in which we work on the agenda that evening. So under public hearing, we're going to have these two items, plus the Castle & Cooke's extension.

Ms. de Jetley: Right.

Mr. Gima: And then comes Communications. So if you want to take Communications first, at the September 19th meeting, we need to make a motion to switch.

Ms. de Jetley: Okay, so we need to do that now? I make a motion to take Communications first on the agenda.

Mr. Summers: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The only thing that is fixed is the public hearing on the Rural Ordinance because that was advertised 30-days in advance and they probably have seven o'clock start time, so we couldn't have that public hearing before seven o'clock. So that's the only item that would be fixed.

Mr. Hopper: The policy plan doesn't have to be public hearing again. You already closed that public hearing, but you can still have to allow public testimony on that. That wouldn't be a public hearing. The Rural Ordinance since it was noticed for seven, has to occur at seven. If you start your meeting at six, you can discuss other items, you just can't discuss the public hearing item it gets to seven. And so it's true that you can change the – you can just have the agenda order posted differently, and then you can change the order as you'd like. But, if the public hearing was only on the Rural Bill Ordinance change and that has to occur at seven o'clock, then I guess it would probably be a good idea to have that as one of the later agenda items anyway, and put the other items ahead of it – ahead of time, if that's the will of the Commission. You wouldn't necessarily need to wait for that meeting to change the order, you could just set – you know have the agenda posted with the order different. I mean, there's no obligation that the public hearing is the first thing that's talked about at the meeting. You would just open the public hearing when you got to seven o'clock just so no one shows up late and have the public hearing already completed.

Mr. Gima: You were going to say John?

Mr. Summers: That's right on. Your public items cannot happen until seven o'clock. So with that, it's been covered adequately.

Mr. Gima: So what's the pleasure of the Commission then?

Mr. Endrina: I guess we don't have a choice. We've got to take the policy first if we're going to start at six o'clock.

Ms. Bosco: I guess the only stipulation is that you have the public hearing items at seven. If you would like to start with Communication items at six, that's the will of the Commission. I'm just – I just hope we get to the Policy Plan – that's my point.

Mr. Gima: Okay. We can make that change in two weeks. One clarification that I need. – we had the public hearing tonight, but that doesn't preclude us from taking public hearing on the next two GPAC items?

Mr. Hopper: You actually have to allow public testimony at the next GPAC because of the Sunshine Law in general. The public hearing really only differs from public testimony in general because of the notice requirements. And usually, you do open and close it if there's like an item to vote on, like an SMA Permit or something like, you would open to public hearing, take the testimony, then close the public hearing and then go on to action. It's a little different because you've got this plan that you're going to be going through in sort of a constant – it goes through sort of constant procedure and so other GPACs and other Planning Commissions have left public testimony open throughout the entire meeting in case something comes up where a person comes up later. Then you would at least have to allow people three minutes to testify anyway. I mean, the public hearings closed, but you have to allow public testimony, and those things are different.

F. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: September 19, 2007

G. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Gima: Okay. Thank you. If there's no further announcement, meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

There being no further discussion brought forward to the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully transmitted by,

LEILANI A. RAMORAN
SECRETARY TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS I

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT:

Reynold "Butch" Gima, Chair
Lawrence Endrina, Vice-Chair
James Elliott
Dwight Gamulo
Sally Kaye
Beverly Zigmond
Alberta de Jetley
Matthew Mano

OTHERS:

John Summers, Planning Program Administrator, Long Range Division
Simone Bosco, Staff Planner
Julia Staley, Staff Planner
Michael Hopper, Deputy, Corporation Counsel